



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2003

No. 30

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 25, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHELLY MOORE CAPITO 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: Eternal God, Divine Providence has guided this Nation throughout its history.

You have brought us through times of war and times of peace, days of hardship and days of plenty.

Through all of our struggles You have brought to light great falsehoods and led us to embrace greater truths.

Be with the Members of the 108th Congress and guide them in these unsettling times.

Keep our Nation strong and, in Your loving care, keep us safe.

Be close to those who are in most need of Your consolation and help.

Listen to all who call upon Your holy name in prayer as they struggle to understand the signs of the times.

We beg to know Your holy will 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 151. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sexual exploitation of children.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8002 of title 26, United States Code, the Chair, on behalf of the Committee on Finance, announces the designation of the following Senators as members of the Joint Committee on Taxation:

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH).

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES).

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 14, 2003.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 14, 2003, at 10:38 a.m.

That the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 4.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 395.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 1.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 35.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 41.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.J. Res. 19.

That the Senate agreed to conference report H.J. Res. 2.

Appointment: Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker pro tempore BARTLETT signed the following enrolled joint resolution on Tuesday, February 18, 2003:

H.J. Res. 2, making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

REJECT EXPLOITATION

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

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, the coming debate on cloning raises a fundamental issue: Is it ethical to turn

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1277

human reproduction into a scientific manufacturing process? To me, Madam Speaker, the answer is an unequivocal no. There is no moral justification for human cloning.

Some people claim that, in this case, the ends justify the means and we should just ignore the ethical connotations of creating cloned human embryos, for whatever purpose. But let us establish the first principle here: every life is precious and every life is unique.

The procedures contemplated by opponents of a full cloning ban are no better than medical strip-mining, and they would trample the dignity of life. This we cannot and will not allow.

HONORING JUSTICE ERNEST A. FINNEY, JR.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the extraordinary achievements of Earnest A. Finney, Jr.

Raised by his father after his mother died following his birth, Earnest Finney went on to graduate from Claflin College and from South Carolina State University School of Law. Finding it difficult to earn a living as an attorney, Finney became a teacher and waited tables to make ends meet.

Finney then settled in Sumter, South Carolina, with his family and became South Carolina's leading defender of civil rights, representing more than 6,000 clients. In 1963 Finney served as chairman of the South Carolina Commission on Civil Rights and in 1972 was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives. He was then elected as judge of the Third Judicial Circuit in 1976.

Later, in 1994, Ernest Finney, who was once denied membership in South Carolina's lawyers association because of his race, became the first African American chief justice of South Carolina's Supreme Court since Reconstruction. I am extremely honored to have been Justice Finney's first Republican supporter in the State Senate. Since then, Justice Finney has retired and was named interim president of South Carolina State University in 2002.

Justice Finney remains a bright and shining star; and I thank him for his service, integrity, and commitment to making South Carolina and America a better place.

GERMANY AND FRANCE MUST DECIDE WHERE THEY STAND

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, nearly a century ago, George Santayana wrote, "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."

This is a big world we live in, but if there are two countries in this world

that should remember the consequences of coddling tyrants, they are France and Germany.

But these two countries seem to have forgotten.

The world is watching as Saddam Hussein amasses weapons so powerful they could wipe out whole armies, whole cities and, given time, perhaps even whole nations; and we know he will use them because he has done so before. But France and Germany seem to be doing everything in their power to foil our plans to stop him before it is too late.

Is it because these two countries have seen so much blood that they just cannot stand the thought of another war? Or is it because so much of Saddam's technology has come from Germany? Perhaps it is because France is Saddam's third largest trading partner. France and Germany's recklessness has even risked the safety of an ally and threatened the cohesiveness of NATO itself, although I am glad to say they have come to their senses there.

It is time for Germany and France to decide where they stand. Are they on the side of tyrants, or are they on the side of freedom? There is no other choice.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2003, AND THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2003

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, February 26; and that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Thursday, February 27, 2003.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4 p.m.

□ 1615

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 4 o'clock and 15 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 and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AL HIRSCHFELD AND HIS LEGACY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 46) honoring the life of Al Hirschfeld and his legacy.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 46

Whereas Al (Albert) Hirschfeld was born June 21, 1903, in St. Louis, Missouri;

Whereas Hirschfeld moved to New York City with his family at age 12;

Whereas, by age 18, Hirschfeld was already the art director for Selznick Pictures;

Whereas Hirschfeld went on to study painting, sculpture, and drawing in Paris;

Whereas on a trip in Bali, Hirschfeld first became "enchanted with line" and developed his signature style of caricature;

Whereas, in 1926, Hirschfeld attended the theater with press agent Richard Maney, who noticed the sketch Hirschfeld had doodled on his program and convinced him to submit it to the New York Herald Tribune, which printed it on its front page;

Whereas Hirschfeld began receiving periodic drawing assignments for the drama pages of the New York Times;

Whereas Hirschfeld became a close friend of legendary New York Times theater critic Brooks Atkinson and developed a relationship with the newspaper that would last nearly 75 years;

Whereas Hirschfeld went on to draw nearly every important figure of the American theater for the New York Times;

Whereas searching for the name of Hirschfeld's daughter, Nina, sometimes hidden as many as a dozen times within his drawings, became a favorite pastime for readers;

Whereas Hirschfeld's work has appeared in numerous books and is hung in many museums including the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and the St. Louis Art Museum;

Whereas Hirschfeld received 2 special Antoinette Perry (Tony) Awards for excellence in the theater;

Whereas Hirschfeld was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters;

Whereas Hirschfeld was selected to receive the National Medal of Arts in 2003;

Whereas in 1996 Hirschfeld was named a Living New York City Landmark by the New York Landmarks Conservancy;

Whereas audiences for years to come will be reminded of Hirschfeld's life and work through a Broadway theater named after him;

Whereas success on Broadway was measured, in part, by whether one had been caricatured by Hirschfeld;

Whereas Hirschfeld's drawings helped to communicate to millions of people the excitement of live theater;

Whereas Hirschfeld continued working until the day he passed away, January 20, 2003, at the age of 99; and

Whereas Hirschfeld's unique contribution to American culture will be sorely missed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives honors the life of Al Hirschfeld and his legacy, and extends its condolences to his family, friends, and loved ones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from

Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Resolution 46, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), honors the life of legendary illustrator Al Hirschfeld.

Madam Speaker, Al Hirschfeld passed away at his home in New York City on January 20 at the age of 99. During his remarkable career that spanned three-quarters of a century, Al Hirschfeld drew caricatures of giants of the performing arts world that appeared primarily in the New York Times, but also in a variety of books and periodicals. An A-list of museums and galleries feature his works, including the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York and the St. Louis Art Museum, which is in his hometown.

His drawings, easily recognized by their distinctive flowing lines and the hidden word "Nina," the name of his daughter that appeared in each of his works, turned generations of his own fans into connoisseurs of all art and theater. Indeed, in June of 1990, I had the opportunity to meet some of his family members to observe and admire his work firsthand and even to go on a search for some of those Ninas that were hidden in his caricatures when his exhibit was at the Tennessee Botanical Gardens and Fine Arts Center in Nashville.

By passing this resolution, this House can express the sadness of the City of New York, and indeed all of America, from Al Hirschfeld's passing last month. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 46.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, today we honor the life and legacy of Al Hirschfeld, the pen and ink illustrator who chronicled some 75 years of American theater and entertainment history who died on January 20 in Manhattan at the age of 99.

Hirschfeld, who was born June 21, 1903 in St. Louis, earned a special Tony award for his drawing of theater people. As my colleague, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), has

mentioned, he often featured the word Nina for his daughter in thousands and thousands of his drawings. In fact, it is kind of fun to find the Ninas in a particular drawing and Hirschfeld made more than 10,000 caricatures in his career.

At the tender age of 11, Hirschfeld's art teacher in St. Louis told his mother, "There is nothing more that we can teach him here in St. Louis."

The family promptly moved to New York where he enrolled in the Art Students' League. At age 17, Hirschfeld became an art director at Selznick Pictures. He held that position for about 4 years; and then in 1924 he moved to Paris to work, led a Bohemian life, grew a beard, which he retained until his death.

Although Hirschfeld is best known for his illustrations on the New York Times's theater pages, he also turned out posters for Broadway shows and drew for "TV Guide," "The Washingtonian," "Play Bill," "Rolling Stone" and many, many other publications.

In 1991, Al Hirschfeld became the first artist in history to have his name on a U.S. postage stamp booklet when the United States Postal Service released five stamps they commissioned Hirschfeld to design. The stamps portray Laurel and Hardy, Jack Benny, Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy, Abbot and Costello, and Fanny Brice.

The Hirschfeld postage stamps were so successful that in 1994 the U.S. Postal Service again commissioned Hirschfeld to portray Hollywood's celebrated stars of the silent screen era. This series of commemorative Hirschfeld stamps honors Rudolf Valentino, Charlie Chaplin, Buster Keaton, and the Keystone Cops.

In a 1999 interview with Reuters, Hirschfeld is quoted as saying, "After 70 years of drawing you have to improve, otherwise you are a dolt. It is a question of elimination and understanding, of trial and error, and suddenly something happens, an epiphany."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 46, honoring the life and legacy of Al Hirschfeld.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I would like to thank the leadership of both sides for bringing it to the floor today.

As a sponsor of the resolution and as the Member of Congress representing the Broadway community, I appreciate the bipartisan support this resolution has received.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is in honor of a beloved member of the American theater community who passed away in his sleep this past January 20.

Throughout his long and extraordinary career, Al Hirschfeld's drawings conveyed to millions of people the ex-

citement and glamour of live theater. Al Hirschfeld was born on June 21, 1903, in St. Louis, Missouri, and moved to New York City with his family at the age of 12. He discovered his artistic talents early on; and by age 18, he had already been hired as art director for Selznick Pictures, drawing the posters for such important movies as the Marx Brothers' "A Night at the Opera."

It was a night at the theater, however, that was the turning point in his life. In 1926 Hirschfeld attended a Broadway show with press agent Richard Maney, who was impressed by the sketch Hirschfeld had doodled on his program. Maney convinced him to submit the sketch to the New York Herald Tribune, which printed it on its front page. Periodic drawing assignments from the Herald Tribune lead to an invitation from the New York Times to contribute a drawing for its drama pages. Thus began one of the most fruitful partnerships in history as Al Hirschfeld's drawings became a critical element of the New York Times's drama coverage for the next 75 years.

Hirschfeld drew nearly every important figure in the American theater and popular culture from Charlie Chaplin to Jerry Seinfeld. His drawings were caricatures. They captured the essence of a performer in just a few lines. They were never mean-spirited and never meant to hurt a subject. In fact, it was a mark of respect and an honor to be captured in a Hirschfeld. Many a performer reticent to give an interview to the New York Times could be convinced when a Hirschfeld drawing was promised if he would give the interview.

No tribute to Al Hirschfeld could be complete without mention of his daughter, Nina, whose name has appeared in nearly every Hirschfeld drawing since her birth in 1945. It became a popular activity for regular readers of the Times to locate the one or many Ninas hidden throughout in his drawings.

In this Hirschfeld, for example, you will observe that the Nina is throughout the tie and that next to his signature the number 23 is put in, which is the number of times Nina's name is in the caricature.

Throughout his life, Hirschfeld gained wide recognition for his work which appeared in numerous books and museums, including the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Whitney Museum, and the St. Louis Art Museum. He also earned countless honors such as receiving two special Tony awards for excellence in the theater and for being named a living New York City landmark.

Shortly before his passing he learned that he had been elected to the American Academy of Arts and Letters and was to have been presented with the National Medal of Arts by President Bush at the White House later this year. And as an ultimate tribute from the theater community to which he contributed so much, on June 21st of

this year, which would have been his 100th birthday, he will have a theater named after him.

But while all of this recognition is well deserved, Al Hirschfeld was most at home at his drawing board, sitting on the barber's chair he liked to use. He was still working until the day he died, drawing a picture of his good friends, the Marx Brothers.

We will never forget Al Hirschfeld. His work will endure for many, many generations. But there is a big hole in the Sunday Times these days with no Hirschfeld drawings to liven up the drama pages and no Ninas to search for.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution. I hope we pass it unanimously.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER). I simply urge adoption of this measure.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the much-beloved New York artist, Al Hirschfeld, who brought the vibrant world of Broadway alive for 75 years—longer than most of us live.

This singular talent drew the actors, composers, choreographers, directors who made it all work—the talented people who are responsible for what we collectively call “the theater,” but what we also recognize is one of the unique contributions of American culture. For a mild-mannered and gentle soul, he was a veritable force of nature.

Hirschfeld's curvy, single line drawings that appeared to be so spare, so simple, held within them all the awe with which he—and we the audience—felt for this original and talented artistic community—and he did it over the generations. His work, his memory, and the theatre he loved will live on, and we will appreciate it more because of a prolific ability to share his vision of it with us.

I urge all my colleagues to support the resolution that remembers and commemorates Al Hirschfeld—a giant in the business of making magic happen before your very eyes, on the New York stage.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 46.

The question was taken.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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.

PERMITTING OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPHS TO BE TAKEN WHILE THE HOUSE IS IN ACTUAL SESSION

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 67) permitting official photographs of the House of Representatives to be taken while the House is in actual session on March 12, 2003.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 67

Resolved, That on March 12, 2003, official photographs of the House may be taken while the House is in actual session. Payment for the costs associated with taking, preparing, and distributing such photographs may be made from the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise here today for some mundane business, but important as far as the history of the House is concerned, and that is consideration of House Resolution 67, which would authorize the use of the Chambers of the House for a photograph, official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 108th Congress while we are in session.

I am pleased to do this today on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) of the Committee on House Administration who is not able to be with us; but as a Member I am pleased that the official photograph of the House will be taken, and I will announce this on March 12, 2003.

Payments associated with the taking, preparing, and distributing of the photo may be made from the applicable accounts of the House. The official photo of the House of Representatives, as we all know, has become a tradition for each of our Congresses. I believe this photograph is not only an appropriate moment to the Members serving in the 108th Congress but also a valuable historical record. I urge full support of this bipartisan request for this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and wish to associate myself with the remarks of my esteemed colleague from Florida (Mr. MICA) on what has become a quintessential Kodak moment for the Members of this august body. And I look forward to that photo opportunity because I agree with the gentleman that this clearly is a historic moment for the House as well.

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

□ 1630

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

Again, this is a bipartisan request. It is too bad that the picture is not taken today when we all look relaxed, refreshed, coming back from our districts, but it will be taken, as I said, March 12.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 67.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of House Resolution 67, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 40) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 40

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on April 30, 2003, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise here today for consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 40, which is necessary to permit the House and the Congress to use the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum was charged with providing appropriate ways for the Nation to commemorate the days of remembrance as an annual national and civic commemoration of the Holocaust. As a result of this legislation, the very first ceremony of remembrance was held in the rotunda in 1979. It has been held there every year since that time except for periods when the rotunda has been closed for renovations.

House Concurrent Resolution 40, the resolution before us, will provide this year's national ceremony which will be conducted on April 30, 2003, in the rotunda of the United States Capitol Building. The purpose of the days of remembrance, again, is to ask all citizens, all Americans, to reflect on the Holocaust, to remember the victims and to strengthen our sense of democracy, our demand for human rights.

This ceremony will be the centerpiece of similar remembrance ceremonies to be held throughout the Nation. Members of the Congress, government officials, foreign dignitaries, Holocaust survivors, and citizens from all walks of life have attended previous ceremonies. At last year's days of remembrance commemoration in the rotunda of our Capitol, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, Condoleezza Rice, was the keynote speaker. Two years ago, President George W. Bush gave the keynote address.

The theme for this particular day of remembrance is "For Your Freedom and Ours." How fitting and how proper that it be in honor and remembrance of those courageous individuals in the Warsaw ghetto who valiantly rose up against their Nazi oppressors some 60 years ago.

In remembering those who took a determined stand against Nazism, we honor the memory of those who perished, and of course we are reminded that individuals do have the power, and the choice, to make a difference in the fight against oppression and murderous hatred. And we are so much reminded of that today as we make choices here in this Congress and as our President makes choices, not only for our Nation but the world, against similar oppression and potential Holocaust.

Madam Speaker, I urge that we support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 40, authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda on April 30, 2003, for a ceremony sponsored by the United States Holocaust Memorial Council, pursuant to Public Law 106-292, to observe the days of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of this resolution, and I want to congratulate the distinguished gen-

tleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for bringing it before us today, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the new chief deputy majority whip, for introducing it.

Congress provides for this ceremony every year during the spring. Related events will be occurring all over the country. I am proud to acknowledge that it has set a precedent in the State of Connecticut. I presided over that chamber's Holocaust memorial services for 8 years.

These related events provide Americans of all faiths and ethnic backgrounds to reflect on the Holocaust, to remember its victims and to strengthen our commitment to democracy and human rights. It is appropriate that we use the Capitol rotunda, the citadel for the rule of law and the location of so many historic ceremonies, to again draw attention to one of the greatest tragedies in human history. It reminds us that such events must never be permitted to occur.

Each year the ceremony has a theme geared to specific events which occurred during the Holocaust, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has pointed out. This year's theme for the days of remembrance is "For Your Freedom and Ours," to honor the courageous armed resistance of the Jews in the Warsaw ghetto to deportation and slaughter in the Nazi death camps.

Between July and September of 1942 the Germans deported nearly 300,000 Jews from the Warsaw ghetto for execution. Cut off from assistance from the outside world, poorly armed resistance forces fought the German military for a month, in April and May of 1943, until the ghetto was finally destroyed. This resistance served as a symbolic victory and protest in the fight against oppression and helped raise the consciousness about the atrocities Hitler was perpetrating in Europe.

While the days of remembrance commemorates historic events in the 1930s and 1940s in Europe, the issues raised by the Holocaust remain fresh in our memories as we survey the political scene in the world today. The nature and tactics of war and the identity of an enemy may change, but what remains is the terror, the cruelty, and the madness of it.

It is especially timely now to encourage public reflection on the faith of Holocaust victims and to remember that there was then and there is still today evil in the world. The ceremony we are authorizing today reminds us that individuals, as well as Nations, can strike a blow to preserve the balance on which human civilization rests.

I urge the passage of this concurrent resolution. I have no additional speakers, but I would just like to thank Matt Pinkus from our staff for his very thorough job and assistance in the comments that I used to address the body today.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased again to bring before the House, House Concurrent Resolution 40 which would permit the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance for the victims of the Holocaust. I urge my colleagues to pass this concurrent resolution and also for them to reflect upon the time in history that we face, the potential for another Holocaust and the easy route of ignoring the world situation and the potential for human disaster. Difficult choices in our times, but we cannot afford to ever experience what we will commemorate and remember, victims of the Holocaust from World War II, on this occasion and use of our rotunda.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I want to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 40, authorizing the rotunda of the Capitol to be used on April 30, 2003, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust, and commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) for bringing this important measure to the floor at this time.

When we talk of the Holocaust, we speak of a unique atrocity, distinct from any other.

The mass murder that was inflicted upon millions of innocent men, women, and children must be viewed both as crimes against humanity and acts of genocide in their own right, and should be remembered as such.

Yet, while the Holocaust is unique in history, anti-Semitism continues to haunt European society.

Initially, Jews returning home after their liberation from the death camps often were met by their neighbors who had taken their houses, refused to return them, and in many places murdered these survivors of the Nazis.

More recently, the continued violence in Israel, the West Bank and Gaza has released pent-up anti-Semitism throughout Europe.

In my capacity as the Chair of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights in the 107th Congress, I held several hearings and briefings on the rise of religious persecution in Europe, engaged in Western European nations in combating the rise of anti-Semitism within their counties and in international fora, where anti-Semitic and anti-Israel bias prevails.

However, this most recent outbreak of anti-Semitism is not limited to Europe by any means.

Many of the ancient canards and lies about Jews are being resurrected in the Arab media.

This includes the revival of the "blood libel" and pervasive Holocaust denial by the government-controlled press in Egypt and Saudi Arabia.

This cannot be tolerated.

We must demand that these governments, recipients of significant U.S. foreign assistance and other U.S. support, take immediate action to publicly repudiate both the message of hate and violence, as well as the purveyors of such filth.

Today, as we consider this measure to provide a forum for honoring the courage and indomitable will of the victims of the Holocaust, let us be guided by the lessons of the past and commit ourselves to eradicating the intolerance and extremism which led to this grim period in history.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, so that the lessons of the Holocaust may not be forgotten.

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I am honored to rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 40, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Remembrance of victims of the Holocaust is an indispensable and enduring task. We all must honor and identify with the victims. I therefore strongly support the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony remembering the victims of the Holocaust.

The most horrifying extent of anti-Semitism took place during the Nazi and Fascist reign in Europe. Jewish people were beaten, discriminated, and deported to concentration camps where they had to suffer from hard labor and medical experiments or were executed in gas chambers. This most horrible form of anti-Semitism took the lives of more than six million people, and the Jewish fate must never be forgotten. Indeed, we must ensure that the seeds of anti-Semitism are never sown again in Europe or elsewhere in the world.

And although we are currently in the sixth decade after the end of the Holocaust, the fight against anti-Semitism is far from over. Quite the contrary, new hatred against Jews can be witnessed in Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia. Nazi slogans are shouted in the streets of Germany, synagogues are burnt, and Jews are beaten up. This kind of hatred has already brought catastrophe to the Jewish people. Remembrance of the past is therefore essential as it helps focus attention on current and future threats to the Jewish people.

Remembrance must, however, go beyond intellectual insight and historical facts and should also include an emotional understanding, as far as this is possible. Only then are people ready to develop an attitude of zero-tolerance against anti-Semitism and discrimination in general.

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this important resolution, H. Con. Res. 40, permitting the use of the United States Capitol rotunda to observe, Yom Hashoah, the Day of Remembrance for Victims of the Holocaust.

Madam Speaker, seventy years ago a tyrant as evil as any known in the history of man, rose to power preaching an agenda of hate and racial superiority. His shadow caused darkness to fall upon the earth. He slew the innocent and pure, men and women and children, with vapors of poison and burned them with fire. And when the light of freedom shined again, tens of millions lay dead, cities and nations lay in ruin and a world stood awe struck at the horrors that had occurred.

Sadly today, even in our time, we face again totalitarian regimes led by maniacal dictators who threaten the peace and stability of the world. The rotunda of the United States Capitol represents the seat of free and open discourse, the foundation of our democracy, and is an anathema to those tyrannical leaders and their regimes.

We in the United States, the birthplace of Thomas Jefferson and Martin Luther King, enjoy a great deal of freedom. We must not take these freedoms for granted. We must not forget that genocide and human rights abuses continue to occur around the world. We must not remain silent when such atrocities occur,

and we must dedicate ourselves to continue to educate people around the globe about the horrors of the Holocaust. We must be forever mindful of the danger of such intolerance and ensure that it never happens again.

Madam Speaker, that is why there can be no place more fitting than the rotunda of our Capitol, where freedom shines, to remember those innocent who suffered from a tyrant past, and to speak to the hope of those oppressed people who suffer from the tyrants of today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 40.

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. MICA. 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. MICA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of H. Con. Res. 40.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY REGARDING PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-41)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report prepared by my Administration on the national emergency with respect to the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction that was declared in Executive Order 12938 of November 14, 1994.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 25, 2003.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

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

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 98), and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 98

Resolved. That the following Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Small Business: Mr. King of Iowa.

Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Murphy.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 46, by the yeas and yeas;

H. Con. Res. 40, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AL HIRSCHFELD AND HIS LEGACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 46.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend

the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 46, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Deal (GA)	Jackson (IL)
Ackerman	DeFazio	Jackson-Lee
Aderholt	DeGette	(TX)
Akin	Delahunt	Janklow
Alexander	DeLauro	Jefferson
Allen	DeLay	Jenkins
Andrews	DeMint	John
Baca	Deutsch	Johnson (IL)
Bachus	Diaz-Balart, L.	Johnson, E. B.
Baird	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson, Sam
Baker	Dicks	Jones (NC)
Baldwin	Dingell	Kanjorski
Ballance	Doggett	Kaptur
Ballenger	Dooley (CA)	Keller
Barrett (SC)	Doolittle	Kelly
Bartlett (MD)	Doyle	Kennedy (MN)
Barton (TX)	Dreier	Kildee
Beauprez	Duncan	Kilpatrick
Becerra	Dunn	Kind
Bell	Edwards	King (IA)
Bereuter	Ehlers	King (NY)
Berkley	Emanuel	Kingston
Berman	Emerson	Kirk
Berry	Engel	Kleczka
Biggart	English	Kline
Bilirakis	Eshoo	Knollenberg
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Kolbe
Bishop (NY)	Evans	Kucinich
Bishop (UT)	Everett	LaHood
Blackburn	Farr	Lampson
Blumenauer	Fattah	Langevin
Blunt	Ferguson	Lantos
Boehlert	Filner	Larsen (WA)
Boehner	Flake	Larson (CT)
Bonilla	Fletcher	Latham
Bonner	Foley	LaTourette
Bono	Forbes	Leach
Boozman	Ford	Lee
Boswell	Fossella	Levin
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (KY)
Bradley (NH)	Frelinghuysen	Linder
Brady (PA)	Frost	LoBiondo
Brady (TX)	Garrett (NJ)	Lofgren
Brown (OH)	Gerlach	Lowe
Brown (SC)	Gibbons	Lucas (KY)
Brown, Corrine	Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)
Brown-Waite,	Gillmor	Lynch
Ginny	Gingrey	Majette
Burgess	Gonzalez	Maloney
Burns	Goode	Manzullo
Burr	Goodlatte	Markey
Burton (IN)	Goss	Marshall
Buyer	Granger	Matheson
Calvert	Graves	Matsui
Camp	Green (TX)	McCarthy (MO)
Cannon	Green (WI)	McCarthy (NY)
Cantor	Greenwood	McCollum
Capito	Grijalva	McCotter
Capps	Gutknecht	McCreery
Capuano	Hall	McGovern
Cardin	Harman	McHugh
Cardoza	Harris	McInnis
Carson (OK)	Hart	McIntyre
Case	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Castle	Hayes	McNulty
Chabot	Hayworth	Meehan
Chocola	Hefley	Meek (FL)
Clay	Hensarling	Meeks (NY)
Coble	Herger	Menendez
Cole	Hill	Mica
Collins	Hinojosa	Michaud
Cooper	Hobson	Miller (FL)
Costello	Hoekstra	Miller (MI)
Cramer	Holden	Miller (NC)
Crane	Holt	Miller, Gary
Crenshaw	Honda	Miller, George
Cubin	Hostettler	Mollohan
Culberson	Houghton	Moore
Cummings	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Cunningham	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Davis (AL)	Hunter	Murphy
Davis (CA)	Hyde	Murtha
Davis (FL)	Insee	Musgrave
Davis (TN)	Isakson	Myrick
Davis, Jo Ann	Israel	Nadler
Davis, Tom	Issa	Napolitano
	Istook	Neal (MA)

Nethercutt	Ros-Lehtinen	Tancredo
Ney	Ross	Tanner
Northup	Rothman	Tauscher
Norwood	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin
Nunes	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Nussle	Ruppersberger	Taylor (NC)
Oberstar	Ryan (OH)	Terry
Obey	Ryan (WI)	Thomas
Olver	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Ortiz	Sanchez, Linda	Thompson (MS)
Osborne	T.	Thornberry
Ose	Sanchez, Loretta	Tiahrt
Owens	Sanders	Tiberti
Oxley	Sandlin	Tierney
Pallone	Saxton	Toomey
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Towns
Pastor	Schiff	Turner (OH)
Paul	Schrock	Turner (TX)
Payne	Scott (GA)	Udall (CO)
Pearce	Scott (VA)	Udall (NM)
Pelosi	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Pence	Serrano	Van Hollen
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Velazquez
Petri	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pickering	Shaw	Vitter
Pitts	Shays	Walden (OR)
Platts	Sherman	Walsh
Pombo	Sherwood	Wamp
Pomeroy	Shimkus	Waters
Porter	Shuster	Watson
Portman	Simmons	Watt
Price (NC)	Simpson	Waxman
Pryce (OH)	Skelton	Weiner
Putnam	Slaughter	Weldon (FL)
Quinn	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Radanovich	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Rahall	Smith (TX)	Wexler
Ramstad	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Rangel	Solis	Wicker
Souder	Souder	Wilson (NM)
Spratt	Spratt	Wilson (SC)
Stark	Stark	Wolf
Stearns	Stearns	Woolsey
Stenholm	Stenholm	Wu
Strickland	Strickland	Wynn
Stupak	Stupak	Young (AK)
Sullivan	Sullivan	
Swaney	Swaney	

NOT VOTING—31

Bass	Gordon	McDermott
Carson (IN)	Gutierrez	Millender-
Carter	Hastings (WA)	McDonald
Clyburn	Hinche	Otter
Combust	Hoefel	Peterson (MN)
Conyers	Hooley (OR)	Rogers (AL)
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Rush
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Ryun (KS)
Feeney	Kennedy (RI)	Snyder
Galleghy	Lewis (CA)	Young (FL)
Gephardt	Lipinski	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. WHITFIELD) (during the vote). The Chair will remind Members there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1850

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 33 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 33 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, due to weather related factors, I was unavoidably detained and missed H. Res. 46 rollcall vote No. 33. If I were present, I would have voted in favor of H. Res. 46.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the next vote will be a 5-minute vote.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY AS PART OF COMMEMORATION OF DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF HOLOCAUST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 40.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 40, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 408, nays 0, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—408

Abercrombie	Capps	Etheridge
Ackerman	Capuano	Evans
Aderholt	Cardin	Everett
Akin	Cardoza	Farr
Alexander	Carson (OK)	Feeney
Allen	Carter	Ferguson
Andrews	Case	Filner
Baca	Castle	Flake
Bachus	Chabot	Fletcher
Baird	Chocola	Foley
Baker	Clay	Forbes
Baldwin	Coble	Ford
Ballance	Cole	Fossella
Ballenger	Collins	Frank (MA)
Barrett (SC)	Conyers	Franks (AZ)
Bartlett (MD)	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Costello	Frost
Beauprez	Cox	Garrett (NJ)
Becerra	Cramer	Gerlach
Bell	Crane	Gibbons
Bereuter	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Berkley	Crowley	Gillmor
Berman	Cubin	Gingrey
Berry	Culberson	Gonzalez
Biggart	Cummings	Goode
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	Goss
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Davis (FL)	Graves
Blackburn	Davis (TN)	Green (TX)
Blumenauer	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Blunt	Davis, Tom	Greenwood
Boehlert	Deal (GA)	Grijalva
Boehner	DeFazio	Gutknecht
Bonilla	DeGette	Hall
Bonner	Delahunt	Harman
Bono	DeLauro	Harris
Boozman	DeLay	Hart
Boswell	DeMint	Hastings (FL)
Boucher	Deutsch	Hayes
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayworth
Bradley (NH)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hefley
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Herger
Brown (SC)	Doggett	Hill
Brown, Corrine	Dooley (CA)	Hinojosa
Brown-Waite,	Doolittle	Hobson
Ginny	Doyle	Hoekstra
Burgess	Dreier	Holden
Burns	Duncan	Holt
Burr	Dunn	Honda
Burton (IN)	Edwards	Hostettler
Buyer	Ehlers	Houghton
Calvert	Emanuel	Hoyer
Camp	Emerson	Hulshof
Cannon	Engel	Hunter
Cantor	English	Hyde
Capito	Eshoo	Inslee

Isakson	Miller (NC)	Schakowsky
Israel	Miller, Gary	Schiff
Issa	Miller, George	Schrock
Istook	Mollohan	Scott (GA)
Jackson (IL)	Moore	Scott (VA)
Jackson-Lee	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Serrano
Janklow	Murphy	Sessions
Jefferson	Murtha	Shadegg
Jenkins	Musgrave	Shaw
John	Myrick	Shays
Johnson (CT)	Nadler	Sherman
Johnson (IL)	Napolitano	Sherwood
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Shimkus
Johnson, Sam	Nethercutt	Shuster
Jones (NC)	Ney	Simmons
Kanjorski	Northup	Simpson
Kaptur	Norwood	Skelton
Keller	Nunes	Slaughter
Kelly	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Kennedy (MN)	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kildee	Obey	Smith (TX)
Kilpatrick	Olver	Smith (WA)
Kind	Ortiz	Solis
King (IA)	Osborne	Souder
King (NY)	Ose	Spratt
Kingston	Otter	Stark
Kirk	Owens	Stearns
Klecza	Oxley	Stenholm
Kline	Pallone	Strickland
Knollenberg	Pascarell	Stupak
Kolbe	Pastor	Sullivan
Kucinich	Paul	Sweeney
LaHood	Payne	Tancredo
Lampson	Pearce	Tanner
Langevin	Pelosi	Tauscher
Lantos	Pence	Tauzin
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (PA)	Taylor (MS)
Larson (CT)	Petri	Taylor (NC)
Latham	Pickering	Terry
LaTourette	Pitts	Thomas
Leach	Platts	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Pombo	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Pomeroy	Thornberry
Lewis (GA)	Porter	Tiahrt
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Tiberi
Linder	Price (NC)	Tierney
LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Toomey
Lofgren	Putnam	Towns
Lowey	Quinn	Turner (OH)
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Turner (TX)
Lucas (OK)	Rahall	Udall (CO)
Lynch	Ramstad	Udall (NM)
Majette	Rangel	Upton
Maloney	Regula	Van Hollen
Manzullo	Rehberg	Velazquez
Markey	Renzi	Viscosky
Marshall	Reyes	Vitter
Matheson	Reynolds	Walden (OR)
Matsui	Rodriguez	Walsh
McCarthy (MO)	Rogers (AL)	Wamp
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (KY)	Waters
McColum	Rogers (MI)	Watson
McCotter	Rohrabacher	Watt
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Waxman
McGovern	Ross	Weiner
McHugh	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
McInnis	Royal-Allard	Weldon (PA)
McIntyre	Royce	Weller
McKeon	Ruppersberger	Wexler
McNulty	Ryan (OH)	Whitfield
Meehan	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wilson (NM)
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
Menendez	T.	Wolf
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
Michaud	Sanders	Wu
Miller (FL)	Sandlin	Wynn
Miller (MI)	Saxton	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Bass	Gordon	Lipinski
Brown (OH)	Gutierrez	McDermott
Carson (IN)	Hastings (WA)	Millender-
Clyburn	Hinchev	McDonald
Combest	Hoeffel	Peterson (MN)
Davis (IL)	Hooley (OR)	Rush
Fattah	Jones (OH)	Ryun (KS)
Gallely	Kennedy (RI)	Snyder
Gephardt	Lewis (CA)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind the Members there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1857

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call Nos. 33 and 34, H. Res. 46 and H. Con. Res. 40, I was on the hill but my pager was inoperable. I would have voted "yes" on both resolutions.

□ 1900

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PLAN

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I speak out today in support of the President's economic plan. This plan is about three things: number one, jobs; number two, jobs; number three, jobs.

If you do not have a job and you want a job, the President's plan is for you. If you do have a job and you want a better job, the President's plan is for you.

Some have said that this plan is only for the rich because it will eliminate double taxation on dividends. They say that because they are stuck in an economic time warp and they refuse to understand the economic realities of today. Double taxation is un-American, and our seniors need this tax break so that that their retirement income can provide them with security and stability.

The President's plan provides an economic stimulus for every American. It enacts tax policy that is pro-growth, pro-opportunity, and, most importantly, pro-family, and I am talking about the American family, every single one of them.

I urge my colleagues not to give in to the hand-wringers and to support this bold plan for America's future.

TAX FAIRNESS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not normally give 1 minutes any more, but after hearing my colleague from the Republican side talk about it, I shall.

I was home most of last week and talked with my constituents about the President's proposed tax cut. One of the things that I think bothers a lot of folks is if we eliminate the so-called double taxation, we have double taxation in lots of areas in our country, but if we eliminate double taxation,

the double taxation is a good issue, but it is just patently wrong for a person in my district who makes \$60,000 a year working at a chemical plant or refinery, because they work 40 hours a week and maybe overtime to pay their tax rates. For somebody to sit home and clip coupons because maybe they inherited that and they make \$60,000 a year, to say I am sorry, you do not have to pay taxes on that is wrong. Income is income.

Now, I agree that I would like to increase the dividend deduction so we can help smaller investors, but, again, abolishing the dividend tax, which is half the President's plan, is just patently wrong for the American people.

BALANCING THE COST OF WAR AGAINST THE COST OF TAX REDUCTION

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem with the tax cut that President Bush has proposed is not that it is going to require over \$4 trillion in lost Federal revenue over the next decade, it is not that it is going to create more than a \$2 trillion deficit, and it is not that the majority of it is going to go to those who need it the least, the biggest problem is that we do not know what the cost of the war is.

We have gone down this road before and we wound up quadrupling the public debt. The responsible thing to do is to hold off on tax cuts until we know what the cost of this conflict in Iraq will amount to, until we have some sense of how long we are going to have to stay there, until we have some sense of what it will cost to reconstruct that country, until we have some sense of what it will cost to establish a stable democracy before we get out of there and allow it to return to the kind of despotic leadership that it is subject to today.

So let us be prudent. Let us hold off on tax cuts. If we must, we should proceed with a prudent foreign policy with regard to the Middle East. Let us rid the world of weapons of mass destruction to the extent we can do so, but let us not break the bank in the United States and pass the bill on to our children.

Let us be prudent and fiscally responsible. Let us put off tax cuts until we know what kind of expense we are undertaking with regard to the war in Iraq.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the rules of the Committee on Government Reform for the 108th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. These rules were adopted by the Committee on February 13, 2003, in a meeting that was open to the public.

1. RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM
U.S. House of Representatives
108th Congress

Rule XI, clause 1(a)(1)(A) of the House of Representatives provides:

Except as provided in subdivision (B), the Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable.

(B) A motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, each shall be privileged in committees and subcommittees and shall be decided without debate.

Rule XI, clause 2(a)(1) of the House of Representatives provides, in part:

Each standing committee shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. * * *

In accordance with this, the Committee on Government Reform, on February 13, 2003, adopted the rules of the committee:

Rule 1.—Application of Rules

Except where the terms "full committee" and "subcommittee" are specifically referred to, the following rules shall apply to the Committee on Government Reform and its subcommittees as well as to the respective chairmen.

[See House Rule XI, 1.]

Rule 2.—Meetings

The regular meetings of the full committee shall be held on the second Tuesday of each month at 10 a.m., when the House is in session. The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting or to change the date thereof, and to call and convene additional meetings, when circumstances warrant. A special meeting of the committee may be requested by members of the committee following the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(c)(2). Subcommittees shall meet at the call of the subcommittee chairmen. Every member of the committee or the appropriate subcommittee, unless prevented by unusual circumstances, shall be provided with a memorandum at least three calendar days before each meeting or hearing explaining (1) the purpose of the meeting or hearing; and (2) the names, titles, background and reasons for appearance of any witnesses. The ranking minority member shall be responsible for providing the same information on witnesses whom the minority may request.

[See House Rule XI, 2 (b) and (c).]

Rule 3.—Quorums

A majority of the members of the committee shall form a quorum, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, and one-third of the members shall form a quorum for taking any action other than the reporting of a measure or recommendation. If the chairman is not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking member of the majority party on

the committee or subcommittee who is present shall preside at that meeting.

[See House Rule XI, 2(h).]

Rule 4.—Committee Reports

Bills and resolutions approved by the committee shall be reported by the chairman following House Rule XIII, clauses 2-4.

A proposed report shall not be considered in subcommittee or full committee unless the proposed report has been available to the members of such subcommittee or full committee for at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays, unless the House is in session on such days) before consideration of such proposed report in subcommittee or full committee. Any report will be considered as read if available to the members at least 24 hours before consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays unless the House is in session on such days. If hearings have been held on the matter reported upon, every reasonable effort shall be made to have such hearings available to the members of the subcommittee or full committee before the consideration of the proposed report in such subcommittee or full committee. Every investigative report shall be approved by a majority vote of the committee at a meeting at which a quorum is present.

Supplemental, minority, or additional views may be filed following House Rule XI, clause 2(l) and Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1). The time allowed for filing such views shall be three calendar days, beginning on the day of notice, but excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays (unless the House is in session on such a day), unless the committee agrees to a different time, but agreement on a shorter time shall require the concurrence of each member seeking to file such views.

An investigative or oversight report may be filed after sine die adjournment of the last regular session of Congress, provided that if a member gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

Only those reports approved by a majority vote of the committee may be ordered printed, unless otherwise required by the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Rule 5.—Proxy Votes

In accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives, members may not vote by proxy on any measure or matter before the committee or any subcommittee.

[See House Rule XI, 2(f).]

Rule 6.—Record Votes

A record vote of the members may be had upon the request of any member upon approval of a one-fifth vote of the members present.

Rule 7.—Record of Committee Actions

The committee staff shall maintain in the committee offices a complete record of committee actions from the current Congress including a record of the rollcall votes taken at committee business meetings. The original records, or true copies thereof, as appropriate, shall be available for public inspection whenever the committee offices are open for public business. The staff shall assure that such original records are preserved with no unauthorized alteration, additions, or defacement.

[See House Rule XI, 2(e).]

Rule 8.—Subcommittees; Referrals

There shall be seven subcommittees with appropriate party ratios that shall have fixed jurisdictions. Bills, resolutions, and other matters shall be referred by the chairman to subcommittees within two weeks for

consideration or investigation in accordance with their fixed jurisdictions. Where the subject matter of the referral involves the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee or does not fall within any previously assigned jurisdiction, the chairman shall refer the matter as he may deem advisable. Bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to subcommittees may be reassigned by the chairman when, in his judgement, the subcommittee is not able to complete its work or cannot reach agreement therein. In a subcommittee having an even number of members, if there is a tie vote with all members voting on any measure, the measure shall be placed on the agenda for full committee consideration as if it had been ordered reported by the subcommittee without recommendation. This provision shall not preclude further action on the measure by the subcommittee.

Rule 9.—Ex Officio Members

The chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee shall be ex officio members of all subcommittees. They are authorized to vote on subcommittee matters; but, unless they are regular members of the subcommittee, they shall not be counted in determining a subcommittee quorum other than a quorum for taking testimony.

Rule 10.—Staff

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the chairman of the full committee shall have the authority to hire and discharge employees of the professional and clerical staff of the full committee and of subcommittees.

Rule 11.—Staff Direction

Except as otherwise provided by House Rule X, clauses 6, 7 and 9, the staff of the committee shall be subject to the direction of the chairman of the full committee and shall perform such duties as he may assign.

Rule 12.—Hearing Dates and Witnesses

The chairman of the full committee will announce the date, place, and subject matter of all hearings at least one week before the commencement of any hearings, unless he determines, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee determines by a vote, that there is good cause to begin such hearings sooner. So that the chairman of the full committee may coordinate the committee facilities and hearings plans, each subcommittee chairman shall notify him of any hearing plans at least two weeks before the date of commencement of hearings, including the date, place, subject matter, and the names of witnesses, willing and unwilling, who would be called to testify, including, to the extent he is advised thereof, witnesses whom the minority members may request. The minority members shall supply the names of witnesses they intend to call to the chairman of the full committee or subcommittee at the earliest possible date. Witnesses appearing before the committee shall so far as practicable, submit written statements at least 24 hours before their appearance and, when appearing in a non-governmental capacity, provide a curriculum vitae and a listing of any Federal Government grants and contracts received in the previous fiscal year.

[See House Rules XI, 2 (g)(3), (g)(4), (j) and (k).]

Rule 13.—Open Meetings

Meetings for the transaction of business and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public or closed in accordance with Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

[See House Rules XI, 2 (g) and (k).]

Rule 14.—Five-Minute Rule

(1) A committee member may question a witness only when recognized by the chairman for that purpose. In accordance with

House Rule XI, clause 2(j)(2), each committee member may request up to five minutes to question a witness until each member who so desires has had such opportunity. Until all such requests have been satisfied, the chairman shall, so far as practicable, recognize alternately based on seniority of those majority and minority members present at the time the hearing was called to order and others based on their arrival at the hearing. After that, additional time may be extended at the direction of the chairman.

(2) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit an equal number of majority and minority members to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(3) The chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by motion, may permit committee staff of the majority and minority to question a witness for a specified, total period that is equal for each side and not longer than thirty minutes for each side.

(4) Nothing in paragraph (2) or (3) affects the rights of a Member (other than a Member designated under paragraph (2)) to question a witness for 5 minutes in accordance with paragraph (1) after the questioning permitted under paragraph (2) or (3). In any extended questioning permitted under paragraph (2) or (3), the chairman shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by majority members or majority committee staff and the ranking minority member shall determine how to allocate the time permitted for extended questioning by minority members or minority committee staff. The chairman or the ranking minority member, as applicable, may allocate the time for any extended questioning permitted to staff under paragraph (3) to members.

Rule 15.—Investigative Hearing Procedures

Investigative hearings shall be conducted according to the procedures in House Rule XI, clause 2(k). All questions put to witnesses before the committee shall be relevant to the subject matter before the committee for consideration, and the chairman shall rule on the relevance of any questions put to the witnesses.

Rule 16.—Stenographic Record

A stenographic record of all testimony shall be kept of public hearings and shall be made available on such conditions as the chairman may prescribe.

Rule 17.—Audio and Visual Coverage of Committee Proceedings

(1) An open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, Internet broadcast, and still photography, unless closed subject to the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 2(g). Any such coverage shall conform with the provisions of House Rule XI, clause 4.

(2) Use of the Committee Broadcast System shall be fair and nonpartisan, and in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4(b), and all other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Government Reform. Members of the committee shall have prompt access to a copy of coverage by the Committee Broadcast System, to the extent that such coverage is maintained.

(3) Personnel providing coverage of an open meeting or hearing of the committee or a subcommittee by Internet broadcast, other than through the Committee Broadcast System, shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

Rule 18.—Additional Duties of Chairman

The chairman of the full committee shall:

(a) Make available to other committees the findings and recommendations resulting from the investigations of the committee or its subcommittees as required by House Rule X, clause 4(c)(2);

(b) Direct such review and studies on the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within the committee's jurisdiction as required by House Rule X, clause 2(c);

(c) Submit to the Committee on the Budget views and estimates required by House Rule X, clause 4(f), and to file reports with the House as required by the Congressional Budget Act;

(d) Authorize and issue subpoenas as provided in House Rule XI, clause 2(m), in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the committee;

(e) Prepare, after consultation with subcommittee chairmen and the minority, a budget for the committee which shall include an adequate budget for the subcommittees to discharge their responsibilities;

(f) Make any necessary technical and conforming changes to legislation reported by the committee upon unanimous consent; and

(g) Designate a vice chairman from the majority party.

Rule 19.—Commemorative Stamps

The committee has adopted the policy that the determination of the subject matter of commemorative stamps properly is for consideration by the Postmaster General and that the committee will not give consideration to legislative proposals for the issuance of commemorative stamps. It is suggested that recommendations for the issuance of commemorative stamps be submitted to the Postmaster General.

Rule 20.—Panels and Task Forces

(a) The chairman of the committee is authorized to appoint panels or task forces to carry out the duties and functions of the committee.

(b) The chairman and ranking minority member of the committee may serve as ex-officio members of each panel or task force.

(c) The chairman of any panel or task force shall be appointed by the chairman of the committee. The ranking minority member shall select a ranking minority member for each panel or task force.

(d) The House and committee rules applicable to subcommittee meetings, hearings, recommendations and reports shall apply to the meetings, hearings, recommendations and reports of panels and task forces.

(e) No panel or task force so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel or task force so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the chairman.

II. SELECTED RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A. 1. Powers and Duties of the Committee—Rule X of the House

House Rule X provides for the organization of standing committees. The first paragraph of clause 1 of Rule X and subdivision (h) thereof reads as follows:

ORGANIZATION OF COMMITTEES

Committees and their legislative jurisdictions

1. There shall be in the House the following standing committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4. All bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of the standing committees listed in this clause shall be referred to those committees,

in accordance with clause 2 of rule XII, as follows:

* * * * *

(h) Committee on Government Reform.

(1) Federal civil service, including inter-governmental personnel; and the status of officers and employees of the United States, including their compensation, classification, and retirement.

(2) Municipal affairs of the District of Columbia in general (other than appropriations).

(3) Federal paperwork reduction.

(4) Government management and accounting measures generally.

(5) Holidays and celebrations.

(6) Overall economy, efficiency, and management of government operations and activities, including Federal procurement.

(7) National archives.

(8) Population and demography generally, including the Census.

(9) Postal service generally, including transportation of the mails.

(10) Public information and records.

(11) Relationship of the Federal Government to the States and municipalities generally.

(12) Reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government.

2. General Oversight Responsibilities—Rule X, Clauses 2 and 3 of the House

Clause 2 of Rule X relates to general oversight responsibilities. Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of clause 2 read as follows:

2. (a) The various standing committees shall have general oversight responsibilities as provided in paragraph (b) in order to assist the House in—

(1) its analysis, appraisal, and evaluation of—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of Federal laws; and

(B) conditions and circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation; and

(2) its formulation, consideration, and enactment of changes in Federal laws, and of such additional legislation as may be necessary or appropriate.

(b)(1) In order to determine whether laws and programs addressing subjects within the jurisdiction of a committee are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of Congress and whether they should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated, each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) shall review and study on a continuing basis—

(A) the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(B) the organization and operation of Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities for the administration and execution of laws and programs addressing subjects within its jurisdiction;

(C) any conditions or circumstances that may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation addressing subjects within its jurisdiction (whether or not a bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto); and

(D) future research and forecasting on subjects within its jurisdiction.

(2) Each committee to which subparagraph (1) applies having more than 20 members shall establish an oversight subcommittee, or require its subcommittees to conduct oversight in their respective jurisdictions, to assist in carrying out its responsibilities under this clause. The establishment of an oversight subcommittee does not limit the responsibility of a subcommittee with legislative jurisdiction in carrying out its oversight responsibilities.

(c) Each standing committee shall review and study on a continuing basis the impact

or probable impact tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as described in clauses 1 and 3.

(d)(1) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, each standing committee shall, in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present, adopt its oversight plan for that Congress. Such plan shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing its plan each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(A) consult with other committees that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction with the objective of ensuring maximum coordination and cooperation among committees when conducting reviews of such laws, programs, or agencies and include in its plan an explanation of steps that have been or will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(B) review specific problems with Federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(C) give priority consideration to including in its plan the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority; and

(D) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review every 10 years.

(2) Not later than March 31 in the first session of a Congress, after consultation with the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader, the Committee on Government Reform shall report to the House the oversight plans submitted by committees together with any recommendations that it, or the House leadership group described above, may make to ensure the most effective coordination of oversight plans and otherwise to achieve the objectives of this clause.

(e) The Speaker, with the approval of the House, may appoint special ad hoc oversight committees for the purpose of reviewing specific matters within the jurisdiction of two or more standing committees.

Special oversight functions

Clause 3 of Rule X also relates to oversight functions. Paragraph (e) reads as follows:

(e) The Committee on Government Reform shall review and study on a continuing basis the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency.

3. Additional Functions of Committees—Rule X, Clauses 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9 of the House

Clause 4 of Rule X relates to additional functions of committees and committee budgets. Paragraphs (a)(2), (c) and (f) of clause 4 and clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 read as follows:

4. (a)

(2) Pursuant to section 401(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, when a committee reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new entitlement authority as defined in section 3(9) of that Act, and enactment of the bill or joint resolution, as reported, would cause a breach of the committee's pertinent allocation of new budget authority under section 302(a) of that Act, the bill or joint resolution may be referred to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it with recommendations (which may include an amendment limiting the total amount of new entitlement authority provided in the bill or joint

resolution). If the Committee on Appropriations fails to report a bill or joint resolution so referred within 15 calendar days (not counting any day on which the House is not in session), the committee automatically shall be discharged from consideration of the bill or joint resolution, and the bill or joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(c)(1) The Committee on Government Reform shall—

(A) receive and examine reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and submit to the House such recommendations as it considers necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of the reports;

(B) evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government; and

(C) study intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

(2) In addition to its duties under subparagraph (1), the Committee on Government Reform may at any time conduct investigations of any matter without regard to clause 1, 2, 3, or this clause conferring jurisdiction over the matter to another standing committee. The findings and recommendations of the committee in such an investigation shall be made available to any other standing committee having jurisdiction over the matter involved.

Budget Act responsibilities

(f)(1) Each standing committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget not later than six weeks after the President submits his budget, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request—

(A) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(B) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(2) The views and estimates submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means under subparagraph (1) shall include a specific recommendation, made after holding public hearings, as to the appropriate level of the public debt that should be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget.

Expense resolutions

6. (a) Whenever a committee, commission, or other entity (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is granted authorization for the payment of its expenses (including staff salaries) for a Congress, such authorization initially shall be procured by one primary expense resolution reported by the Committee on House Administration. A primary expense resolution may include a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees. An amount from such a reserve fund may be allocated to a committee only by the approval of the Committee on House Administration. A primary expense resolution reported to the House may not be considered in the House unless a printed report thereon was available on the previous calendar day. For the information of the House, such report shall—

(1) state the total amount of the funds to be provided to the committee, commission, or other entity under the primary expense resolution for all anticipated activities and

programs of the committee, commission, or other entity; and

(2) to the extent practicable, contain such general statements regarding the estimated foreseeable expenditures for the respective anticipated activities and programs of the committee, commission, or other entity as may be appropriate to provide the House with basic estimates of the expenditures contemplated by the primary expense resolution.

(b) After the date of adoption by the House of a primary expense resolution for a committee, commission, or other entity for a Congress, authorization for the payment of additional expenses (including staff salaries) in that Congress may be procured by one or more supplemental expense resolutions reported by the Committee on House Administration, as necessary. A supplemental expense resolution reported to the House may not be considered in the House unless a printed report thereon was available on the previous calendar day. For the information of the House, such report shall—

(1) state the total amount of additional funds to be provided to the committee, commission, or other entity under the supplemental expense resolution and the purposes for which those additional funds are available; and

(2) state the reasons for the failure to procure the additional funds for the committee, commission, or other entity by means of the primary expense resolution.

(c) The preceding provisions of this clause do not apply to—

(1) a resolution providing for the payment from committee salary and expense accounts of the House of sums necessary to pay compensation for staff services performed for, or to pay other expenses of, a committee, commission, or other entity at any time after the beginning of an odd-numbered year and before the date of adoption by the House of the primary expense resolution described in paragraph (a) for that year; or (2) a resolution providing each of the standing committees in a Congress additional office equipment, airmail and special-delivery postage stamps, supplies, staff personnel, or any other specific item for the operation of the standing committees, and containing an authorization for the payment from committee salary and expense accounts of the House of the expenses of any of the foregoing items provided by that resolution, subject to and until enactment of the provisions of the resolution as permanent law.

(d) From the funds made available for the appointment of committee staff by a primary or additional expense resolution, the chairman of each committee shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

(e) Funds authorized for a committee under this clause and clauses 7 and 8 are for expenses incurred in the activities of the committee.

Interim funding

7. (a) For the period beginning at noon on January 3 and ending at midnight on March 31 in each odd-numbered year, such sums as may be necessary shall be paid out of the committee salary and expense accounts of the House for continuance of necessary investigations and studies by—

(1) each standing and select committee established by these rules; and

(2) except as specified in paragraph (b), each select committee established by resolution.

(b) In the case of the first session of a Congress, amounts shall be made available for a

select committee established by resolution in the preceding Congress only if—

(1) a resolution proposing to reestablish such select committee is introduced in the present Congress; and

(2) the House has not adopted a resolution of the preceding Congress providing for termination of funding for investigations and studies by such select committee.

(c) Each committee described in paragraph (a) shall be entitled for each month during the period specified in paragraph (a) to 9 percent (or such lesser percentage as may be determined by the Committee on House Administration) of the total annualized amount made available under expense resolutions for such committee in the preceding session of Congress.

(d) Payments under this clause shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of the committee, except as provided in paragraph (e), and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

(e) Notwithstanding any provision of law, rule of the House, or other authority, from noon on January 3 of the first session of a Congress until the election by the House of the committee concerned in that Congress, payments under this clause shall be made on vouchers signed by—

(1) the member of the committee who served as chairman of the committee at the expiration of the preceding Congress; or

(2) if the chairman is not a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in the present Congress, then the ranking member of the committee as it was constituted at the expiration of the preceding Congress who is a member of the majority party in the present Congress.

(f)(1) The authority of a committee to incur expenses under this clause shall expire upon adoption by the House of a primary expense resolution for the committee.

(2) Amounts made available under this clause shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

(3) This clause shall be effective only insofar as it is not inconsistent with a resolution reported by the Committee on House Administration and adopted by the House after the adoption of these rules.

Travel

8. (a) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States or its territories or possessions. Appropriated funds, including those authorized under this clause and clauses 6 and 8, may not be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of a committee or its employees in a country where local currencies are available for this purpose.

(b) The following conditions shall apply with respect to travel outside the United States or its territories or possessions:

(1) A member or employee of a committee may not receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in a country for a day at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law.

(2) A member or employee shall be reimbursed for his expenses for a day at the lesser of—

(A) the per diem set forth in applicable Federal law; or

(B) the actual, unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) he incurred during that day.

(3) Each member or employee of a committee shall make to the chairman of the committee an itemized report showing the dates each country was visited, the amount

of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and funds expended for any other official purpose and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies or appropriated funds expended. Each report shall be filed with the chairman of the committee not later than 60 days following the completion of travel for use in complying with reporting requirements in applicable Federal law and shall be open for public inspection.

(c)(1) In carrying out the activities of a committee outside the United States in a country where local currencies are unavailable, a member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for expenses (other than for transportation) in excess of the maximum per diem set forth in applicable Federal law.

(2) A member or employee shall be reimbursed for his expenses for a day, at the lesser of—

(A) the per diem set forth in applicable Federal law; or

(B) the actual unreimbursed expenses (other than for transportation) he incurred during that day.

(3) A member or employee of a committee may not receive reimbursement for the cost of any transportation in connection with travel outside the United States unless the member or employee actually paid for the transportation.

(d) The restrictions respecting travel outside the United States set forth in paragraph (c) also shall apply to travel outside the United States by a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House authorized under any standing rule.

Committee staffs

9. (a)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2) and paragraph (f), each standing committee may appoint, by majority vote, not more than 30 professional staff members to be compensated from the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff by primary and additional expense resolutions. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, as the committee considers advisable.

(2) Subject to paragraph (f) whenever a majority of the minority party members of a standing committee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence) so request, not more than 10 persons (or one-third of the total professional committee staff appointed under this clause, whichever is fewer) may be selected, by majority vote of the minority party members, for appointment by the committee as professional staff members under subparagraph (1). The committee shall appoint persons so selected whose character and qualifications are acceptable to a majority of the committee. If the committee determines that the character and qualifications of a person so selected are unacceptable, a majority of the minority party members may select another person for appointment by the committee to the professional staff until such appointment is made. Each professional staff member appointed under this subparagraph shall be assigned to such committee business as the minority party members of the committee consider advisable.

(b)(1) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

(A) may not engage in any work other than committee business during congressional working hours; and

(B) may not be assigned a duty other than one pertaining to committee business.

(2)(A) Subparagraph (1) does not apply to staff designated by a committee as "asso-

ciate" or "shared" staff who are not paid exclusively by the committee, provided that the chairman certifies that the compensation paid by the committee for any such staff is commensurate with the work performed for the committee in accordance with clause 8 of rule X-XIII.

(B) The use of any "associate" or "shared" staff by a committee other than the Committee on Appropriations shall be subject to the review of, and to any terms, conditions, or limitations established by, the Committee on House Administration in connection with the reporting of any primary or additional expense resolution.

(c) Each employee on the professional or investigative staff of a standing committee shall be entitled to pay at a single gross per annum rate, to be fixed by the chairman and that does not exceed the maximum rate of pay as in effect from time to time under applicable provisions of law.

(d) Subject to appropriations hereby authorized, the Committee on Appropriations may appoint by majority vote such staff as it determines to be necessary (in addition to the clerk of the committee and assistants for the minority). The staff appointed under this paragraph, other than minority assistants, shall possess such qualifications as the committee may prescribe.

(e) A committee may not appoint to its staff an expert or other personnel detailed or assigned from a department or agency of the Government except with the written permission of the Committee on House Administration.

(f) If a request for the appointment of a minority professional staff member under paragraph (a) is made when no vacancy exists for such an appointment, the committee nevertheless may appoint under paragraph (a) a person selected by the minority and acceptable to the committee. A person so appointed shall serve as an additional member of the professional staff of the committee until such a vacancy occurs (other than a vacancy in the position of head of the professional staff, by whatever title designated), at which time that person is considered as appointed to that vacancy. Such a person shall be paid from the applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of rule X. If such a vacancy occurs on the professional staff when seven or more persons have been so appointed who are eligible to fill that vacancy, a majority of the minority party members shall designate which of those persons shall fill the vacancy.

(g) Each staff member appointed pursuant to a request by minority party members under paragraph (a), and each staff member appointed to assist minority members of a committee pursuant to an expense resolution described in clause 6(a), shall be accorded equitable treatment with respect to the fixing of the rate of pay, the assignment of work facilities, and the accessibility of committee records.

(h) Paragraph (a) may not be construed to authorize the appointment of additional professional staff members of a committee pursuant to a request under paragraph (a) by the minority party members of that committee if 10 or more professional staff members provided for in paragraph (a)(1) who are satisfactory to a majority of the minority party members are otherwise assigned to assist the minority party members.

(i) Notwithstanding paragraph (a)(2), a committee may employ nonpartisan staff, in lieu of or in addition to committee staff designated exclusively for the majority or minority party, by an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the majority party and of a majority of the members of the minority party.

B. Procedure for Committees and Unfinished Business—Rule XI of the House

Clauses 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 of Rule XI are set out below.

In general

1. (a)(1)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), the Rules of the House are the rules of its committees and subcommittees so far as applicable.

(B) A motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, each shall be privileged in committees and subcommittees and shall be decided without debate.

(2) Each subcommittee is a part of its committee and is subject to the authority and direction of that committee and to its rules, so far as applicable.

(b)(1) Each committee may conduct at any time such investigations and studies as it considers necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under rule X. Subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X, each committee may incur expenses, including travel expenses, in connection with such investigations and studies.

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read in committee if it has been available to the members for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day).

(3) A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

(4) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, an investigative or oversight report may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that a member who gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion in the report.

(c) Each committee may have printed and bound such testimony and other data as may be presented at hearings held by the committee or its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with a meeting or hearing of a committee shall be paid from the applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of rule X.

(d)(1) Each committee shall submit to the House not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year a report on the activities of that committee under this rule and rule X during the Congress ending at noon on January 3 of such year.

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of that committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the committee under clause 2(d) of rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by that committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(4) After an adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, the chairman of a committee may file an activities report under subparagraph (1) with the Clerk at any time and without approval of the committee, provided that—

(A) a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days; and

(B) the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

Adoption of written rules

2. (a)(1) Each standing committee shall adopt written rules governing its procedure. Such rules—

(A) shall be adopted in a meeting that is open to the public unless the committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by record vote that all or part of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public;

(B) may not be inconsistent with the Rules of the House or with those provisions of law having the force and effect of Rules of the House; and

(C) shall in any event incorporate all of the succeeding provisions of this clause to the extent applicable.

(2) Each committee shall submit its rules for publication in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

Regular meeting days

(b) Each standing committee shall establish regular meeting days for the conduct of its business, which shall be not less frequent than monthly. Each such committee shall meet for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the committee or the transaction of other committee business on all regular meeting days fixed by the committee unless otherwise provided by written rule adopted by the committee.

Additional and special meetings

(c)(1) The chairman of each standing committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional and special meetings of the committee for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business, subject to such rules as the committee may adopt. The committee shall meet for such purpose under that call of the chairman.

(2) Three or more members of a standing committee may file in the offices of the committee a written request that the chairman call a special meeting of the committee. Such request shall specify the measure or matter to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If the chairman does not call the requested special meeting within three calendar days after the filing of the request (to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request) a majority of the members of the committee may file in the offices of the committee their written notice that a special meeting of the committee will be held. The written notice shall specify the date and hour of the special meeting and the measure or matter to be considered. The committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

Temporary absence of chairman

(d) A member of the majority party on each standing committee or subcommittee thereof shall be designated by the chairman of the full committee as the vice chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be, and shall preside during the absence of the chairman from any meeting. If the chairman and vice chairman of a committee or subcommittee are not present at any meeting of the committee or subcommittee, the ranking majority member who is present shall preside at that meeting.

Committee records

(e)(1)(A) Each committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include—

(i) in the case of a meeting or hearing transcript, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved; and

(ii) a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(B)(i) Except as provided in subdivision (B)(ii) and subject to paragraph (k)(7), the result of each such record vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in its offices. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the committee present but not voting.

(ii) The result of any record vote taken in executive session in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct may not be made available for inspection by the public without an affirmative vote of a majority of the members of the committee.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), all committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the member serving as its chairman. Such records shall be the property of the House, and each Member, Delegate, and the Resident Commissioner shall have access thereto.

(B) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, other than members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, may not have access to the records of that committee respecting the conduct of a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House without the specific prior permission of that committee.

(3) Each committee shall include in its rules standards for availability of records of the committee delivered to the Archivist of the United States under rule VII. Such standards shall specify procedures for orders of the committee under clause 3(b)(3) and clause 4(b) of rule VII, including a requirement that nonavailability of a record for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable under that rule shall be approved by vote of the committee.

(4) Each committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

Prohibition against proxy voting

(f) A vote by a member of a committee or subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may not be cast by proxy.

Open meetings and hearings

(g)(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, by a standing committee or subcommittee thereof (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittee) shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate a law or rule of the House. Persons, other than members of the committee and such noncommittee Members, Delegates, Resident Commissioner, congressional staff, or departmental representatives as the committee may authorize, may not be present at a business or

markup session that is held in executive session. This subparagraph does not apply to open committee hearings, which are governed by clause 4(a)(1) of rule X or by subparagraph (2).

(2)(A) Each hearing conducted by a committee or subcommittee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittees) shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate a law or rule of the House.

(B) Notwithstanding the requirements of subdivision (A), in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the purpose of taking testimony, a majority of those present may—

(i) agree to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate clause 2(k)(5); or

(ii) agree to close the hearing as provided in clause 2(k)(5).

(C) A Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may not be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at a hearing of a committee or subcommittee (other than the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct or its subcommittees) unless the House by majority vote authorizes a particular committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures specified in this subparagraph for closing hearings to the public.

(D) The committee or subcommittee may vote by the same procedure described in this subparagraph to close one subsequent day of hearing, except that the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the subcommittees thereof, may vote by the same procedure to close up to five additional, consecutive days of hearings.

(3) The chairman of each committee (other than the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of a committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the chairman of the committee, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin a hearing sooner, or if the committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the transaction of business, the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. An announcement made under this subparagraph shall be published promptly in the Daily Digest and made available in electronic form.

(4) Each committee shall, to the greatest extent practicable, require witnesses who appear before it to submit in advance written statements of proposed testimony and to limit their initial presentations to the committee to brief summaries thereof. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Fed-

eral grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(5)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), a point of order does not lie with respect to a measure reported by a committee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with this clause.

(B) A point of order on the ground described in subdivision (A) may be made by a member of the committee that reported the measure if such point of order was timely made and improperly disposed of in the committee.

(6) This paragraph does not apply to hearings of the Committee on Appropriations under clause 4(a)(1) of rule X.

Quorum requirements

(h)(1) A measure or recommendation may not be reported by a committee unless a majority of the committee is actually present.

(2) Each committee may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which may not be less than two.

(3) Each committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Ways and Means) may fix the number of its members to constitute a quorum for taking any action other than for which the presence of a majority of the committee is otherwise required, which may not be less than one-third of the members.

(4)(A) Each committee may adopt a rule authorizing the chairman of a committee or subcommittee—

(i) to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment; and

(ii) to resume proceedings on a postponed question at any time after reasonable notice.

(B) A rule adopted pursuant to this subparagraph shall provide that when proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Limitation on committee sittings

(i) A committee may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

Calling and questioning of witnesses

(j)(1) Whenever a hearing is conducted by a committee on a measure or matter, the minority members of the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

(2)(A) Subject to subdivisions (B) and (C), each committee shall apply the five-minute rule during the questioning of witnesses in a hearing until such time as each member of the committee who so desires has had an opportunity to question each witness.

(B) A committee may adopt a rule or motion permitting a specified number of its members to question a witness for longer than five minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(C) A committee may adopt a rule or motion permitting committee staff for its majority and minority party members to ques-

tion a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this subdivision shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

Hearing procedures

(k)(1) The chairman at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing.

(2) A copy of the committee rules and of this clause shall be made available to each witness on request.

(3) Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

(4) The chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; and the committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(5) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) notwithstanding paragraph (g)(2), such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session if, in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the committee for the purpose of taking testimony, the committee determines by vote of a majority of those present that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the committee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

In either case the committee shall afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness, and receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(6) Except as provided in subparagraph (5), the chairman shall receive and the committee shall dispose of requests to subpoena additional witnesses.

(7) Evidence or testimony taken in executive session, and proceedings conducted in executive session, may be released or used in public sessions only when authorized by the committee, a majority being present.

(8) In the discretion of the committee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The committee is the sole judge of the pertinence of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearing.

(9) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the committee.

Supplemental, minority, or additional views

(1) If at the time of approval of a measure or matter by a committee (other than the Committee on Rules) a member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the report to the House thereon, that member shall be entitled to not less than two additional calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the clerk of the committee.

Power to sit and act, subpoena power

(m)(1) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under this rule

and rule X (including any matters referred to it under clause 2 of rule XII), a committee or subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (3)(A))—

(A) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it considers necessary; and

(B) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it considers necessary.

(2) The chairman of the committee, or a member designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

(3)(A)(i) Except as provided in subdivision (A)(ii), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) in the conduct of an investigation or series of investigations or activities only when authorized by the committee or subcommittee, a majority being present. The power to authorize and issue subpoenas under subparagraph (1)(B) may be delegated to the chairman of the committee under such rules and under such limitations as the committee may prescribe. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the chairman of the committee or by a member designated by the committee.

(ii) In the case of a subcommittee of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, a subpoena may be authorized and issued only by an affirmative vote of a majority of its members.

(B) A subpoena duces tecum may specify terms of return other than at a meeting or hearing of the committee or subcommittee authorizing the subpoena.

(C) Compliance with a subpoena issued by a committee or subcommittee under subparagraph (1)(B) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House.

* * * * *

Audio and visual coverage of committee proceedings

4. (a) The purpose of this clause is to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings or committee meetings that are open to the public may be covered by audio and visual means—

(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body, and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution as an institution of the Federal Government.

(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause may not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting (whether of a hearing or otherwise) covered under authority of this clause by audio or visual means, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing or other meeting, shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the ac-

ceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations, and may not be such as to—

(1) distort the objects and purposes of the hearing or other meeting or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or meeting or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

(2) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner or bring the House, the committee, or a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner into disrepute.

(d) The coverage of committee hearings and meetings by audio and visual means shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

(e) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by a committee or subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by audio and visual means. A committee or subcommittee chairman may not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(f) Each committee shall adopt written rules to govern its implementation of this clause. Such rules shall contain provisions to the following effect:

(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chairman for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be per-

mitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(9) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

Pay of witnesses

5. Witnesses appearing before the House or any of its committees shall be paid the same per diem rate as established, authorized, and regulated by the Committee on House Administration for Members, Delegates, the Resident Commissioner, and employees of the House, plus actual expenses of travel to or from the place of examination. Such per diem may not be paid when a witness has been summoned at the place of examination.

Unfinished business of the session

6. All business of the House at the end of one session shall be resumed at the commencement of the next session of the same Congress in the same manner as if no adjournment had taken place.

C. Filing and Printing of Reports—Rule XIII, Clauses 2, 3 and 4 of the House

2. (a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), all reports of committees (other than those filed from the floor as privileged) shall be delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar under the direction of the Speaker in accordance with clause 1. The title or subject of each report shall be entered on the Journal and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) A bill or resolution reported adversely shall be laid on the table unless a committee to which the bill or resolution was referred requests at the time of the report its referral to an appropriate calendar under clause 1 or unless, within three days thereafter, a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner makes such a request.

(b)(1) It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House a measure or matter approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken steps necessary to bring the measure or matter to a vote.

(2) In any event, the report of a committee on a measure that has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which a written request for the filing of the report, signed by a majority of the members of the committee, has been filed with the clerk of the committee. The clerk of the committee shall immediately notify the chairman of the filing of such a request. This subparagraph does not apply to a report of the Committee on Rules with respect to a rule, joint rule, or order of business of the House, or to the reporting of a resolution of inquiry addressed to the head of an executive department.

(c) All supplemental, minority, or additional views filed under clause 2(l) of rule XI by one or more members of a committee shall be included in, and shall be a part of,

the report filed by the committee with respect to a measure or matter. When time guaranteed by clause 2(l) of rule XI has expired (or, if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk not later than one hour after the expiration of such time. This clause and provisions of clause 2(l) of rule XI do not preclude the immediate filing or printing of a committee report in the absence of a timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views as provided in clause 2(l) of rule XI.

Content of reports

3. (a)(1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), the report of a committee on a measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume that—

(A) shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(B) shall bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under paragraph (c)(3)) are included as part of the report.

(2) A committee may file a supplemental report for the correction of a technical error in its previous report on a measure or matter. A supplemental report only correcting errors in the depiction of record votes under paragraph (b) may be filed under this subparagraph and shall not be subject to the requirement in clause 4 concerning the availability of reports.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report a measure or matter of a public nature, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of members voting for and against, shall be included in the committee report. The preceding sentence does not apply to votes taken in executive session by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

(c) The report of a committee on a measure that has been approved by the committee shall include, separately set out and clearly identified, the following:

(1) Oversight findings and recommendations under clause 2(b)(1) of rule X.

(2) The statement required by section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, except that an estimate of new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant programs to the appropriate levels under current law.

(3) An estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if timely submitted to the committee before the filing of the report.

(4) A statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding.

(d) Each report of a committee on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain the following:

(1) A statement citing the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution.

(2)(A) An estimate by the committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in each of the five fiscal years following that fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years);

(B) A comparison of the estimate of costs described in subdivision (A) made by the committee with any estimate of such costs

made by a Government agency and submitted to such committee; and

(C) When practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant programs with the appropriate levels under current law.

(3)(A) In subparagraph (2) the term "Government agency" includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia.

(B) Subparagraph (2) does not apply to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Rules, or the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and does not apply when a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been included in the report under paragraph (c)(3).

(e)(1) Whenever a committee reports a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof, it shall include in its report or in an accompanying document—

(A) the text of a statute or part thereof that is proposed to be repealed; and

(B) a comparative print of any part of the bill or joint resolution proposing to amend the statute and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended, showing by appropriate typographical devices the omissions and insertions proposed.

(2) If a committee reports a bill or joint resolution proposing to repeal or amend a statute or part thereof with a recommendation that the bill or joint resolution be amended, the comparative print required by subparagraph (1) shall reflect the changes in existing law proposed to be made by the bill or joint resolution as proposed to be amended.

* * * * *

Availability of reports

4. (a)(1) Except as specified in subparagraph (2), it shall not be in order to consider in the House a measure or matter reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which each report of a committee on that measure or matter has been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

(2) Subparagraph (1) does not apply to—

(A) a resolution providing a rule, joint rule, or order of business reported by the Committee on Rules considered under clause 6;

(B) a resolution providing amounts from the applicable accounts described in clause 1(i)(1) of rule X reported by the Committee on House Administration considered under clause 6 of rule X;

(C) a bill called from the Corrections Calendar under clause 6 of rule XV;

(D) a resolution presenting a question of the privileges of the House reported by any committee;

(E) a measure for the declaration of war, or the declaration of a national emergency, by Congress; and

(F) a measure providing for the disapproval of a decision, determination, or action by a Government agency that would become, or continue to be, effective unless disapproved or otherwise invalidated by one or both Houses of Congress. In this subdivision the term "Government agency" includes any department, agency, establishment, wholly owned Government corporation, or instrumentality of the Federal Government or of the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) A committee that reports a measure or matter shall make every reasonable effort to

have its hearings thereon (if any) printed and available for distribution to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner before the consideration of the measure or matter in the House.

(c) A general appropriation bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations may not be considered in the House until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which printed hearings of the Committee on Appropriations thereon have been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner.

III. SELECTED MATTERS OF INTEREST

A. 5 U.S.C. Sec. 2954. Information to Committees of Congress on Request

An Executive agency, on request of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives, or of any seven members thereof, or on request of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, or any five members thereof, shall submit any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee.

B. 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1505. Obstruction of Proceedings Before Departments, Agencies, and Committees

Whoever, with intent to avoid, evade, prevent, or obstruct compliance, in whole or in part, with any civil investigative demand duly and properly made under the Antitrust Civil Process Act, willfully withholds, misrepresents, removes from any place, conceals, covers up, destroys, mutilates, alters, or by other means falsifies any documentary material, answers to written interrogatories, or oral testimony, which is the subject of such demand; or attempts to do so or solicits another to do so; or

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power or inquiry under which any inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee or either House or any joint committee of the Congress—

Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

C. 31 U.S.C. Sec. 712. Investigating the Use of Public Money

The Comptroller General shall—

* * * * *

(3) analyze expenditures of each executive agency the Comptroller General believes will help Congress decide whether public money has been used and expended economically and efficiently;

(4) make an investigation and report ordered by either House of Congress or a committee of Congress having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures; and

(5) give a committee of Congress having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures the help and information the committee requests.

D. 31 U.S.C. Sec. 719. Comptroller General Reports

* * * * *

(e) The Comptroller General shall report on analyses carried out under section 712(3) of this title to the Committees on Governmental Affairs and Appropriations of the Senate, the Committees on Government Operations and Appropriations of the House, and the committees with jurisdiction over

legislation related to the operation of each executive agency.¹

* * * * *

(i) On request of a committee of Congress, the Comptroller General shall explain to discuss with the committee or committee staff a report the Comptroller General makes that would help the committee—

(1) evaluate a program or activity of an agency within the jurisdiction of the committee; or

(2) in its consideration of proposed legislation.

E. 31 U.S.C. Sec. 717. Evaluating Programs and Activities of the United States Government

(d)(1) On request of a committee of Congress, the Comptroller General shall help the committee to—

(A) develop a statement of legislative goals and ways to assess and report program performance related to the goals, including recommended ways to assess performance, information to be reported, responsibility for reporting, frequency of reports, and feasibility of pilot testing; and

(B) assess program evaluations prepared by and for an agency.

(2) On request of a member of Congress, the Comptroller General shall give the member a copy of the material the Comptroller General compiles in carrying out this subsection that has been released by the committee for which the material was compiled.

F. 31 U.S.C. Sec. 1113. Congressional Information

(a)(1) When requested by a committee of Congress having jurisdiction over receipts or appropriations, the President shall provide the committee with assistance and information.

(2) When requested by a committee of Congress, additional information related to the amount of an appropriation originally requested by an Office of Inspector General shall be submitted to the committee.

(b) When requested by a committee of Congress, by the Comptroller General, or by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the head of each executive agency shall—

(1) provide information on the location and kind of available fiscal, budget, and program information;

(2) to the extent practicable, prepare summary tables of that fiscal, budget, and program information and related information of the committee, the Comptroller General, or the Director of the Congressional Budget Office considers necessary; and

(3) provide a program evaluation carried out or commissioned by an executive agency.

(c) In cooperation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, the Secretary, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) establish and maintain a current directory of sources of, and information systems for, fiscal, budget, and program information and a brief description of the contents of each source and system;

(2) when requested, provide assistance to committees of Congress and members of Congress in obtaining information from the sources in the directory; and

(3) when requested, provide assistance to committees and the extent practicable, to members of Congress in evaluating the infor-

mation from the sources in the directory; and

(d) To the extent they consider necessary, the Comptroller General and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office individually or jointly shall establish and maintain a file of information to meet recurring needs of Congress for fiscal, budget, and program information to carry out this section and sections 717 and 1112 of this title. The file shall include information on budget requests, congressional authorizations to obligations and expenditures. The Comptroller General and the Director shall maintain the file and an index so that it is easier for the committees and agencies of Congress to use the file and index through data processing and communications techniques.

(e)(1) The Comptroller General shall—

(A) carry out a continuing program to identify the needs of committees and members of Congress for fiscal budget, and program information to carry out this section and section 1112 of this title;

(B) assist committees of Congress in developing their information needs;

(C) monitor recurring reporting requirements of Congress and committees; and

(D) make recommendations to Congress and committees for changes and improvements in those reporting requirements to meet information needs identified by the Comptroller General, to improve their usefulness to congressional users, and to eliminate unnecessary reporting.

(2) Before September 2 of each year, the Comptroller General shall report to Congress on—

(A) the needs identified under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection;

(B) the relationship of those needs to existing reporting requirements;

(C) the extent to which reporting by the executive branch of the United States Government currently meets the identified needs;

(D) the changes to standard classifications necessary to meet congressional needs;

(E) activities, progress, and results of the program of the Comptroller General under paragraph (1)(B)-(D) of this subsection; and

(F) progress of the executive branch in the prior year.

(3) Before March 2 of each year, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Secretary shall report to Congress on plans for meeting the needs identified under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, including—

(A) plans for carrying out changes to classifications to meet information needs of Congress;

(B) the status of information systems in the prior year; and

(C) the use of standard classifications. (Public Law 97-258, Sept. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 914; Public Law 97-452, §1(3), Jan. 12, 1983, 96 Stat. 2467.)

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.)

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules

of the House of Representatives, I am reporting that the Committee on Financial Services adopted the following rules for the 108th Congress on February 5, 2003 in open session, a quorum being present, and submit those rules for publication in the Congressional Record:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

108TH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

RULE 1

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Financial Services (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged motions in the Committee and shall be considered without debate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

RULE 2

MEETINGS

Calling of Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet on the first Tuesday of each month when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Chair"), there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(4) Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

Notice for Meetings

(b)(1) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least two calendar days before the time of the meeting.

(2) The Chair shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least two calendar days before the time of each regular meeting for each measure or matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the measure or materials relating to the matter in question; and

(B) an explanation of the measure or matter to be considered, which, in the case of an explanation of a bill, resolution, or similar measure, shall include a summary of the major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the measure to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(3) The agenda and materials required under this subsection shall be provided to each member of the Committee at least three calendar days before the time of the meeting where the measure or matter to be

¹For other requirements which relate to General Accounting Office reports to Congress and which affect the committee, see secs. 232 and 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-57).

considered was not approved for full Committee consideration by a subcommittee of jurisdiction.

(4) The provisions of this subsection may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Committee, or by the Chair with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

RULE 3

MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES

In General

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules). Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(4) Opening statements by members at the beginning of any hearing or meeting of the Committee shall be limited to 5 minutes each for the Chair or ranking minority member, or their respective designee, and 3 minutes each for all other members.

(5) No person, other than a Member of Congress, Committee staff, or an employee of a Member when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may stand in or be seated at the rostrum area of the Committee rooms unless the Chair determines otherwise.

Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, of authorizing a subpoena, of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of rule XI of the rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)) or of releasing executive session material pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

(3) For the purpose of taking any action other than those specified in paragraph (2) one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or matter pending before the Committee unless the requisite number of members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of one-fifth of the members present.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) In accordance with clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI, a record of the vote of each member of the Committee on each record vote on any measure or matter before the Committee shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee, and, with respect to any record vote on any motion to report or on any amendment, shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the

total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

(5) POSTPONED RECORD VOTES.—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time, but no later than the next meeting day.

(B) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (A), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote;

(C) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

Hearing Procedures

(d)(1)(A) The Chair shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(B) Not less than three days before the commencement of a hearing announced under this paragraph, the Chair shall provide to the members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject of the hearing, or, in the case of a hearing on a measure or matter, a copy of the measure or materials relating to the matter in question and a concise explanation of the measure or matter to be considered. (2) To the greatest extent practicable—

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee two business days in advance of the appearance sufficient copies (including a copy in electronic form), as determined by the Chair, of a written statement of proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to brief summary thereof; and

(B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(3) The requirements of paragraph (2)(A) may be modified or waived by the Chair when the Chair determines it to be in the best interest of the Committee.

(4) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of witnesses before the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of 5 minutes to interrogate witnesses until each member of the Committee present has been recognized once for that purpose.

(5) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon the request of a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present, or pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) The Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period for which the House has adjourned for a period in excess of 3 days when, in the opinion of the Chair, authorization and issuance of the subpoena is necessary to obtain the material or testimony set forth in the subpoena. The Chair shall report to the members of the Committee on the authorization and issuance of a subpoena during the recess period as soon as practicable, but in no event later than one week after service of such subpoena.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

Special Procedures

(f)(1)(A) COMMEMORATIVE MEDALS AND COINS.—It shall not be in order for the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology to hold a hearing on any commemorative medal or commemorative coin legislation unless the legislation is cosponsored by at least two-thirds of the members of the House and has been recommended by the U.S. Mint's Citizens Commemorative Coin Advisory Committee in the case of a commemorative coin.

(B) It shall not be in order for the subcommittee to approve a bill or measure authorizing commemorative coins for consideration by the full Committee which does not conform with the mintage restrictions established by section 5112 of title 31, United States Code.

(C) In considering legislation authorizing Congressional gold medals, the subcommittee shall apply the following standards—

(i) the recipient shall be a natural person;

(ii) the recipient shall have performed an achievement that has an impact on American history and culture that is likely to be recognized as a major achievement in the recipient's field long after the achievement;

(iii) the recipient shall not have received a medal previously for the same or substantially the same achievement;

(iv) the recipient shall be living or, if deceased, shall have been deceased for not less than 5 years and not more than 25 years;

(v) the achievements were performed in the recipient's field of endeavor, and represent either a lifetime of continuous superior achievements or a single achievement so significant that the recipient is recognized and acclaimed by others in the same field, as evidenced by the recipient having received the highest honors in the field.

(2) TESTIMONY OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS.—

(A) Notwithstanding subsection (a)(4), when the Chair announces a hearing of the Committee for the purpose of receiving—

(i) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board pursuant to section 2B of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 221 et seq.), or

(ii) testimony from the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board or a member of the President's cabinet at the invitation of the

Chair, the Chair may, in consultation with the ranking minority member, limit the number and duration of opening statements to be delivered at such hearing. The limitation shall be included in the announcement made pursuant to subsection (d)(1)(A), and shall provide that the opening statements of all members of the Committee shall be made a part of the hearing record.

RULE 4

PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING MEASURES OR MATTERS

(a) No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) The Chair of the Committee shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(b)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) All reports printed by the Committee pursuant to a legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: "This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Financial Services and may not necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

RULE 5

SUBCOMMITTEES

Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be 5 subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL MARKETS, INSURANCE, AND GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISES.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises includes—

- (i) securities, exchanges, and finance;
- (ii) capital markets activities;
- (iii) activities involving futures, forwards, options, and other types of derivative instruments;
- (iv) secondary market organizations for home mortgages including the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation;
- (v) the Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight;
- (vi) the Federal Home Loan Banks; and
- (vii) insurance generally.

(B) SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL MONETARY POLICY, TRADE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology includes—

- (i) financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy;
- (ii) economic growth and stabilization;
- (iii) defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;
- (iv) domestic monetary policy, and agencies which directly or indirectly affect domestic monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, the allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic financial institutions;
- (v) coins, coinage, currency, and medals, including commemorative coins and medals,

proof and mint sets and other special coins, the Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including the coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, currency denominations and design, the distribution of coins, and the operations of the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing;

(vi) development of new or alternative forms of currency;

(vii) multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto, and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions;

(viii) international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank;

(ix) the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto; and

(x) international investment policies, both as they relate to United States investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

(C) SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER CREDIT.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit includes—

(i) all agencies, including the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve System, the Office of Thrift Supervision, and the National Credit Union Administration, which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit insurance for, financial institutions, and the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits;

(ii) the chartering, branching, merger, acquisition, consolidation, or conversion of financial institutions;

(iii) consumer credit, including the provision of consumer credit by insurance companies, and further including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth in lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, fair credit reporting and the use of credit information by credit bureaus and credit providers, equal credit opportunity, debt collection practices, and electronic funds transfers;

(iv) creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, credit and debit cards, and the preemption of State usury laws;

(v) consumer access to financial services, including the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act;

(vi) the terms and rules of disclosure of financial services, including the advertisement, promotion and pricing of financial services, and availability of government check cashing services;

(vii) deposit insurance; and

(viii) consumer access to savings accounts and checking accounts in financial institutions, including lifeline banking and other consumer accounts.

(D) SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity includes—

(i) housing (except programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; rural housing; housing and homeless assistance programs; all activities of the Government National Mortgage Association; private mortgage insurance; housing construction and design and safety standards; housing-related

energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for nonprofit housing sponsors; housing counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord/tenant relations); and real estate lending including regulation of settlement procedures;

(ii) community development and community and neighborhood planning, training and research; national urban growth policies; urban/rural research and technologies; and regulation of interstate land sales;

(iii) government sponsored insurance programs, including those offering protection against crime, fire, flood (and related land use controls), earthquake and other natural hazards; and

(iv) the qualifications for and designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (other than matters relating to tax benefits).

(E) SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations includes—

(i) the oversight of all agencies, departments, programs, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the development of recommendations with regard to the necessity or desirability of enacting, changing, or repealing any legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and for conducting investigations within such jurisdiction; and

(ii) research and analysis regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) The Chair shall regularly refer to one or more subcommittees such measures and matters as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities. In making such a referral, the Chair may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and subcommittees of additional or sequential jurisdiction.

(2) All other measures or matters shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(3) In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(4) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

Composition of Subcommittees

(c)(1) Members shall be elected to each subcommittee and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair.

(2) The Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

(3) The subcommittees shall be comprised as follows:

(A) The Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises shall be comprised of 49 members, 26 elected by the majority caucus and 23 elected by the minority caucus.

(B) The Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology shall be comprised of 26 members, 14 elected by the majority caucus and 12 elected by the minority caucus.

(C) The Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Commercial Credit shall be comprised of 47 members, 25 elected by the majority caucus and 22 elected by the minority caucus.

(D) The Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity shall be comprised of 26 members, 14 elected by the majority caucus and 12 elected by the minority caucus.

(E) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be comprised of 20 members, 11 elected by the majority caucus and 9 elected by the minority caucus.

Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it, consistent with subsection (a).

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chair with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

Effect of a Vacancy

(e) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee as long as the required quorum is present.

Records

(f) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6

STAFF

In General

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff be available to all members of the Committee.

Subcommittee Staff

(b) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available so that each subcommittee can carry out its responsibilities

under the rules of the Committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

Compensation of Staff

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee.

(2) The ranking minority member shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee.

RULE 7

BUDGET AND TRAVEL

Budget

(a)(1) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, the Chair, after consultation with the ranking minority member, shall designate an amount to be under the direction of the ranking minority member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

RULE 8

COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

Records

(a)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

Committee Publications on the Internet

(b) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

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

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

SUPPORT H.R. 837 TO REDUCE AMERICAN DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN ENERGY

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, many of us have noticed that fuel prices are approaching \$2 per gallon. We have doubled petroleum imports from Iraq in the last couple of months. This has been due largely to the Venezuelan crisis. We are currently averaging 6 billion barrels a year of imported fuel from Iraq. As anyone might suppose, we may eventually lose that supply. Nearly 60 percent of all oil is from foreign sources, and this should grow to roughly 70 percent by the year 2020.

Recently the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) and I have introduced H.R. 837 which would, partially at least, address this problem.

H.R. 837 amends section 211 of the Clean Air Act. It requires the use of at least 2.3 billion gallons of renewable fuels during the year 2004, and that would increase to 5 billion gallons by the year 2012.

Renewable fuels are fuels produced from grain, sewage, feedlot waste, or other decaying organic materials. Ethanol and biodiesel are the two primary sources of renewable fuels.

Ethanol contains 34 percent more energy than is required to produce it. This combats the myth that many people think it takes more energy to produce ethanol than ethanol actually produces. That is not true.

Ethanol improves octane level in fuels. It improves air quality and allows us to meet EPA clean air requirements. And, possibly as important as anything, it replaces the additive

MTBE, which has been proven to pollute groundwater and is being phased out throughout the Nation. Of course, our legislation requires MTBE to be phased out over the next 4 years. Ethanol results in by-products of animal feed and biodegradable plastics, which certainly adds value to the agricultural community.

This legislation, H.R. 837, would replace nearly all of the oil that we currently import from Iraq by the year 2012, which is roughly 6 billion gallons per year. It would also reduce foreign oil purchases by \$34 billion a year. Currently, roughly 25 percent of the trade imbalance that we have is caused by the purchase of foreign petroleum. So this is an important thing.

Also this legislation would create 200,000 new jobs in the United States, it would increase farm income by roughly \$6 billion annually and lessen our dependence on farm program payments. Ethanol currently comprises 1 percent of U.S. fuel supply. H.R. 837 would increase the use of ethanol to at least 3 percent by the year 2012. Currently, by contrast, Brazil has 22 percent of its fuel supply from ethanol.

Most automobiles can burn ethanol fuel at an 85 percent level. Currently there are over 200 State and Federal automobile fleets that use a biodiesel blend of 20 percent. So a 3 percent usage of ethanol is just the tip of the iceberg. We certainly can go much further with this particular technology.

Ethanol production is expanding rapidly. We had 12 new plants come into production last year. We have 10 new plants under construction this year, and many plants that are expanding. Eighty percent of California's reformulated gasoline contains ethanol at the present time. Many people thought at one time that the ethanol production was not such that California could be satisfied, so supply is really not a problem at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides flexibility in compliance with oxygenated fuel standards at the State and local level. This is not a mandate that is going to restrict anybody unnecessarily. This should cut refinery costs when compared to current fuel regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 837, because it decreases dependence on foreign oil while improving air quality, lessening groundwater pollution, improving farm income and providing hundreds of thousands of jobs for American citizens.

CONCERNS ABOUT AMERICA'S GLOBAL ALLIANCES

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wish to place on the record my deepening concerns about America's global alliances. A few weeks ago, it was with shock and dismay that I observed our

President purposely fail to extend congratulations to German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder on his reelection. The President's behavior was inappropriate and damaging. Germany has stood as our Nation's most cooperative ally for over 50 years as our nations rebuilt Europe, weathered the Cold War and linked our economies with shared democratic values and a rule of law.

NATO has stood as the bulwark against the most awful forms of tyranny and repression. NATO is not the "Old Europe," in Secretary Rumsfeld's poorly chosen words. It is the democratic, dependable Europe that has withstood the test of time. It is the modern Europe that has always stood at America's side.

I have been blessed to live through an era when President John F. Kennedy stood at the Brandenburg Gate, when Berlin was a divided city between the forces of freedom and repression, to proclaim for freedom-loving people everywhere, "Ich bin ein Berliner."

For the vast majority of Americans of this post-World War II period, we express to the German people and their government profound gratitude for your alliance with America, your sister Republic.

□ 1915

Never before in my 20 years in Congress have I felt compelled to place a call to the German Embassy to offer my congratulations to the German Chancellor, as well as the congratulations of all Americans of goodwill to the Chancellor. Indeed, it is no secret that Germany has dispatched its own peacekeeping forces to Afghanistan to help secure the first bloody tranche of peace, a most dangerous and difficult assignment.

So, tonight, I want again to formally thank the Chancellor, the members of the Bundestag, and the German people for their resolve and enduring friendship with America. I thank the Bundestag, as well, for their ongoing exchange with our Congress.

Despite reckless White House rhetoric, Germany's ties to America are deep and growing. Then this past month, we witnessed the Bush administration publicly humiliate France. France too has suffered and suffers as a result of terrorism. They know a great deal about terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the American people how essential France was to the establishment of our own independent Nation. During the Revolutionary War, the French forces allied with our Continental revolutionaries, and they were indispensable to our victory over the British crown. French General Marquis de Lafayette was dispatched by General George Washington to rout out the British forces. About 5,500 French soldiers, led by Lieutenant Jean Rochambeau, drove the British from New York; and ultimately, the French and American forces were victorious at Yorktown. Mr. Speaker, 5,500 French troops in those days was a

huge commitment by the nation of France. Our Republic owes much to France and the people of France, and I wish to thank them tonight in their own words.

Donc, ce soir je voudrais exprimer mon gratitude profonde envers le Président Chirac et envers le parlement français de leur alliance durable avec notre pays et avec l'OTAN. Je voudrais aussi offrir de respect au ministre de l'Etranger de la France, Dominique de Villepin—je ne veux absolument pas le châtier. Le monde civilisé ne peut pas encore savoir la meilleure méthode pour endiguer le terrorisme grandissant qui est engendré par la ferveur révolutionnaire trouvée au Moyen-Orient et à l'Asie Centrale. Mais je suis certaine d'une chose: nous ne réussissons pas sans nos alliés historiques et valables en l'Europe—ni face à leur opposition. La guerre doit être la dernière ressource, après que les inspections raisonnables exécutées par les agents de l'ONU auront épuisé.

Je veu parler des rapports entre les gouvernements de la France et des Etats-Unis et entre les citoyens de nos pays. Notre amitié est importante et historique, et date des jours où le général Lafayette nous aidait pendant notre guerre de l'indépendance. Même notre capitale, la ville de Washington, a été dessiné par un français, Pierre L'Enfant, et a pris modèle sur la ville de Paris. Les mots de la révolution française—liberté, égalité, fraternité—restent vrais aujourd'hui et dans notre congrès, ils sont vraiment gravés pour toujours.

(English translation of the above statement is as follows:)

Our friendship is important and historic, and dates from the days when General Lafayette helped us during our war for independence. Even our capital, the city of Washington, was designed by a Frenchman, Pierre L'Enfant, and was modeled after Paris. The words of the French revolution—liberty, equality, brotherhood—remain true today and in our Congress, they are truly carved for all time. U.S. President and U.S. ambassador to France, Thomas Jefferson wrote,

"I do not believe war the most certain means of enforcing principles. Those peaceable coercions which are in the power of every nation, if undertaken in concert and in time of peace, are more likely to produce the desired effect."—Thomas Jefferson to Robert Livingston, 1801.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). The Chair understands the gentlewoman will supply the Clerk with the English translation for the RECORD.

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ANOTHER UNITED NATIONS WAR?

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, President Bush, Sr., proudly spoke of "The New World Order," a term used by those who promote one-world government under the United Nations. In going to war in 1991, he sought and received U.N. authority to push Iraqi forces out of Kuwait. He forcefully stated that this U.N. authority was adequate and that although a congressional resolution was acceptable, it was entirely unnecessary and he would proceed regardless. At that time, there was no discussion regarding a congressional declaration of war. The first Persian Gulf War, therefore, was clearly a U.N. political war fought within U.N. guidelines, not for U.S. security; and it was not fought through to victory. The bombings, sanctions, and harassment of the Iraqi people have never stopped. We are now about to resume the act of fighting. Although this is referred to as the Second Persian Gulf War, it is merely a continuation of a war started long ago and is likely to continue for a long time, even after Saddam Hussein is removed from power.

Our attitude toward the United Nations is quite different today compared to 1991. I have argued for years against our membership in the United Nations because it compromises our sovereignty. The U.S. has always been expected to pay an unfair percentage of U.N. expenses. I contend that membership in the United Nations has led to impractical military conflicts that were highly costly, both in lives and dollars, and that were rarely resolved.

Our 58 years in Korea have seen 33,000 lives lost, 100,000 casualties and over \$1 trillion in today's dollars spent. Korea is the most outrageous example of our fighting a U.N. war without a declaration from the U.S. Congress. And where are we today? On the verge of a nuclear confrontation with a North Korean regime nearly out of control. And to compound the irony, the South Koreans are intervening in hopes of diminishing the tensions that exist between the United States and North Korea.

As bad as the Vietnam nightmare was, at least we left and the U.N. was not involved. We left in defeat and Vietnam remained a unified, Communist country. The results have been much more salutary. Vietnam is now essentially non-Communist and trade with the West is routine. We did not disarm Vietnam; we never counted their weapons; and so far, no one cares. Peaceful relations have developed between our two countries not by force of arms, but through trade and friendship. No United Nations, no war, and no inspections served us well, even after many decades of war and a million deaths inflicted on the Vietnamese in an effort by both the French and the United States to force them into compliance with Western demands.

In this new battle with Iraq, our relationship with the United Nations and our allies is drawing a lot of attention. The administration now says it would be nice to have U.N. support, but it is

not necessary. The President argues that a unilateralist approach is permissible with his understanding of national sovereignty, but no mention is made of the fact that the authority to go to war is not a U.N. prerogative and that such authority can only come from the U.S. Congress.

Although the argument that the United Nations cannot dictate to us what is in our best interests is correct, and we do have a right to pursue foreign policy unilaterally, it is ironic that we are making this declaration in order to pursue an unpopular war that very few people or governments throughout the world support.

But the argument for unilateralism and national sovereignty cannot be made for the purpose of enforcing U.N. security resolutions. That does not make any sense. If one wants to enforce U.N. Security Council resolutions, that authority can only come from the United Nations itself. We end up with the worst of both worlds, hated for our unilateralism, but still lending credibility to the United Nations.

The Constitution makes it clear that if we must counter a threat to our security, that authority must come from the U.S. Congress.

Those who believe, and many sincerely do, that the United Nations serves a useful function, argue that ignoring the United Nations at this juncture will surely make it irrelevant. Even with my opposition to the United Nations, I can hardly be pleased that its irrelevancy might come about because of our rush to war against a nation that has not aggressed against us nor poses any threat to us.

From my viewpoint, the worst scenario would be for the United Nations to sanction this war, which may well occur if we offer enough U.S. taxpayer money and Iraqi oil to the reluctant countries. If that happens, we could be looking at another 58-year occupation, expanded Middle East chaos, or a dangerous spread of hostility to all of Asia or even further.

With regard to foreign affairs, the best advice comes from our Founders and the Constitution. It is better to promote peace and commerce with all nations and exclude ourselves from the entangling alliances and complex, unworkable alliances that comes from our membership in the United Nations.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE STATION NIGHTCLUB FIRE IN RHODE ISLAND

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with great sorrow and a heavy heart to honor the victims of last week's horrific night club fire at the Station Night Club in West Warwick, Rhode Island, that claimed 97 lives and left 187 injured.

In any community, that tragedy would have been overwhelming; but in

a small State like Rhode Island, when a close-knit town in the center of our State falls victim to one of the worst nightclub fires in the Nation's history, the impact is simply incomprehensible. It is said that in our world today, only 6 degrees separates each one of us from any other person. As our Attorney General remarked, in Rhode Island, that distance is more like 1½ degrees. Everyone here has a connection to one of the victims and, indeed, connections are being made by people all across New England and the country.

As Rhode Islanders begin the healing process, I want to express my deepest condolences to those friends and family members who lost loved ones in this horrible fire. There are no words to adequately express our profound sadness. Please know that you are in the thoughts and prayers of all Americans, and we will not let the lives of those 97 sons, daughters, sisters, brothers, mothers, and fathers be forgotten.

As of this afternoon, 64 people remain hospitalized, 46 of them in critical condition. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in offering our prayers for their quick and full recovery. They are fighting every hour, and they need our strength now more than ever. Our best wishes go out to them and their families as they weather the tough days ahead.

I would also like to express my immense gratitude to the incredible and heroic efforts of the multitude of people and agencies throughout Rhode Island and Massachusetts who have helped respond to this disaster.

The firefighters, police, and emergency responders who were first on the scene made a Herculean effort under unimaginable circumstances, and we surely have them to thank that even more lives were not lost. In addition, over a dozen hospitals in Rhode Island and Massachusetts have been caring for the patients since this tragedy, many of whom have made amazing progress. The doctors and nurses and the support staff of these hospitals have worked tirelessly to help nearly 200 injured victims, and we are grateful for their service.

As usual, when tragedy strikes Rhode Island, our community has proven strong, resilient, and boundlessly generous. I want to recognize the work of countless volunteers who have put their own lives on hold to offer time, financial resources, and the many other kinds of assistance and who helped in any way that they could. Likewise, many members of our State's business community have come forward to provide everything from food and shelter to transportation to those affected by this event. I would particularly like to thank the Red Cross and its scores of volunteers and for all that they have done to give comfort and assistance to those whose loved ones were lost or injured.

I would also like to commend the excellent response by Rhode Island's elected officials and State and local

agencies. Our governor, Governor Carcieri, has provided outstanding leadership throughout this tragedy and shown extraordinary sensitivity to the families involved, and I have personally heard from many of them how much they appreciate his efforts. Lieutenant Governor Charles Fogarty and Major General Reginald Centracchio, as cochairs of the Management Advisory Council, have also played a crucial role in this crisis, and the Rhode Island Emergency Management Agency has impressively and effectively coordinated a myriad of State and local activities.

I would also like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. PATRICK KENNEDY), for his assistance, his friendship, and his support over the past several days, and Rhode Island's senior Senator, JACK REED, and Senator LINCOLN CHAFFEE for their tremendous efforts and leadership.

□ 1930

Finally, I want to express my great appreciation for the assistance of several Federal agencies, including FEMA, Social Security, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms. Their involvement has been critical, and I look forward to working with them further in the days and weeks to come.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, allow me to offer these final thoughts.

For those that have lost their lives, we can only take comfort that they are now in a better place. For those that fight hour to hour, we pray for their recovery. For the families and friends who have lost loved ones, we offer our shoulders to lean on in their time of need. For all Rhode Islanders and our fellow citizens across the country, it is our time to provide strength, comfort, and assistance to those who need it, and do whatever it takes to ensure that such a tragedy never befalls any community such as this again.

IN SUPPORT OF THE EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS, PREVENTION AND EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, food is one of life's greatest pleasures. Food is also one of life's greatest necessities. Yet, for many, food is an enemy and the act of eating is torture.

An estimated 5 million to 10 million Americans suffer from eating-related diseases, including anorexia, bulimia, and binge-eating disorders. As many as 50,000 of those affected will die as a direct result of these disorders.

Young women are the most common victims of these deadly diseases, but a significant number of males also expe-

rience eating-related disorders. We are all aware of the medical complications that result from anorexia and bulimia: malnutrition, liver damage, gum erosion, and even death. However, an often-overlooked consequence of eating disorders is the negative impact they have on a child's educational achievement. Students with eating disorders often see their school performance decline due to lapses in concentration, loss of self-esteem, depression, and engaging in self-destructive behaviors.

Listen to how one young woman in our district describes the destruction done to her life by an eating disorder: "I am a 16-year-old with anorexia. Having this disease has been the most horrible experience of my life. It completely takes control of your life. It breaks up your family, friends, and your actual thinking decisions. I have had this disorder for over a year and a half. Over that year and a half I have been slowly killing myself."

Despite the social and physical devastation that these diseases inflict on young people such as this girl, very few States or school districts have adequate programs or services to help children suffering from weight-related disorders. It is not that educators or parents do not realize the problems caused by bulimia or binge-eating or are unable to identify affected students; in many cases, they either do not know how to respond to the problem or are without the resources to help educate our youth about the dangers of eating disorders.

It is for this reason that I am introducing the Eating Disorders Awareness, Prevention and Education Act of 2003. This legislation has three parts which together are designed to raise awareness nationally of the problems caused by eating disorders, and to expand opportunities for parents and educators to address them at the school level. This last goal is particularly important as 86 percent of the affected individuals develop their eating disorders before the age 20.

Here is a quick summary of what the Eating Disorders Awareness, Prevention and Education Act will do:

First, the legislation provides States and local school districts with the option of using title V funds to set up eating disorder prevention, awareness and education programs. Under the No Child Left Behind Act, title V funds can be used for nine specific activities to improve the academic outcome of students. This legislation would make eating disorders awareness, education and prevention the tenth allowable use.

Because this legislation expands what States and school districts can do with funds they already receive, it allows us to help vulnerable students without increasing the Federal Government's involvement in local education matters or creating a new Federal program.

The second major provision of this bill ties in with the first. It requires the National Center for Education Sta-

tistics at the Department of Education and the National Center for Health Statistics at the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a joint study and report to Congress on the impact eating disorders have on educational advancement and achievement.

The study will evaluate the extent to which students with eating disorders are more likely to miss school, have delayed rates of development, or reduce cognitive skills. The study will also outline current State and local programs to educate youth about the dangers of eating disorders, as well as evaluate the value of such programs.

The third and final piece of this legislation calls for the Department of Education and Health and Human Services to carry out a national eating disorders public awareness campaign. This campaign will be similar to the antidrug campaign now being run by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. Speaker, there is no easy solution to the problem of eating disorders. They present a serious threat to the health and educational advancement of our Nation's children. They must be addressed.

The Eating Disorders Awareness, Prevention and Education Act gives States, local school districts, and parents the tools needed to address this problem at its root: in schools and classrooms across America. At the same time, it continues the principle of local control of education, makes good use of limited Federal resources, and increases educational opportunities for this group of at-risk children.

Let me close by quoting another young woman from my district struggling with an eating disorder. After describing her tragic battle with anorexia, she closed her letter by saying this: "I really hope that you now realize how important it is to have some awareness and programs in schools about eating disorders."

I do understand, Mr. Speaker, and hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this much needed legislation.

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

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

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on International Relations has adopted written rules governing its procedure. Pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2, I am hereby submitting them for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS 108TH CONGRESS

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Rules of the House of Representatives, and in particular, the committee rules enumerated in clause 2 of Rule XI, are the rules of the Committee on International Relations (hereafter referred to as the "Committee"), to the extent applicable. A motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, is a privileged non-debatable motion in Committee.

The Chairman of the Committee on International Relations (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman") shall consult the Ranking Minority Member to the extent possible with respect to the business of the Committee. Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules, to the extent applicable.

RULE 2. DATE OF MEETING

The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the first Tuesday of every month when the House of Representatives is in session pursuant to clause 2(b) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman as he may deem necessary or at the request of a majority of the Members of the Committee in accordance with clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

The determination of the business to be considered at each meeting shall be made by the Chairman subject to clause 2(c) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives.

A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no business to be considered.

RULE 3. QUORUM

For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two Members shall constitute a quorum.

One-third of the Members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, except: (1) reporting a measure or recommendation; (2) closing Committee meetings and hearings to the public; (3) authorizing the issuance of subpoenas; and (4) any other action for which an actual majority quorum is required by any rule of the House of Representatives or by law.

No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the Members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

RULE 4. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) MEETINGS

(1) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public, because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. No person other than Members of the Committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session

which has been closed to the public. This subsection does not apply to open Committee hearings which are provided for by subsection (b) of this rule.

(2) The chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter, or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time. When exercising postponement authority, the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(b) HEARINGS

(1) Each hearing conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day should be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony—

(A) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or violate paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(B) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(2) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness—

(A) such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person; and

(B) the Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(3) No Member of the House of Representatives may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee unless the House of Representatives has by majority vote authorized the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings, on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this subsection for closing hearings to the public.

(4) The Committee or a subcommittee may by the procedure designated in this sub-

section vote to close one (1) subsequent day of hearing.

(5) No congressional staff shall be present at any meeting or hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee that has been closed to the public, and at which classified information will be involved, unless such person is authorized access to such classified information in accordance with Rule 20.

RULE 5. ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

Public announcement shall be made of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or markup to be conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee at the earliest possible date, and in any event at least one (1) week before the commencement of that hearing or markup unless the Committee or subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin that meeting at an earlier date, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be. Such determination may be made with respect to any markup by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate. Such determination may be made with respect to any hearing of the Committee or of a subcommittee by its Chairman, with the concurrence of its Ranking Minority Member, or by the Committee or subcommittee by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business.

Public announcement of all hearings and markups shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record. Members shall be notified by the Chief of Staff of all meetings (including markups and hearings) and briefings of subcommittees and of the full Committee.

The agenda for each Committee and subcommittee meeting, setting out all items of business to be considered, including whenever possible a copy of any bill or other document scheduled for markup, shall be furnished to each Committee or subcommittee Member by delivery to the Member's office at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) before the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed on such agenda shall be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or subcommittee or by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

RULE 6. WITNESSES

(a) Interrogation of Witnesses

(1) Insofar as practicable, witnesses shall be permitted to present their oral statements without interruption subject to reasonable time constraints imposed by the Chairman, with questioning by the Committee Members taking place afterward. Members should refrain from questions until such statements are completed.

(2) In recognizing Members, the Chairman shall, to the extent practicable, give preference to the Members on the basis of their arrival at the hearing, taking into consideration the majority and minority ratio of the Members actually present. A Member desiring to speak or ask a question shall address the Chairman and not the witness.

(3) Subject to paragraph (4), each Member may interrogate the witness for 5 minutes, the reply of the witness being included in the 5-minute period. After all Members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, may permit one (1) or more majority members of the Committee designated by the Chairman to question a witness for a specified period of not

longer than 30 minutes. On such occasions, an equal number of minority Members of the Committee designated by the Ranking Minority Member shall be permitted to question the same witness for the same period of time. Committee staff may be permitted to question a witness for equal specified periods either with the concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member or by motion. However, in no case may questioning by Committee staff proceed before each Member of the Committee who wishes to speak under the 5-minute rule has had one opportunity to do so.

(b) Statements of Witnesses

Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee is required to file with the clerk of the Committee, at least two (2) working days in advance of his or her appearance, sufficient copies, as determined by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, of his or her proposed testimony to provide to Members and staff of the Committee or subcommittee, the news media, and the general public. The witness shall limit his or her oral presentation to a brief summary of his or her testimony. In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall, to the extent practicable, include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness, to the extent that such information is relevant to the subject matter of, and the witness' representational capacity at, the hearing.

To the extent practicable, each witness should provide the text of his or her proposed testimony in machine-readable form, along with any attachments and appendix materials.

The Committee or subcommittee shall notify Members at least two working days in advance of a hearing of the availability of testimony submitted by witnesses.

The requirements of this subsection or any part thereof may be waived by the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee, or the presiding Member, provided that the witness or the Chairman or Ranking Minority Member has submitted, prior to the witness's appearance, a written explanation as to the reasons testimony has not been made available to the Committee or subcommittee. In the event a witness submits neither his or her testimony at least two working days in advance of his or her appearance nor has a written explanation been submitted as to prior availability, the witness shall be released from testifying unless a majority of the Committee or subcommittee votes to accept his or her testimony.

(c) Oaths

The Chairman, or any Member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

RULE 7. PREPARATION AND MAINTENANCE OF COMMITTEE RECORDS

An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and markup sessions. Members of the Committee and any witness may examine the transcript of his or her own remarks and may make any grammatical or technical changes that do not substantively alter the record. Any such Member or witness shall return the transcript to the Committee offices within five (5) calendar days (not including Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) after receipt of the transcript, or as soon thereafter as is practicable.

Any information supplied for the record at the request of a Member of the Committee shall be provided to the Member when received by the Committee.

Transcripts of hearings and markup sessions (except for the record of a meeting or hearing which is closed to the public) shall be printed as soon as is practicable after receipt of the corrected versions, except that the Chairman may order the transcript of a hearing to be printed without the corrections of a Member or witness if the Chairman determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time to correct such transcript and such transcript has not been returned within such time.

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

The Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible, make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE 8. EXTRANEANOUS MATERIAL IN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

No extraneous material shall be printed in either the body or appendices of any Committee or subcommittee hearing, except matter which has been accepted for inclusion in the record during the hearing or by agreement of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee within five calendar days of the hearing. Copies of bills and other legislation under consideration and responses to written questions submitted by Members shall not be considered extraneous material.

Extraneous material in either the body or appendices of any hearing to be printed which would be in excess of eight (8) printed pages (for any one submission) shall be accompanied by a written request to the Chairman, such written request to contain an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing such material.

RULE 9. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE VOTES

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available for inspection by the public at reasonable times at the Committee offices. Such result shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each Member voting for and against, and the Members present but not voting.

RULE 10. PROXIES

Proxy voting is not permitted in the Committee or in subcommittees.

RULE 11. REPORTS

(a) Reports on bills and resolutions

To the extent practicable, not later than 24 hours before a report is to be filed with the Clerk of the House on a measure that has been ordered reported by the Committee, the Chairman shall make available for inspection by all Members of the Committee a copy of the draft committee report in order to afford Members adequate information and the opportunity to draft and file any supplemental, minority or additional views which they may deem appropriate.

With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total

number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in any Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) Prior approval of certain reports

No Committee, subcommittee, or staff report, study, or other document which purports to express publicly the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the Committee or a subcommittee may be released to the public or filed with the Clerk of the House unless approved by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day). In any case in which clause 2(l) of Rule XI and clause 3(a)(1) of Rule XIII of the House of Representatives does not apply, each Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall be given an opportunity to have views or a disclaimer included as part of the material filed or released, as the case may be.

(c) Foreign travel reports

At the same time that the report required by clause 8(b)(3) of Rule X of the House of Representatives, regarding foreign travel reports, is submitted to the Chairman, Members and employees of the committee shall provide a report to the Chairman listing all official meetings, interviews, inspection tours and other official functions in which the individual participated, by country and date. Under extraordinary circumstances, the Chairman may waive the listing in such report of an official meeting, interview, inspection tour, or other official function. The report shall be maintained in the full committee offices and shall be available for public inspection during normal business hours.

RULE 12. REPORTING BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Except in unusual circumstances, bills and resolutions will not be considered by the Committee unless and until the appropriate subcommittee has recommended the bill or resolution for Committee action, and will not be taken to the House of Representatives for action unless and until the Committee has ordered reported such bill or resolution, a quorum being present.

Except in unusual circumstances, a bill or resolution originating in the House of Representatives that contains exclusively findings and policy declarations or expressions of the sense of the House of Representatives or the sense of the Congress shall not be considered by the Committee or a subcommittee unless such bill or resolution has at least 25 House co-sponsors, at least ten of whom are members of the Committee.

For purposes of this Rule, unusual circumstances will be determined by the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member and such other Members of the Committee as the Chairman deems appropriate.

RULE 13. STAFF SERVICES

(a) The Committee staff shall be selected and organized so that it can provide a comprehensive range of professional services in the field of foreign affairs to the Committee, the subcommittees, and all its Members. The staff shall include persons with training and experience in international relations, making available to the Committee individuals with knowledge of major countries, areas, and U.S. overseas programs and operations.

(b) Subject to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee, except as provided in paragraph (c), shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chairman with the approval of the majority of the majority Members of the

Committee. Their remuneration shall be fixed by the Chairman, and they shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman. Staff assignments are to be authorized by the Chairman or by the Chief of Staff under the direction of the Chairman.

(c) Subject to clause 9 of Rule X of the House of Representatives, the staff of the Committee assigned to the minority shall be appointed, their remuneration determined, and may be removed, by the Ranking Minority Member with the approval of the majority of the minority party Members of the Committee. No minority staff person shall be compensated at a rate which exceeds that paid his or her majority staff counterpart. Such staff shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member with the approval or consultation of the minority Members of the committee.

(d) The Chairman shall ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee. The Chairman shall ensure that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff.

RULE 14. NUMBER AND JURISDICTION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Full committee

The full Committee will be responsible for oversight and legislation relating to: foreign assistance (including development assistance, security assistance, and Public Law 480 programs abroad) or relating to the Peace Corps; national security developments affecting foreign policy; strategic planning and agreements; war powers, treaties, executive agreements, and the deployment and use of United States Armed Forces; peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and enforcement of United Nations or other international sanctions; arms control and disarmament issues; the Agency for International Development; activities and policies of the State, Commerce and Defense Departments and other agencies related to the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, and the Foreign Assistance Act including export and licensing policy for munitions items and technology and dual-use equipment and technology, and other matters related to international economic policy and trade; international law; promotion of democracy; international law enforcement issues, including terrorism and narcotics control programs and activities; Department of State, Broadcasting Board of Governors, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, Trade and Development Agency, and related agency operations; the diplomatic service; international education and cultural affairs; embassy security and foreign buildings; the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and other international organizations; parliamentary conferences and exchanges; protection of American citizens abroad; international broadcasting; international communication and information policy; the American Red Cross; international population planning and child survival activities; and all other matters not specifically assigned to a subcommittee. The full Committee may conduct oversight with respect to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee as defined in the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) Subcommittees

There shall be six (6) standing subcommittees. The names and jurisdiction of those subcommittees shall be as follows:

1. Functional Subcommittee

There shall be one subcommittee with functional jurisdiction:

Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights.—Over-

sight and legislative responsibilities over the United States' efforts to manage and coordinate international programs to combat terrorism as coordinated by the Department of State and other agencies, including diplomatic, economic, and military assistance programs in areas designed to prevent terrorism, and efforts intended to identify, arrest, and bring international terrorists to justice. Oversight of, and (to the degree applicable to matters outside the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, sanctions laws pertaining to individual countries and the provision of foreign assistance) legislation pertaining to: nonproliferation including matters relating to arms transfer policy; export control policy including the transfer of dual use equipment and technology; matters involving nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction; legislation aimed at the promotion of sanctions and other nonproliferation matters generally. Oversight of, and (to the degree applicable to matters outside the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the Export Administration Act, and the provision of foreign assistance) legislation pertaining to, implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other matters relating to internationally-recognized human rights, including sanctions legislation aimed at the promotion of human rights and democracy generally.

2. Regional Subcommittees

There shall be five subcommittees with regional jurisdiction: the Subcommittee on Europe; the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia; the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere; the Subcommittee on Africa; and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

The regional subcommittees shall have jurisdiction over the following within their respective regions:

(1) Matters affecting the political relations between the United States and other countries and regions, including resolutions or other legislative measures directed to such relations.

(2) Legislation with respect to disaster assistance outside the Foreign Assistance Act, boundary issues, and international claims.

(3) Legislation with respect to region- or country-specific loans or other financial relations outside the Foreign Assistance Act.

(4) Resolutions of disapproval under section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, with respect to foreign military sales.

(5) Legislation and oversight regarding human rights practices in particular countries.

(6) Oversight of regional lending institutions.

(7) Oversight of matters related to the regional activities of the United Nations, of its affiliated agencies, and of other multilateral institutions.

(8) Identification and development of options for meeting future problems and issues relating to U.S. interests in the region.

(9) Base rights and other facilities access agreements and regional security pacts.

(10) Oversight of matters relating to parliamentary conferences and exchanges involving the region.

(11) Concurrent oversight jurisdiction with respect to matters assigned to the functional subcommittees insofar as they may affect the region.

(12) Oversight of all foreign assistance activities affecting the region.

(13) Such other matters as the Chairman of the full Committee may determine.

RULE 15. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report

to the full Committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee chairmen, and other appropriate Members, with a view towards minimizing scheduling conflicts. It shall be the practice of the Committee that meetings of subcommittees not be scheduled to occur simultaneously with meetings of the full Committee.

In order to ensure orderly administration and fair assignment of hearing and meeting rooms, the subject, time, and location of hearings and meetings shall be arranged in advance with the Chairman through the Chief of Staff of the Committee.

The Chairman of the full Committee shall designate a Member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may attend the meetings and participate in the activities of all subcommittees of which they are not members, except that they may not vote or be counted for a quorum in such subcommittees.

RULE 16. REFERRAL OF BILLS BY CHAIRMAN

In accordance with Rule 14 of the Committee and to the extent practicable, all legislation and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred by the Chairman to a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks. In accordance with Rule 14 of the Committee, legislation may also be concurrently referred to additional subcommittees for consideration. Unless otherwise directed by the Chairman, such subcommittees shall act on or be discharged from consideration of legislation that has been approved by the subcommittee of primary jurisdiction within two (2) weeks of such action. In referring any legislation to a subcommittee, the Chairman may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the full Committee.

Subcommittees with regional jurisdiction shall have primary jurisdiction over legislation regarding human rights practices in particular countries within the region. The Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights shall have additional jurisdiction over such legislation.

The Chairman may designate a subcommittee chairman or other Member to take responsibility as manager of a bill or resolution during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

RULE 17. PARTY RATIOS ON SUBCOMMITTEES AND CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

The majority party caucus of the Committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority party Members for each subcommittee. Party representation on each subcommittee or conference committee shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the full Committee. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member are authorized to negotiate matters affecting such ratios including the size of subcommittees and conference committees.

RULE 18. SUBCOMMITTEE FUNDING AND RECORDS

(a) Each subcommittee shall have adequate funds to discharge its responsibility for legislation and oversight.

(b) In order to facilitate Committee compliance with clause 2(e)(1) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall keep a complete record of all subcommittee actions which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded. The result of each record vote shall be promptly made available to the full Committee for inspection by the public in accordance with Rule 9 of the Committee.

(c) All subcommittee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept distinct

from the congressional office records of the Member serving as chairman of the subcommittee. Subcommittee records shall be coordinated with the records of the full Committee, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto.

RULE 19. MEETINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

The Chairman shall call a meeting of the subcommittee chairmen on a regular basis not less frequently than once a month. Such a meeting need not be held if there is no business to conduct. It shall be the practice at such meetings to review the current agenda and activities of each of the subcommittees.

RULE 20. ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Authorized persons.—In accordance with the stipulations of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all Members of the House who have executed the oath required by clause 13 of Rule XXIII of the House of Representatives shall be authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee.

Members of the Committee staff shall be considered authorized to have access to classified information within the possession of the Committee when they have the proper security clearances, when they have executed the oath required by clause 13 of Rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and when they have a demonstrable need to know. The decision on whether a given staff member has a need to know will be made on the following basis:

(a) In the case of the full Committee majority staff, by the Chairman, acting through the Chief of Staff;

(b) In the case of the full Committee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the committee, acting through the Minority Chief of Staff;

(c) In the case of subcommittee majority staff, by the Chairman of the subcommittee;

(d) In the case of the subcommittee minority staff, by the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee.

No other individuals shall be considered authorized persons, unless so designated by the Chairman.

Designated persons.—Each Committee Member is permitted to designate one member of his or her staff as having the right of access to information classified confidential. Such designated persons must have the proper security clearance, have executed the oath required by clause 13 of Rule XXIII of the House of Representatives, and have a need to know as determined by his or her principal. Upon request of a Committee Member in specific instances, a designated person also shall be permitted access to information classified secret which has been furnished to the Committee pursuant to section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended. Upon the written request of a Committee Member and with the approval of the Chairman in specific instances, a designated person may be permitted access to other classified materials. Designation of a staff person shall be by letter from the Committee Member to the Chairman.

Location.—Classified information will be stored in secure safes in the Committee rooms. All materials classified top secret must be stored in a Secure Compartmentalized Information Facility (SCIF).

Handling.—Materials classified confidential or secret may be taken from Committee offices to other Committee offices and hearing rooms by Members of the Committee and authorized Committee staff in connection with hearings and briefings of the Committee or its Subcommittees for which such information is deemed to be essential. Re-

moval of such information from the Committee offices shall be only with the permission of the Chairman under procedures designed to ensure the safe handling and storage of such information at all times. Except as provided in this paragraph, top secret materials may not be taken from the SCIF for any purpose, except that such materials may be taken to hearings and other meetings that are being conducted at the top secret level when necessary. Top secret materials may otherwise be used under conditions approved by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

Notice.—Appropriate notice of the receipt of classified documents received by the Committee from the executive branch will be sent promptly to Committee Members through the Survey of Activities or by other means.

Access.—Except as provided for above, access to materials classified top secret or otherwise restricted held by the Committee will be in the SCIF. The following procedures will be observed:

(a) Authorized or designated persons will be admitted to the SCIF after inquiring of the Chief of Staff or an assigned staff member. Access to the SCIF will be afforded during regular Committee hours.

(b) Authorized or designated persons will be required to identify themselves, to identify the documents or information they wish to view, and to sign the Classified Materials Log, which is kept with the classified information.

(c) The assigned staff member will be responsible for maintaining a log which identifies (1) authorized and designated persons seeking access, (2) the classified information requested, and (3) the time of arrival and departure of such persons. The assigned staff member will also assure that the classified materials are returned to the proper location.

(d) The Classified Materials log will contain a statement acknowledged by the signature of the authorized or designated person that he or she has read the Committee rules and will abide by them.

Divulgence.—Classified information provided to the Committee by the executive branch shall be handled in accordance with the procedures that apply within the executive branch for the protection of such information. Any classified information to which access has been gained through the Committee may not be divulged to any unauthorized person. Classified material shall not be photocopied or otherwise reproduced without the authorization of the Chief of Staff. In no event shall classified information be discussed over a non-secure telephone. Apparent violations of this rule should be reported as promptly as possible to the Chairman for appropriate action.

Other regulations.—The Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such additional regulations and procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the Committee. Members of the Committee will be given notice of any such regulations and procedures promptly. They may be modified or waived in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

RULE 21. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

All Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings which are open to the public may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any such methods of coverage in accordance with the provisions of clause 3 of House rule XI.

The Chairman or subcommittee chairman shall determine, in his or her discretion, the

number of television and still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room, but shall not limit the number of television or still cameras to fewer than two (2) representatives from each medium.

Such coverage shall be in accordance with the following requirements contained in Section 116(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, and clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives:

(a) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(b) No witness served with a subpoena by the Committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to clause 2(k)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

(c) The allocation among cameras permitted by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(d) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and Member of the Committee or its subcommittees or the visibility of that witness and that Member to each other.

(e) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(f) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the Committee or subcommittee is in session.

(g) Floodlights, spotlights, strobe lights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing or meeting at the current state-of-the-art level of television coverage.

(h) In the allocation of the number of still photographers permitted by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman in a hearing or meeting room, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos, United Press International News pictures, and Reuters. If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman for coverage of the hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(i) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing or meeting, between the witness table and the Members of the Committee or its subcommittees.

(j) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(k) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(l) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery Committee of Press Photographers.

(m) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

RULE 22. SUBPOENA POWERS

A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Chairman, in accordance with clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities within the jurisdiction of the Committee, following consultation with the Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or its subcommittees in accordance with clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the House of Representatives, in the conduct of any investigation or activity or series of investigations or activities, when authorized by a majority of the Members voting, a majority of the committee or subcommittee being present.

Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman or by any Member designated by the Committee.

RULE 23. RECOMMENDATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Whenever the Speaker is to appoint a conference committee, the Chairman shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees those Members of the Committee who are primarily responsible for the legislation (including to the full extent practicable the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House), who have actively participated in the Committee or subcommittee consideration of the legislation, and who agree to attend the meetings of the conference. With regard to the appointment of minority Members, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE 24. GENERAL OVERSIGHT

Not later than February 15th of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the House of Representatives.

RULE 25. OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Any additional procedures or regulations may be modified or rescinded in any or all particulars by a majority vote of the full Committee.

HONORING SUSAN B. ANTHONY

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the debt that all of us owe to the pioneering work of Susan B. Anthony. Susan B. Anthony is celebrated for her indispensable role in securing for women the right to vote and setting our Nation on the course towards recognizing the full equality and the dignity of women.

For Susan B. Anthony and her colleagues in the 19th century, promoting women's rights and promoting the dignity of women also meant opposing the evil of abortion. Out of respect for women recovering from abortion, I will refrain from using the term that Susan B. Anthony used to describe this procedure.

Susan B. Anthony was very insightful. She was one of our pioneering feminists, and she was also a strong pro-life advocate. It is instructive, Mr. Speaker, that Susan B. Anthony's opposition to abortion arose from her fight for equal rights for women, and that she saw no reason to separate the two.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 183rd anniversary of Susan B. Anthony's birthday and her human rights legacy, let us not separate the fight for equal rights for women from the fight for rights for all women, born and unborn.

Mr. Speaker, abortion is one of the greatest human rights issues that face us in our time. In honoring Susan B. Anthony, let us agree that being pro-life is inseparable from being pro-woman.

IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT BUSH AND WORLD LEADERS IN CONFRONTING SADDAM HUSSEIN

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, we will confront many issues in the 108th Congress. They will have to do with the economy; our own budget; a debate over cloning, which will come to the House floor this week and to this very Chamber moments from now; reforming Medicare; but nothing can be compared to the issues of war and peace.

In the midst of an incessant barrage of media alerts, Mr. Speaker, and new resolutions being debated before the United Nations, as a member of the Committee on International Relations I rise tonight to stand with the President of the United States and the strong and unwavering leadership in confronting tyranny which he and the Prime Minister of England and the leaders of some 43 other nations have consistently and courageously provided to the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a combat veteran; it was not part of my generation. But my father was, having seen conflict and bloodshed in the Korean War. I do not welcome war. I do not hope for it. As near as I can tell, from my late father and veterans with whom I have close enough relationships to hear the truth, war is a wicked and a violent enterprise that can consume our children in a conflagration, unthinkable in ordinary life.

But nevertheless it has come from time to time upon the free nations of the world, and it seems most especially on the United States of America, to be willing to employ the arsenal of de-

mocracy to confront force with force as a last resort. We may well be come upon such a time again, Mr. Speaker.

We are hearing a great deal in the national media about what the facts are or are not, what has been proven and what has not been proven. Mr. Speaker, I felt compelled tonight simply to rise and talk about the facts for what they are, for what we as policymakers in the 107th Congress knew them to be, and for what every member of the Security Council of the United Nations knows them to be today.

Mr. Speaker, it is said that facts are stubborn things. I offer tonight a few stubborn things.

For instance, this Congress on this floor and our colleagues in the Senate overwhelmingly gave this President the authority to use America's military power to disarm Iraq. The national legislature of the United States spoke in overwhelming fashion that the need was real and urgent and the President should be empowered under our constitutional authority.

The United States Security Council adopted Resolution 1441. We hear a great deal about new resolutions. I applaud the President's effort to try and exhaust all diplomatic means this week.

But let us be clear what 1441 said. Mr. Speaker, number one, it said that Iraq is guilty. No objective observer doubts that Iraq has violated 17 U.N. resolutions.

Number two, it said that Iraq could remedy its guilt through disarmament and disclosure.

Number 3, if it refused to remedy, it would be a material breach, and serious consequences should flow.

Mr. Speaker, Baghdad is guilty. Baghdad refuses to remedy. Serious consequences are in order. I stand with the President of the United States. I pray with millions of Americans as we will ask, perhaps within the week, our finest to go forward on behalf of liberty again.

Let us focus on the facts and on the true challenges before us.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN ARTS EDUCATION AWARDS BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 815(a)(1) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 815) and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Awards Board:

Mr. MCKEON of California.
Mrs. BIGGERT of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 United States Code 4303, and

the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of Gallaudet University:

Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 20 United States Code 4412, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. KOLBE of Arizona.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES PAGE BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 2 United States Code 88(b)(3), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the House of Representatives Page Board:

Mr. SHIMKUS of Illinois.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

□ 1945

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution:

Mr. REGULA of Ohio.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mr. SIMMONS of Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 1295b(h), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. KING of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mrs. KELLY of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of California.

Mr. GILCREST of Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of

the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mr. LEACH of Iowa, chairman.

Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska.

Mr. DREIER of California.

Mr. WOLF of Virginia.

Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BENJAMIN FRANKLIN TERCENTENARY COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of the Benjamin Franklin Tercentenary Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 Note), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Benjamin Franklin Tercentenary Commission:

Mr. CASTLE of Delaware.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the National Historical Publications and Record Commission:

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 Note), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission:

Mr. LAHOOD of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

Ms. DUNN of Washington.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PUTNAM of Florida.

Mr. PAUL of Texas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20

U.S.C. 955(b) Note), and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the National Council on the Arts:

Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina.
Mr. MCKEON of California.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 2301, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. LATOURETTE of Ohio.
Mr. CANNON of Utah.
Mr. CANTOR of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Executive Order 12131, and the order of the House of January 8, 2003, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
Mr. PICKERING of Mississippi.
Mr. HAYES of North Carolina.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY 108TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I hereby submit the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary for the 108th Congress for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These rules were adopted by the Committee on February 12, 2003, in a meeting that was open to the public.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY RULES OF PROCEDURE, ADOPTED FEBRUARY 12, 2003

RULE I.

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on the Judiciary and its Subcommittees with the following specific additions thereto.

RULE H. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting day of the Committee on the Judiciary for the conduct of its business shall be on Tuesday of each week while the House is in session.

(b) Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman and a regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with when, in the judgment of the Chairman, there is no need therefor.

(c) At least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session) before each scheduled Committee or Subcommittee meeting, each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee shall be furnished a list of the bill(s) and subject(s) to be considered and/or acted upon at the meeting. Bills or subjects not listed shall

be subject to a point of order unless their consideration is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(d) The Chairman, with such notice to the ranking Minority Member as is practicable, may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to that call of the Chairman.

(e) Committee and Subcommittee meetings for the transaction of business, i.e. meetings other than those held for the purpose of taking testimony, shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(f) Every motion made to the Committee and entertained by the Chairman shall be reduced to writing upon demand of any Member, and a copy made available to each Member present.

(g) For purposes of taking any action at a meeting of the full Committee or any Subcommittee thereof, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of not less than one-third of the Members of the Committee or subcommittee, except that a full majority of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of reporting a measure or recommendation from the Committee or Subcommittee, closing a meeting to the public, or authorizing the issuance of a subpoena.

(h)(1) Subject to subparagraph (2), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time.

(2) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (1), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify Members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(3) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(i) Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and may be published in the same manner as hearings before the Committee and shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chairman.

RULE III. HEARINGS

(a) The Committee Chairman or any Subcommittee chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by it on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee, or Subcommittee, with the concurrence of the ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or Subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman or Subcommittee chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee hearings shall be open to the public except when the Committee or Subcommittee determines by majority vote to close the meeting because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would com-

promise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House.

(c) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence before the Committee or any Subcommittee, a quorum shall be constituted by the presence of two Members.

(d) In the course of any hearing each Member shall be allowed five minutes for the interrogation of a witness until such time as each Member who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(e) The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at the place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Individuals, including Members of Congress, whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication. Any requests by those Members, staff or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors in the transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional Committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript.

RULE IV. BROADCASTING

Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee is open to the public, these proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio and still photography except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Committee Rules of Procedure.

RULE V. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) The full Committee shall have jurisdiction over the following subject matters: anti-trust law, tort liability, including medical malpractice and product liability, legal reform generally, and such other matters as determined by the Chairman.

(b) There shall be five standing Subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary, with jurisdictions as follows:

(1) Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property: copyright, patent and trademark law, information technology, administration of U.S. courts, Federal Rules of Evidence, Civil and Appellate Procedure, judicial ethics, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(2) Subcommittee on the Constitution: constitutional amendments, constitutional rights, federal civil rights laws, ethics in government, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(3) Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law: bankruptcy and commercial law, bankruptcy judgeships, administrative law, independent counsel, state taxation affecting interstate commerce, interstate compacts, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(4) Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security: Federal Criminal Code, drug enforcement, sentencing, parole and pardons, terrorism, internal and homeland security, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, prisons, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(5) Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security, and Claims: immigration and naturalization, border security, admission of refugees, treaties, conventions and international agreements, claims against the

United States, federal charters of incorporation, private immigration and claims bills, other appropriate matters as referred by the Chairman, and relevant oversight.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee and ranking Minority Member thereof shall be ex officio Members, but not voting Members, of each Subcommittee to which such Chairman or ranking Minority Member has not been assigned by resolution of the Committee. Ex officio Members shall not be counted as present for purposes of constituting a quorum at any hearing or meeting of such Subcommittee.

RULE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective Subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman and other Subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

RULE VII. NON-LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

No report of the Committee or Subcommittee which does not accompany a measure or matter for consideration by the House shall be published unless all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee issuing the report shall have been apprised of such report and given the opportunity to give notice of intention to file supplemental, additional, or dissenting views as part of the report. In no case shall the time in which to file such views be less than three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays when the House is not in session).

RULE VIII. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use according to the rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking Minority Member of any decision to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the Committee.

HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to address the House regarding the very important issue of human cloning.

The question before our Nation is are we going to allow human cloning in the United States of America or are we going to ban human cloning?

In the 107th Congress, I introduced legislation, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2001. This legislation ultimately was reviewed and passed approvingly after hearings by the Committee on the Judiciary and was brought to the floor of the House and received a favorable vote in the House of Representatives passing by a margin of 265 for, 162 against.

Of note in that vote there were some 63 Democrats who voted in support of

this legislation to ban all forms of human cloning. And I would point out that many of the Democrats who voted in support of banning human cloning were pro-choice.

There are many people who have tried to define this debate about human cloning as liberal/conservative. They have tried to define it as a pro-life/pro-abortion rights kind of debate; but in reality the debate on human cloning transcends some of those traditional divisions that separate the political parties and factions within the House of Representatives and within our Nation.

Unfortunately, the legislation to ban all forms of human cloning that passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives 2 years ago, almost 2 years ago now, it was never taken up by the Senate. The Senate never held a vote on the issue. Therefore, the issue was essentially left open; and, indeed, many Americans are shocked and surprised to learn today that there is no law on the books in the United States of America to ban human cloning. Indeed, many foreign countries have already moved, they have already acted to ban human cloning. Several European countries have banned it outright, like Germany, for example. Norway has banned it completely. The European Parliament has called for a complete ban on human cloning. The French Senate very recently voted to ban all forms of human cloning. So clearly there is a tide sweeping the globe that says, no, we are not going to move away from human pro-creation to baby manufacturing, which is really what this debate is all about in its essence.

Due to the failure of the Senate, or the other body, to act on this issue, I reintroduced my legislation along with my colleague from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK). Our bill is H.R. 534, the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2003. And I would like to talk a little bit about what the legislation is and what it does, and I have a few visuals to help with this debate.

First of all, I would like to start out with what is human cloning. In normal sexual reproduction, the sperm and the egg unite to form a single-cell embryo, and that single-cell embryo rapidly begins a process of dividing to form this multicell embryo. And, of course, from there it develops further into the fetal stage of development forming a baby and ultimately a human being like you and I.

In human cloning we have a procedure called somatic cell nuclear transfer, and what happens here is you take a human egg and you either deactivate the nucleus in the egg or you remove it, and there are two different approaches to that. And you essentially end up with an egg that has no nuclear material in it. In a normal human egg, the normal cells in our bodies have 46 chromosomes; but in the egg there are 23 chromosomes and in the sperm there are 23, and they come together to form a new unique human being with 46 chromosomes.

So in the process of cloning, you either deactivate this nucleus or you eject it out. So you end up with an enucleated egg. And then you take a cell from somebody's body, and in this depiction this has the appearance of a skin cell and you extract the nucleus out of that cell, and you place it inside the egg. And this is why it is called nuclear transfer. It is called somatic cell nuclear transfer because the cells in our bodies are called somatic cells or body cells. Somatic means body. And then what happens next is typically they zap this egg with a little bit of electricity, and lo and behold it begins to divide and form an embryo.

This, of course, is the first mammal that was ever cloned. The first species that was cloned, I believe, it occurred in the 1950s. It was a carrot. But this creation of Dolly the sheep was the first example of a mammal being cloned. Prior to cloning Dolly, there had been some other vertebrates that were cloned, but Dolly was the first mammal. And, of course, we as humans are mammals. And the reason this created so much news is because Dolly a sheep, a mammal very similar to us, and what they did there was they took an udder, cell which is essentially a mammary duct cell, and they took the nucleus out of it from the donor sheep, and then they took another sheep and they took an egg from that sheep and removed the nucleus. And so they did the nuclear transfer technology, and so they had the DNA of this sheep in the egg from this sheep. They zapped it with electricity. They got it to grow in culture, and then they transplanted it into another female sheep. And this is, of course, the surrogate mother and Dolly was created.

And here is Dolly depicted here. This sheep is a genetic duplicate of this sheep, the one that you took the nucleus out of. This sheep can be construed as the twin or this one can be construed as the twin of this sheep.

Now, it is worth noting that Dolly was born on July 5, 1996. Almost immediately Dolly began to show signs of premature aging. Indeed, the researchers who have studied all the cloned mammals that have been cloned so far, pigs, goats, mice, they all show genetic defects in all of them.

Dolly manifested early arthritis; and, of course, she had to be euthanized, or put to sleep, recently because of the development of further medical conditions. She essentially experienced half the normal life expectancy of a normal sheep. And this is one of the principle issues why many people feel that to do cloning in humans, as some people are proposing, is morally and ethically reprehensible.

It took 237 attempts to create Dolly with many miscarriages, many sheep being born with very, very severe birth defects. So if we try to do this with humans, the question, of course, becomes how many humans will be born, how many babies will be born with birth defects? How will we take care of them? Who will be responsible for them?

□ 2000

One of the most disturbing things about all this is if we were able to overcome those immediate birth-related problems, what would the life of a person who was cloned be like? Would they manifest premature aging? Would they ultimately succumb to diseases at an early age? This is clearly experimentation of the absolute worst and most reprehensible kind, and there is general agreement that we should outlaw cloning specifically of this type, referred to as reproductive cloning.

What this House will engage in a tremendous amount of debate on over the next few days is the issue of whether or not we should allow something called therapeutic cloning or the creation of cloned embryos in the lab. I anticipate that there will be a substitute for my legislation being offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD). His legislation contends that it is best to simply outlaw the creation of a human being but to allow the unfettered creation of human embryos in the lab to be exploited for research purposes because of the supposed great potential of these to lead to cures to many diseases.

I know there are a lot of people who have some questions about this issue, and I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), a distinguished freshman from the Flagstaff area. I understand he had some questions for me about this issue.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman from Florida in a colloquy if he would not mind, please.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I would be happy to do that.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I have seen and heard a lot of rhetoric, and recently we had a letter that was sent around by one of our colleagues that favors the research, if we can call it that, on behalf of the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research. And I have got some serious questions and doubts as to the truth.

One of our colleagues says that their position is reasonable, and his letter goes on to state that somatic cell nuclear transfer is not the science fiction you see in movies but, rather, a reasonable and appropriate way to alleviate the horror faced by patients suffering from deadly and painful disease. Pain and disease is something that all Americans are passionate about, and I would ask my colleague, then, what cures, in light of this great new technology, have occurred using somatic cell nuclear transfer, if he does not mind.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to respond to his question. This is a very, very important issue, and it gets essentially to the crux of the debate we are going to have here on the floor of this body on Thursday when H.R. 534 comes up for discussion, debate, and consideration and vote, and I want to just point out one very very important thing about this.

They are trying to call embryo cloning somatic cell nuclear transfer, and the reason they are trying to do that, scientifically that is what it is, but the overwhelming majority of Americans are opposed to all forms of human cloning. It is something like 65, 70, 80 percent of the American people are against all forms of human cloning, and so they are trying to put a pretty face on it so they are calling it somatic cell nuclear transfer.

The important point I want to raise I think was stated very nicely by the President's National Bioethics Advisory Commission back in 1997, and they said the commission began its discussion fully recognizing that any efforts in humans to transfer a somatic cell nucleus into an enucleated egg involves the creation of an embryo with the apparent potential to be planted in utero and developed to term.

So what they are saying here is this is cloning. So they may want to call it somatic cell nuclear transfer but it is definitely cloning.

They go on to say this is not science fiction you see in movies, but rather a reasonable and appropriate way to alleviate the horrors faced by patients suffering from deadly painful diseases. This kind of language in my opinion is reprehensible. There is no basis in science to make a claim like this, and I have been saying this over and over again. I would be very, very happy to debate these people who go around making these claims.

Therapeutic cloning has never been done. It is going to be debated here as though it is a scientific fact. It is a scientific fiction. It has never been demonstrated in humans. What is more, it has never even been demonstrated in an animal model. We purchase from research labs these animals that are genetically programmed to develop diabetes. We cannot take this technology and use it to even cure an animal. The advocates for embryo cloning do not have even one, one, example of where in an animal model they can cure disease; and for them to go so far as to say this has the potential to alleviate the horrors faced by patients suffering from deadly diseases, I think it is a horror that they would make such a grossly exaggerated and false statement, because it raises the false hopes of millions of Americans who suffer from these diseases. There is no scientific evidence that this has the potential to be effective at this time.

I apologize, this is a very, very long answer to the gentleman's question. But my legislation to ban cloning does not prohibit animal cloning, and it does not prohibit animal embryo cloning, and so the advocates for this will have unfettered ability to demonstrate that this works in animal models, and if they can demonstrate that it works in animal models, they can come back to the Congress and say we really feel very strongly that you need to allow this to move forward in human models, the Congress has the

ability to reverse the law. But that is a grossly exaggerated claim.

I understand the gentleman wanted to ask me some more questions in a colloquy.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I take it then from the gentleman's answer that we have no proof that any cures to human beings, never mind even animals, exist; and by the chart the gentleman showed, it actually accelerates the aging of an animal and actually leads to faster death, then. So rather than cure life, it leads to a faster death.

Could I respond also to a portion of the gentleman's statement as it relates to some of the break-throughs that have been claimed, and could I ask that the gentleman look at a piece from a letter that was also recently sent around, and I quote: Cloning is widely used. It is widely used. It is a vital medical tool that has allowed scientists and researchers to develop powerful new drugs, produce insulin, useful bacteria in the lab, track the origins of biological weapons, catch criminals, and free innocent people. It even produces new plants and livestock to help feed and nourish the poor of our world.

In addition to wanting to alleviate pain and suffering, I consider myself a compassionate American who wants to help save our world, and it sounds like cloning is going to do just that. The gentleman's bill, of course, would not ban this type of cloning that was going to save our world, would it?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. This is a very confusing quote because it really mixes two issues. It starts out saying cloning is a widely used, vital medical tool that has allowed scientists and researchers to develop powerful new drugs. What they are talking about is we have been cloning tissues in the labs for years, we have been cloning animals in the labs for years, we have been cloning DNA in the lab, and some of these cloning technologies are finding their way into the research and development arenas that are used for development of new drugs, produce insulin, useful bacteria in the lab. And so those statements are true.

But my bill does not ban those things. This group, CAMR, or the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research, they are against my bill; but in that response they fail to point out that my bill does not ban all of that animal cloning and all of that DNA cloning, all that stuff that is going on.

What it specifically only bans is human cloning, an attempt to create a human embryo in the lab, and they seem to imply in the first sentence of that quote the gentleman just read that it is a vital medical tool. Those applications that would be permissible under my legislation are certainly vital, and they will proceed unfettered,

but human cloning is not a vital medical tool. There is not one research article where human cloning has been used to treat anybody of anything.

Might I also add, the crux of this debate is the whole issue of regenerative medicine and if a person gets sick, the traditional tools used by physicians are surgery and medications to make a person well; and of course there is therapy and there are lots of other modalities to make people well. But an additional tool is this concept of regenerative medicine where we take cells and put cells in a person's body and those cells make a person better, and adults themselves have actually been used in 45 human clinical trials to make people well.

Embryonic stem cells have never been used in a single clinical trial to ever make anybody well. Embryo stem cells have never been used in an animal model to heal an animal. There have been a couple of studies that seem to suggest that embryo stem cells might have some potential at some point in the future, but they do not have a model where we can take an animal with disease and make it well, and that is what they are trying to imply by this response.

Again, it is a very deceptive response, and I apologize for these lengthy responses to the gentleman's inquiries. These issues are just very, very complicated science, and it is very hard to do them justice by just giving 8-second sound-bite responses to the questions.

Mr. RENZI. The letter that the gentleman and I are discussing and the portions of the letter and the quotes that we have gone over together, this letter from the Coalition for the Advancement of Medical Research; has the gentleman seen the quote which addresses the leading scientists and even two prestigious committees on the National Academy of Sciences that have agreed that cloning to reproduce humans should be illegal but that somatic cell nuclear transfer or therapeutic cloning should be permitted?

My question is that it is my understanding that these panels included no bioethics experts and even that they considered the ethical debate, the morality in question, to be something that should be left up for others to debate.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. That is absolutely correct. The National Academy of Sciences panel made that recommendation, but then they acknowledged there were no bioethicists on the panel, and then they went on further to state that others should debate the ethics of this. There were no bioethicists. There were no theologians. There were no elected representatives from the people, no representatives from the community. And they wisely said that others should debate the morality and the ethics of this issue; and frankly, they wisely said that because the path that they are recommending that we allow the cre-

ation of human life in the lab for research purposes and then those human embryos are to be destroyed is an entirely new path for us to walk down.

□ 2015

Historically in our Nation we have always stood up for protecting life. The recent historical departure from that, *Roe v. Wade*, that decision was rendered in the context, at least my understanding of the interpretation of the decision of the court was not that the baby developing inside the woman is not alive and not that it is not human and not that it is a commodity that can just be manipulated and discarded, but that the right of reproductive freedom or privacy of the mother trumped the right to life of the baby, a decision I do not particularly agree with.

But now we are talking about going in a whole new direction. We are talking about creating life expressly for the purpose of exploiting it and destroying it. A parallel would be for a woman to deliberately try to get pregnant so she could have an abortion. Clearly this is a moral and ethical quagmire that I do not think we should walk down as a Nation.

I will just cite for you one example of where this would lead us if we allow therapeutic cloning or embryo cloning. The artificial womb is available to us today. You can take a mammalian embryo and drop it in the artificial womb, and it will pass from the embryonic stage into the fetal stage of development and can survive up to 30 days of development. That will be the next place these researchers will want to go to. Who on Earth would want to extract stem cells from an embryo and try to grow those embryo stem cells into, let us say you want heart tissue. Why would you want to go through the ordeal of in a petri dish trying to grow those cells into heart tissue when you could just much more cheaply and easily place that embryo into an artificial womb and then come back 2 weeks or 3 weeks later and get the tissue you want out of it? That is the slippery slope we are going down. So it is a moral and ethical minefield that I think we as a Nation should not enter into, and we should ban all forms of human cloning.

Mr. RENZI. I wanted to ask, we have got a good colleague within our own party who has addressed also this subject matter. Could I ask if you are aware or do you know if the Greenwood bill would ban human reproductive cloning?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Actually, I do not know if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) is going to change his language before it comes to the floor, but the language as I last saw it, it is not actually a ban. It is a moratorium. It is a 10-year moratorium on reproductive cloning, taking the cloned embryo and putting it in the uterus of a surrogate mother for the purpose of creating a child. It is a 10-year moratorium. It essentially is say-

ing we do not think this is something we want to allow for the next 10 years, but in 10 years we may want to allow reproductive cloning. So I do not think it is a true ban.

The other point I want to mention, and I have debated my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, on this issue many times in the past, a reproductive-only ban is very, very difficult to enforce. Indeed, I have a quote from the Justice Department I am going to put up on the easel here in a minute where they state categorically it is going to be very, very hard to enforce. If you allow research cloning to proliferate all over the country, you are going to have dozens of labs producing human embryos for experimental research purposes. It would be very, very easy for an unscrupulous, dishonest physician to do this. I am a physician and I know as a fact that not every physician is an honest person. The medical profession draws its ranks from the human race and there are people who do bad things even within the medical profession.

It will be very easy for an unscrupulous physician to implant one of those human embryos into a woman in the privacy of the doctor-patient relationship, and it would be impossible for our Justice Department to police such a thing and prevent it from happening. Indeed, if a physician did that and a baby were to develop, what could the government do at that point? They certainly would not mandate an abortion on a woman like that. And so I feel very, very strongly that the Feinstein-Hatch-type approach in the other body or the Greenwood approach would actually help usher in reproductive cloning, the very thing that they say they want to prohibit.

Mr. RENZI. I would like to go back to the letter that the Coalition for Medical Research has put out. There is an interesting quote also in the body of that letter that addresses somatic cell nuclear transfer as being, quote, "a research technique to develop cells that can be used to treat or cure chronic and degenerative diseases and disorders." They claim the process has nothing to do with sexual reproduction and that its sole purpose is research to meet unmet medical needs.

The way I read this, sir, it sounds to me like we are not creating human embryos. Where are we? Are we creating human embryos, or are we not creating human embryos?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Here again what they are trying to do is change the terminology. They have been losing the debate on this issue with the hearts and minds of the American people, so they are now trying to call it somatic cell nuclear transfer rather than embryo cloning or therapeutic cloning. When they called it those things, people understood exactly what it is. But when they say somatic cell nuclear transfer, suddenly people do not know what they are talking about and they may be able to get this thing through.

Clearly as a scientist, as a physician, I can tell you that you are talking about creating human embryos, there is no two ways around it, with the potential to develop into a human being. That is not only my opinion; it is the opinion of the Bioethics Advisory Commission. The same commission has a number of members who feel that therapeutic cloning or embryo cloning should be permissible, but they readily recognize that as soon as you take a somatic cell nucleus and put it in an enucleated egg, it involves the creation of an embryo with the apparent potential to be implanted in a uterus and developed to term. It is the procedure used to create Dolly. So to try to say it is not, I think, is misleading. The facts are the facts.

Mr. RENZI. The fact being, then, that they are creating human life, they are exploiting a human embryo, and that they are using this term "somatic cell nuclear transfer" as a new terminology to come back in and try and legalize or try and establish human cloning as being something that should be legal in America.

Could I ask, please, the Coalition for Medical Research that we are discussing talks about moving stem cell research forward and that somatic cell nuclear transfer could bring new hope to nearly 1 million Americans suffering from, and now we move to the type of diseases which really tug at the heart strings of America. They are citing cancer would be cured, Alzheimer's, diabetes, hepatitis, Parkinson's disease. The only thing left off here is AIDS. And so I would ask you, is this not similar to the type of promises that we saw 10 years ago when we were debating fetal tissue research, the idea that that would bring us all the type of breakthroughs that would cure what ails our human population? Are we not seeing the same sort of propaganda? Are we not seeing the same sort of promises where in over 10 years since fetal tissue research, we really have seen very little, if at all, any kind of great scientific breakthroughs?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. The gentleman raises an absolutely important point. That is, the debates that they are bringing up here were the same exact debates 10 years ago on fetal tissue research. One of the amazing aspects of all this is Senator HATCH was one of the people who led the charge against fetal tissue research in the other body 10 years ago, and now today he is leading the charge to allow embryo cloning, which is a great irony for me. As I mentioned to you before, there is no basis in science to make a claim like that. I find it very reprehensible for them to hold out hopes to millions and millions of Americans that this is going to be the cure for their condition. I will simply just point out, if that were the case, if this statement were true, you would go into the research labs at Harvard and Yale and UCLA and all the prestigious medical schools throughout the Nation and I

would expect all the research scientists to be working on cloning, but in point of fact they are not. The reason they are not is because this is a bogus, absurd statement. There is no evidence in science that substantiates a claim like this, that you are going to be able to cure all these millions of Americans of all of these diseases.

I will just simply point out a very important point that they fail to mention. If that were the case, where would you get all the eggs to do all this? It took dozens and dozens of eggs to create Dolly. If you come down with one of these diseases they describe here, we cannot necessarily cure you with one egg. We might need a dozen eggs to get one good clone of you that might develop into an embryo. By the way, this is all science fiction, this is not real; but this is what they are claiming. You would literally need billions of eggs. Who is going to donate all these eggs? To get the eggs, to get a woman's egg, you have to give a woman powerful drugs that cause a phenomenon called superovulation, so instead of one egg developing you get a dozen eggs developing. The drugs have side effects. Thirty percent of women who take those drugs develop depression. You have to give them these powerful drugs, and then you have to give them a general anesthetic and do a surgical procedure to harvest the eggs. This is not some simple, minor procedure that you can have done in a medical office in 30 seconds. You are talking about an ordeal for a woman to donate her eggs. And for them to make the absurd notion that you are going to cure 100 million Americans with this, you would literally need 1 billion eggs.

Mind you, they do not have one, one example where they can do one of these things in an animal model. Not one. I have challenged some of the most prestigious scientists in the world with this question. Show me one, one article where you can do this in a human. None. I say show me one article, one research article, a peer-reviewed journal article where you can do this in an animal model. None. They have absolutely none. But they make these bald-faced, absurd assertions that they are going to cure 100 million people with all these conditions. I think it is shameful that they would seriously consider this.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to engage in this colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. RENZI. I am grateful, sir. I want to congratulate and applaud the gentleman from Florida for his substantive argument tonight based on fact. There is not a lot of emotional rhetoric there. It is truly your research that contains the truth and not their research which contains false hopes and, I believe, propaganda.

I would like to mention that the lobbyists who cloak themselves in the guise of medical research do an injustice and mislead our American public. It is you who play upon our American

compassion to help those in pain and relieve those in suffering in order that you may promote an immoral agenda. The morality argument has been made much tonight, but it is you who want to create human life in a petri dish only to genetically engineer it to die 14 days later. This is not medical research. This is you scientists creating defective human American life and that is mutant life. I abhor your objectives in order that you might bring prestige to yourself. I urge my colleagues to reject those scientists who lack the wisdom to recognize human life in favor of garnering international acclaim among their peers for their morbid scientific breakthroughs.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman. It has certainly been a pleasure to engage in this colloquy. I would be very happy to recognize the gentlewoman from Colorado and yield to her if she would like to say a few words about this very important issue.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman. I certainly yield to the gentleman in regard to the clinical objections that you have raised and with all of your knowledge of medical issues raised in regard to human cloning. However, I would like to rise to speak to the profound moral issues raised when we consider permitting medical science to create human life for the exclusive purpose of experimentation and destruction. I think that we need to look to human history. It is a truth of history that governments and mankind, if given the opportunity under the law, will trample on human life.

□ 2030

History is strewn with such examples. By legalizing human cloning for any reason, and many of them can sound altruistic even if they are false, we open a Pandora's box which could set our civilization on a similar course. It is morally wrong to create human life, even nascent human life, for the purpose of experimentation and destruction.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, and those were very well taken points. This is clearly a line in the sand. It is a demarcation point; and if we go across that line, if we say we are going to start creating human lives for the purpose of exploiting them for scientific research and then discarding them, where does that take us next? What comes around the corner? I have been arguing for years that it will usher in reproductive cloning.

Indeed, in testimony that we received in my committee, we had a Dr. Cohen, Brian Cohen, who represented the American Society of Reproductive Medicine; and in his testimony he repeatedly said "We are opposed to reproductive cloning at this time," and he said it twice. Finally I asked him, "Why did you say 'We are opposed to reproductive cloning at this time'?" And this fellow represents the Association of Fertility Experts in the United

States, and essentially his response to me was that once all the science is worked out on this where it can be done safely, they want to be able to do it. They want to be able to clone human beings. And this is the brave new world, no longer confined to fiction literature, but it has essentially arrived because the follow-ons to this will be genetic manipulation, genetic enhancements. Eugenetics is what it is called, an attempt to try to eliminate undesirable traits in our culture and our society. So people will begin to not only select the gender of their desired offspring, but they may actually want to manipulate the genetic code of their offspring so they can get a specific height or size or physical appearance or IQ. I would imagine athletic performance will be one of the things that they will go after.

And this is the Pandora's box of issues that we are opening up if we allow human cloning to occur in the United States. Therapeutic cloning, embryo cloning or reproductive cloning, it is the path we are going down. And I just want to underscore the importance of us banning all forms of human cloning, which is what we are able to do in the Human Cloning Prohibition Act of 2003, and I just want to again underscore that there are people who are going to try to put lipstick on the pig. They are going to try to say that this is not cloning; and they are going to call it somatic cell nuclear transfer, or they are going to try to call it nuclear transfer technologies; and we are going to hear this kind of language being used both in this body and the other body. It is cloning. It is creating human embryos through the process of cloning. And people need to remember that no matter what they call it, that is what it is.

I just want to underscore additionally that this is not purely a pro-life issue. Cloning of all types, therapeutic, embryonic, and reproductive cloning, has been made illegal in Germany by the leadership of the Green Party, which is pro-choice. Indeed, in the vote that we had passing my bill in the 107th Congress, I had seven or eight people voting for the legislation who had a 100 percent voting record with the National Abortion Rights Action League.

And so clearly this is not an abortion debate. It is different from that. There are a lot of people who are pro-life like myself who have a very strong moral and ethical objection to cloning on the basis of simply creating human life in the lab to be exploited and destroyed, a so-called utilitarian approach. But there are many people on the left who are strongly opposed to cloning because of their concern about eugenics, because of their concern about the impact this could have on the disability community, and very importantly there are a lot of people who are very concerned about the exploitation of women. If we are going to have in this country dozens of labs creating hun-

dreds of human embryos every year for the purpose of doing research, where are we going to get those eggs from? Who is going to donate their eggs? Who will submit themselves to this kind of research? I will say who I think it will be. It will probably be poor women. It will probably be predominantly women of color.

Indeed, I want to read this quote from Judy Norsigian. She is the co-author of "Our Bodies, Ourselves for the New Century," the Boston Women's Health Collective book, hardly a right wing group. What does she say? "Because embryo cloning will compromise women's health, turn their eggs and wombs into commodities, compromise their reproductive autonomy, and with virtual certainty lead to the production of experimental human beings, we are convinced that the line must be drawn here." And I was very encouraged by this latter part of her quote. She is not only concerned about women being exploited, but she has a concern about the dignity, the human dignity, and the indignity of this to be creating human beings for experimental research purposes and then to be discarded.

If research cloning is allowed to proceed in this country, or therapeutic cloning unfettered, in my opinion what ultimately will happen, because it will be so expensive to get these eggs from women in the United States because they will have to pay women thousands of dollars to undergo the procedure, because of the fairly high incidence of depression in women who take these superovulatory drugs, we may have women requiring hospitalization following the egg donation procedure or maybe even going so far as attempting suicide, what I think they will end up doing is they will end up going to third world countries. They will end up going to Central America, South America, away from the trial attorneys in the United States that can lead to lawsuits, away from the prying eyes of the American press and where they can pay women peanuts in order to get their eggs; and that I think is one of the concerns of people like Judy Norsigian. She knows that ultimately the potential exists for women to be exploited, and that is just shameful that it would happen when there is no evidence that this could even work in animals. Indeed, the evidence, there was just recently an article in the mouse model where they tried to do therapeutic cloning and it did not work.

The other thing I want to just share is this quote from Daniel Bryant, who is the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs. He says "enforcing a modified cloning ban would be problematic and pose certain law enforcement challenges that would be lessened with an outright ban on human cloning. Anything short of an outright ban would present other difficulties to law enforcement. And what he is talking about here is if we take the approach advocated by the form of

the legislation being promoted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) in the House and Senators HATCH and FEINSTEIN in the other body, just a reproductive ban, how will we enforce that? It will be impossible to enforce that. We will have all of these embryos in all of these labs. The Justice Department, police officers cannot monitor these labs regularly to make sure the embryos have been discarded rather than implanted in women. There will be no way to know whether or not reproductive cloning has occurred. So I feel very, very strongly that this is the best way for us to go.

I will also point out that the President has indicated that he wants a complete ban on all forms of human cloning, reproductive and so-called therapeutic cloning. So clearly, the time has arrived. It is critical that we as a Nation do the right thing. I believe the House of Representatives will do the right thing and ban human cloning in all of its forms, both embryonic cloning and so-called reproductive cloning, that all attempts at creating human embryos in the lab will be prohibited. This is an enforceable ban and a lasting ban. The advocates who say that we must allow embryo cloning in the lab because of its great potential to lead to cures of all these diseases, I again issue my challenge, show me the evidence.

Traditionally in this country we always have demonstrated that it works in animals before we attempt it in humans. Show us the evidence in the scientific literature that this works in animals. They cannot. They will not be able to. The reason they cannot is because it cannot be done. It has not been done in human models. Clearly this takes us down a very dangerous and precarious path, creating human life for the purpose of exploiting it and then destroying it. A very dangerous road for us to walk as a Nation. So I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote in support of the ban on human cloning that we will be debating in the House of Representatives.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I wanted to talk about the President's budget, but I also want to point out, using something very specific examples of how the President's rhetoric, if you will, with regard to what he wants to accomplish in this session of Congress, whether it be turn the economy around, create more jobs, reform Medicare, create a prescription drug benefit, the various things that he talked about in his State of the Union Address are not essentially backed up with the budget that he has presented

to Congress and that we first had unveiled here a few weeks ago.

And it is disturbing to me because I think it creates what many have called a credibility gap between what the President promises versus what he delivers. He creates the illusion that he will create new jobs, reverse our Nation's current economic woes, ensure all Americans have access to healthcare, and provide seniors a prescription drug benefit; but then when we look at his budget for the year 2004, for the next fiscal year, we see that essentially what it does is mire the Nation's future in record deficits, undermine the future of the social security and the Medicare system at the time that they should be strengthened in anticipation of the baby boom generation which will at some point in the near future become 65 years of age, and we only have to look at the promises the President made in the State of the Union Address that he gave a year ago to see how ineffective he is at following up on his rhetoric once he leaves the Capitol.

Last year, the President assured the Nation that "our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short lived." But 1 year later, according to President's budget message, annual deficits will run close to \$300 billion a year for the next 2 years. Even more troubling under the President's watch, the red ink does not appear to go dry any time in the near future, with deficits reaching over a trillion dollars by 2007.

Just last week during the President's Week recess, there was an article in the New York Times that said that the Federal debt was near a ceiling for a second time in 9 months, and I would just read the first couple paragraphs of that article, which was dated February 20, last Thursday, Mr. Speaker. It says "With budget deficits climbing rapidly, the Bush administration acknowledged today that the government had reached its legal limit on borrowing and would run short of cash by early April unless Congress once again raised the debt ceiling.

"Because Congress inevitably does raise the ceiling after intense jousting, the announcement will have little, if any, effect on operations. But it highlights the new era of red ink that the government faces even before President Bush's latest proposals for more than \$1 trillion in tax cuts over 10 years . . . the White House now projects a deficit of more than \$300 billion this year and next, as well as deficits at least for the next decade."

□ 2045

If you talk about the deficit, Mr. Speaker, if you think about what the President has been saying versus reality, he really has no credibility.

When he took office in 2001, the Federal budget had a surplus of \$5.6 billion. Not only has he reversed those fortunes, but on this President's watch the red ink does not appear to go dry anytime in the near future, with defi-

cits reaching \$2.1 trillion over the next 10 years. There again, I just use that as one example. There are so many examples of it.

I guess one of the things that is so obvious in this regard is what the President says about the tax cuts. He implemented some tax cuts about a year ago. He now proposes additional tax cuts and is talking about maybe a third set of tax cuts in another 6 months or so.

There was an article in today's New York Times that, once again, talks about the President's credibility gap in the context of the tax cuts. I just wanted to go to some of those statistics, because I think they are so important in terms of what the President says these tax cuts are going to do, who is going to benefit from them, how they are going to impact the economy, versus what the reality is. This was an article in today's New York Times, and it is entitled "The President's Tax Cut and its Unspoken Numbers."

It starts out by saying, "The statistics that President Bush and his allies use to promote his tax cut plan are accurate, but many of them present only part of the picture. For instance, in a speech in Georgia last week, the President asserted that under his proposal, 92 million Americans would receive an average tax reduction of \$1,083 and that the economy would improve so much that 1.4 million new jobs would be created by the end of 2004."

Now, no one disputes the size of the average tax reduction. But what the President did not say is that half of all income taxpayers would have their taxes cut by less than \$100, 78 percent would receive reductions of less than \$1,000, and the firm that the White House relied on to predict the initial job growth also forecast the plan could hurt the economy over the long run.

You say, how does the President talk about an average tax reduction of \$1,083 and then you find out that most Americans do not benefit in a significant way? The reason is because only a few rich taxpayers, in a sense, get the largest reduction. So if you take the number of taxpayers and you put it into the total reduction, you get an average of \$1,083, but most of the money is going to a very few wealthy taxpayers at the high end of the spectrum.

The cut for those with incomes of \$40,000 to \$50,000, according to calculations by the Brookings Institution and the Urban Institute, would typically be \$380. For those with incomes of \$50,000 to \$75,000 it would be \$553. But if you are someone at the high end, then you are getting tens of thousands of dollars back in tax cuts.

The President primarily when he talks about this tax reduction package talks about the stock dividends and how that is going to help not only turn the economy around, but help the average person, because there are so many people, particularly seniors, he claims, that are going to benefit from eliminating the tax on stock dividends.

But this article in the New York Times today addresses that and basically explains again the President has a credibility gap in how he is spinning it, because among the points that he makes is that more than half of all taxable dividends are paid to people 65 and older and that their average saving from eliminating the tax on dividends would be \$936, and that 60 percent of people receiving dividends have incomes of \$75,000 and less, and he goes on.

But what we find is only slightly more than one-quarter of Americans 65 and older receive dividends and that two-thirds of the dividends the elderly receive are paid to the 9 percent of all elderly who have incomes of over \$100,000.

Essentially what you are having, again, is that most of the money, even with the stock dividend elimination, the tax on that, is going to very few senior citizens who have incomes over \$100,000. The average senior citizen is not benefiting from it in any significant way.

I mention this because, again, I think it is important that we all understand that the President says something, and he spins it and makes it sound like it is going to benefit everyone and turn the economy around, but then the reality is that it is not. It does not accomplish that goal at all.

Let me just give you some information, if I can, about job creation. Last month during his State of the Union address, the President said we must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job.

Of course, obviously, I agree with that statement. Who would not? But, unfortunately, a huge gap again exists between his rhetoric of employing all Americans and the economic stimulus plan that even the White House says is only going to create about 190,000 jobs this year.

He says everyone should have a job. He talks about an economic stimulus plan that will theoretically create 190,000 jobs. But you have 8.6 million Americans now actively looking for a job. He does not have any credibility because—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RENZI). The Chair would like to remind the gentleman from New Jersey that it is out of order to question the credibility of the President.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I accept your ruling. I did not realize you could not talk about the credibility, but I certainly will not use that term again.

I just want to point out that when the President took office in January 2001, unemployment had reached a 40-year low. Two years later, 1.7 million jobs have been lost. That gives President Bush the dubious distinction of having the worst job creation record of any administration in the last 58 years.

So when we talk about job creation and how his economic package is somehow going to create more jobs, it may

create a few more, but it is not doing anything significant in terms of job creation as opposed to the amount of jobs that we have seen lost in this economic downturn.

Now I want to talk a little bit in the same vein about some of the health care initiatives that the President has put forward, because the bottom line is that over the next few weeks we are probably going to hear more specifics about what he wants to do with Medicare, with Medicaid, with access to health insurance, and also with some of the money that is going back to the States, other than through Medicare and Medicaid, to pay for some health care programs.

Again, if you listen to what the President said during his State of the Union address, basically he said that he wanted to not only strengthen Medicaid and Medicare, but also provide a prescription drug benefit in the context of Medicare for senior citizens.

Again, I would like to point out the fact that most of what has been proposed with regard to Medicare and Medicaid, in my opinion, will not only not strengthen the programs but weaken the programs, and that when he talks about providing a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, it is not a prescription drug benefit that most seniors will be able to avail themselves of.

In fact, again, in yesterday's New York Times, Monday, February 24, there was an article on the front page entitled "Bush Proposes Major Changes in Health Plans. Critics See Less Security and Fewer Benefits."

I would stress that critics see less security and fewer benefits because, the gist of this article says, essentially what the President is proposing with regard to not only Medicare and Medicaid, but also with regard to Social Security, are radical changes in the programs and the way these programs are essentially set up.

What I would like to do, if I could, is just highlight some of the major changes in the programs that I call radical or fundamental changes that are being proposed in these three very important programs that are relating to the health care of not only seniors, but poor people of all ages.

I start out by highlighting the first paragraph of this article in the New York Times. It says, "President Bush has begun one of the most ambitious efforts to reinvent Medicare and Medicaid since the programs were created 38 years ago. Combined with his earlier plan for Social Security, the proposals offer a fundamentally different vision of social welfare policy, many experts say."

"Several architects of those programs, the people that put the Medicare, the Medicaid and the Social Security programs together years ago, argue that the Bush administration is retreating from the goals of the Great Society and the New Deal and the promises that government made across the generations.

"The Bush plans," they say, "are essentially an effort to limit the Federal Government's financial responsibilities and to cap what is now an open-ended guarantee of specific benefits, in an effort to move from a defined benefit to a defined contribution."

Essentially what the critics are saying, and this is brought out in this New York Times article, is that these were programs, you talk about Medicare, you talk about Social Security, these were retirement security programs, in the case of Medicare for health care for seniors, in the case of Social Security retirement benefits for seniors, that were basically guaranteed. You paid into this system and you worked over the years, and then when you reached the age of 65, you knew that you had certain benefits that were defined and guaranteed.

What the President is proposing now and the reason it is so radical is because he is basically saying they are not going to be defined or guaranteed anymore. He is saying in the case of Medicare that essentially what you will get is a voucher. You will get a certain amount of money, and you can go out in the private sector and see if you can buy health insurance with that voucher, if you will. But you may or may not be able to find it, and you do not know exactly what it is going to provide you with in terms of the benefit package.

With regard to Social Security, of course, he is talking about privatizing, and your being able to take the money out and invest it in the stock market or other types of things, so that there is a certain amount of risk, if you will, that the money will not be there because of those kinds of decisions that you made when you took the money away.

Let me just get a little more into some of the specifics, because I think it is interesting to see how the New York Times has analyzed this, and also talk a little bit about what the Democrats would like to do differently with regard to the Medicare prescription drug proposal and how the Democratic proposal is consistent with the guarantees and the tradition and the history of the Medicare program, as opposed to the President's proposal, which is not.

What it says in this New York Times article, again from Monday, is that Mr. Bush's Medicare proposal, being revised after an earlier draft drew fire on Capitol Hill, would encourage many beneficiaries to leave traditional Medicare and get their benefits through private health insurance associated with the program.

Now, some of the Congressional Republicans, some of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, have specifically been opposed or have expressed reservations about the President's Medicare proposal, because what he seems to be saying is if you want the benefit of a prescription drug plan, that you have to go outside of Medicare. In other words, you have to

choose a private plan, an HMO or something like an HMO, in order to get the benefits of a prescription drug plan.

It says in the New York Times, "Criticism has come from even influential Congressional Republicans, alarmed at the possibility that the administration might be overreaching. They have been particularly scathing about the possibility that the Bush plan would require the elderly to leave traditional Medicare and join a private plan to get drug benefits discussed in the earlier draft."

Now, the problem with this, again, is a fundamental change in the way we operate the Medicare program, because those who are in Medicare now know it is a guaranteed plan, it is a defined benefit; if you stay in the traditional plan, you can go to any doctor or any hospital and you get your health care covered. But what the New York Times says is that the architects of Medicare said the program was created with some fundamental precepts that the Bush proposal would undermine; that all working Americans pay into the same Medicare system, that the healthy and the sick, the rich and poor, end up in the same program and all have the same core benefits when they retire.

The idea that the elderly would be better served by a private nonprofit insurance market is anathema to those veterans of the Great Society. They say before Medicare, the private health insurance market was a failure for the elderly, nearly half of whom have no hospital coverage, and they fear that private health plans would be attempted to recruit the healthiest of the elderly, leaving sick or more costly patients in the original fee-for-service Medicare program.

So basically the problem with what the President is proposing for Medicare is not only a practical problem, in the sense that we are not really sure and we really have no reason to believe based on past performance that the elderly would be able to take this voucher and buy a good health insurance program, but the real danger is it undermines the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program for those who stay behind, because they are going to be the sicker and the more expensive people to take care of. So the problems, if you will, and the costs of Medicare, are aggravated by the fact that now the Federal Government is paying for an older population, if you will.

□ 2100

So it is almost a prescription, if you will, to destroy the traditional Medicare program.

Now, what does the President do or propose with regard to Medicaid? Medicare, as we know, is the program for seniors, those over 65, primarily. Medicaid is a health insurance program for poor people who fall below a certain income.

Well, again, I am going back to the New York Times article from yesterday: "The issues raised in the Medicaid

debate revolve largely around the role of the Federal Government. The administration proposal would offer States advanced new power to reduce, eliminate, or expand health benefits for low-income people, including many who are elderly or disabled. In return for the flexibility and a temporary increase in Federal assistance, States would eventually have to accept a limit on the Federal contribution to the program."

Now, critics assert it would replace the poor's entitlement to health care with a block grant to the States just when the number of uninsured is rising. Again, Medicaid a program for poor people, is partially funded by the States, partially by the Federal Government. What the President is saying is, we will give you, the States, the flexibility to determine what kind of benefits and who is covered, if you will, by Medicaid. In return for that, though, in the long run, we are going to give you less money. So it is really a cost-saving device. But what it does is undermine the guarantee that if you are poor and you are below a certain income that you are going to have your health benefits.

It is the same thing in a different way that the President is proposing with Medicare in the sense that a program that is provided with a guarantee, an entitlement, now ceases to be and the person is not sure whether they were going to get their health care or how they are going to get their health care or what kind of benefits they are going to receive.

Now, the last thing that is mentioned in The New York Times article yesterday is: "Mr. Bush's proposal for Social Security, first offered in the 2000 campaign, would also break sharply with the past by allowing workers to divert some of their payroll taxes to individual accounts that would be invested in stocks. While its political prospects have been dampened by the declining stock market, Mr. Bush reiterated his support for the idea last month in his State of the Union address. Both sides agree that the coming debate over these proposals," that is all of them, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, "will be a fundamental clash of political philosophies over the obligations of government, the rights of the individual, and the role of the private sector."

Again, I am not an ideologue, Mr. Speaker, and I am not talking about this in the context of the ideology, whether it is a conservative or a liberal ideology or whatever; I am just very concerned, and I think we all need to be, about the practical implications of what the President has proposed. When we have programs like Medicare and Social Security that are so fundamental to so many people in this country and we talk about radical restructuring of those programs in a way that may save the Federal Government money, but also risks the types of guarantees that are provided traditionally to seniors, I think it is something

that we better watch very closely. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that with so many other things going on, that it may be possible somehow to pass significant changes here without us focusing sufficiently on what they really mean and what the impact is going to be.

Now, before I finish, I did want to say that in all of this argument, if you will, about health care, I think that there are two things that are crucial. One is that the number of uninsured in the country not continue to go up, which it has in the last couple of years; and, secondly, that we do, in fact, find some way to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors. Because when I am home, when I am in the district, I hear primarily those two concerns when it comes to health care, which is: I was working, I lost my job, I do not have health insurance anymore. Or, I have my job, but the employer decided to drop health insurance. Or, my employer still offers health insurance, but now he is providing a package that costs me so much out-of-pocket that I cannot afford to buy it anymore or to take that option.

The other thing I hear, of course, very frequently is from seniors who complain about the fact that Medicare does not provide a prescription drug benefit and that they have tried maybe, in some cases in New Jersey, to join an HMO that would give them a prescription drug benefit; but they signed up for it, and then later they were dropped because the HMO decided it really was not profitable to provide a drug benefit to seniors, or now the copay, what it costs them out-of-pocket to pay for the prescription drug coverage, again is so high that it does not make sense for them to continue to stay in the HMO because the benefit is so limited and the cost out-of-pocket is so high.

So I think we have to understand that for Democrats, we feel that these two issues must be addressed: the fact that more and more people have no health insurance and the fact that we need a prescription drug benefit for seniors. But I would venture to say that with regard to that prescription drug benefit, to go the way the President is proposing, which is to say that one has to go out into the private sector and join an HMO or a PPO or something like that to get one's drug coverage, is not the answer.

In fact, the week before the recess, I actually participated in a press conference with Public Citizen; and they did a report on Medicare privatization. Basically, the report showed dramatically that HMOs and private insurance for seniors does not work; that the experience that we have had in the last few years where seniors tried to opt for HMOs in many parts of the country were not available, and where they were available, maybe they lasted for a few years and then they either dropped the seniors or it became unaffordable.

In my own State of New Jersey, in the last 2 years alone, nearly 80,000 sen-

iors who had contracted with private HMOs lost their health coverage. In other words, the HMOs simply dropped them. So I just do not think, if we look at this Public Citizen report, we can come to any conclusion other than the fact that saying to seniors that in order to get your drug benefits you have to go into an HMO or something like that, some kind of private insurance is the answer. It is not. We know it is not. It does not work; it has not worked.

So what the Democrats have proposed and what makes the most sense is simply expanding our traditional Medicare fee-for-service program to include a prescription drug benefit that would be guaranteed for anyone who wanted it. We use the example of part B. As many people know, Medicare part A is hospitalization and Medicare part B pays for doctor bills, and under Medicare part B, you pay a certain amount of premium per month and the Federal Government pays for a certain percentage of the doctor bills. We have come up with a plan that would essentially do the same thing with a drug benefit. You would pay a premium of \$25 a month, a \$100 deductible, so that would be out-of-pocket and then after that, 80 percent of the prescription drugs would be paid for by the Federal Government and you would have a copay of 20 percent. Because of high bills, if one ends up spending as much as \$2,000 out-of-pocket, then the Federal Government would pay 100 percent of your costs.

The last thing and the most important thing, I think, in many respects of what the Democrats propose is that we have a clause in our proposal that was introduced and voted on last session that says that the Secretary of Health and Human Services who administers the Medicare program has to negotiate for lower prices for drugs, because now he has 40 million seniors and he can negotiate for lower prices.

So basically, what the Democrats are saying is, yes, we want to expand Medicare to include prescription drugs; but we want to do it in the traditional way, so everyone has it, no one has to go to a private insurance or opt for an HMO to get it, you just get it; and the system is very similar to what we do with part B under Medicare now for doctor bills.

Mr. Speaker, I see one of my colleagues and I yield to him.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, first of all, for coming out here tonight and talking a little bit about some of those issues that concern us. I know that as the gentleman talks about health, one of the things that really bothers me is now, the President's proposal, as it deals with the issue of health, one of the things that he has done is that he has begun to look at Medicaid, which is the monies that go to the most indigent of this country, and he has also looked at what we call the disproportionate share. That is the money that goes to those hospitals out there that

are providing that indigent care that have no reimbursement except what we provide them. So these are two areas of serious concern because it deals with the most indigent, the most needy in our country.

In addition, he has also looked at what we call the CHIP program. The CHIP program for Americans out there is the program that addresses the needs of those youngsters, of those parents that are hard-working, they are working, they are making \$20,000, \$30,000, \$40,000; but they do not qualify for Medicaid because they are not poor enough and they are hard-working. When they go to the hospitals, they do not get reimbursed on the disproportionate share. So here we have three programs: the Medicaid for the most indigent, the disproportionate share for those hospitals to help them out, for providing that care, and the CHIP program that addresses the needs of those youngsters of those parents.

He is proposing to lump them all up. Here is a program that is a direct attack on the most needy of this country, the ones that are hurting the most in health care; and instead of responding and providing the needed resources that are needed out there, he is looking at providing a block grant and, at the same time, providing those resources to the States. But as the gentleman well knows, those States are in need right now. Those States are hurting when it comes to health care. These are programs that have worked and have somewhat been responsive to some of those needs. What is he doing? He is attacking the most needy of our population. So that really concerns me. It really bothers me. I wanted to share that, because I know the gentleman has talked about health care and the importance of health care, and I know the gentleman has also been touching on the budget.

What also bothers me is that as he looks at the budget, he is also doing the same thing when it comes to the most needy of our children. Under the Department of Health, we have a program that is called Head Start, one of the most beautiful programs that we have had for a long time. It has been very good. Statistics indicate, it has been shown that it has been the program that has responded and has been real good for those kids that are out there and has been meeting the needs of our youngsters. Yet we know it only represents 40 percent of the kids that qualify for Head Start that we are funding at the present time, and it only has 2 percent of the early childhood, those kids that are 2 and 3 years old.

Yet the President is choosing to destroy this program because his proposal is to block grant those monies and give it to the States, when right now those programs are being run locally, they are locally controlled, and he is going to create, by moving that money from the Department of Health to the Department of Education, it is a

very serious move because right now the Department of Health also with Head Start, they work with our parents, they work with our kids; and they provide not only cognitive skills and educational skills, but also reach out to them in terms of services and needs. So what he is choosing to do is he sees these dollars out there, and he is choosing to put them in a block grant and throw them at the States.

Well, I can attest to my colleagues, if they come to Texas where I am from, Texas has had a history of not funding full-day kindergarten. We only fund half; the rest of the day is funded only by the taxpayer through local school districts. So if that occurs, I can attest that we will have a real problem, and they are going to destroy a program that has been there providing for those needs. By doing this, they are going to use that money to supplant because of the fact that they do not have the resources to provide the existing services that they have throughout this country. So I am real disappointed, after what has happened in his efforts that when it comes to education, he has not been there.

I also want to share, and I do not mean to take too much of the gentleman's time, but I want to share a couple of other things, because there is a pattern here. He decided to attack Head Start and try to put it into a block grant; he has attacked the most needy of this country with Medicaid, CHIP, and disproportionate share in terms of health; and he is also now attacking our veterans. These are the individuals that have fought for this country. At a time that we have declared war, he is asking Priority 7 and Priority 8 veterans, those veterans that are making just about \$30,000 or so, for them to begin to pay more than what they already do for the services. And at the same time, not only is he attacking the resources for our veterans, but he is also attacking their kids. Not the kids of the veterans, but kids of the servicemen who now we are asking, or who are out there in Afghanistan, we are asking them to go to the Middle East, we are asking them to go to the Philippines, we are asking them to be in Colombia.

□ 2115

So those are the same soldiers of those kids that now we are saying we do not plan to help fund their education through the assistance. So those are the types of proposals that we have before us. At the same time, he brings to us a tax cut when we do not have sufficient resources.

If we do have a war, if we do have one, who is going to pay for that war? At some point in time every war, and I asked for a CRS study from the Congressional Research Office, I have found that for every single war we have had, with very few exceptions, we have always had a tax to pay for that war. In this case, we do not. It is being paid out of the deficit, which means we are

asking our soldiers to go out and fight, and then we are asking them and their kids in the future to pay for it because of the debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that as we move forward we will have an opportunity to talk about these issues and concerns that confront us.

I want to touch base just a minute on education, because here we have a bill that is basically the President's bill. It is the Leave No Child Behind Act. Well, for 2003 we are already going to leave some children behind, because he has cut \$7 billion from that. As the proposal comes out for 2004, it is a \$9 billion cut.

So when we talk about a promise, and then we come back on that promise of leave no child behind and we cut \$9 billion from the 2004 proposal, and this is at the same time that our States are having a rough time, I have difficulty comprehending what the rationale is. I have difficulty understanding, when he has verbalized his concerns for education, but at the same time he does not display that through the form of a good budget.

The budget basically determines everything. If he cuts taxes and we do not have the resources, I do not care what we say about anything else, it is not going to be there. So it becomes really important that we are forthright about that.

Now we hear that he is willing to come up with about \$50 billion on foreign aid to try to pull off this war, not to mention that the war might cost us from \$100 billion to \$200 billion additional. These are issues that we really need to go and talk about before the American people.

I want to thank the gentleman for coming up tonight and allowing us an opportunity to talk a little about the budget and the issues that concern us. I know that the gentleman has been a constant worker, especially in the area of health care. I want to personally thank the gentleman, and I know we have another colleague that might want to say a few words.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's coming down. I know he has been a leader on the health care issue as well. Let me just make a couple of comments about the things that he said. I think we have about 20 minutes or so left.

The thing the gentleman mentioned when he talked about education, that is so important. I do not want to talk about credibility gaps, I will not use that word again; but the idea that one makes a promise with no child left behind, which means very obviously that no child is going to be left behind, when we know that in many parts of this country in the public school system children are being left behind either because they do not have the money or because they cannot locally get the teachers, or whatever the reason.

So the President gets up with much fanfare a couple of years ago and says

no child is going to be left behind. But when we get a budget with a \$9.7 billion shortfall from what would be necessary to authorize and carry forth that act, that no-child-left-behind program, it is essentially hypocritical to continue to talk about no child left behind. So I think this is a perfect example of the kinds of things that I have been trying to point out tonight.

Going back to the health care issue again, the other thing that I think is so important is that this week the National Governors Conference is taking place. I think it is here in Washington. I am not exactly sure. What the President has been trying to do is to sell this Medicaid proposal to the Governors by saying, look, we are going to give you a lot more flexibility with this program, but you may get less money. We may cap the amount of money that you get.

The Governors have already been coming back on a bipartisan basis, some of them, saying this is not such a great idea because we do not have the resources. We know that, as the gentleman mentioned, in the States because of the economic downturn, most of the States do not have the money to continue to pay for these health care programs for poor people; or even for those who are working, like in the CHIP program, we call it kid care in New Jersey, providing health insurance for kids.

So what we are seeing is with what the President is proposing and the fewer dollars that he is giving out, with the number of uninsured, the number of kids that are going to be covered by CHIP are going to be reduced. The problem is if we implement this Medicaid program, the States are going to have the ability to basically cut back on that as well, so we will see more and more people that have no health insurance.

I am not talking pie in the sky here to my colleague. It has already happened in my home State of New Jersey. Some States have already expanded the CHIP program to cover the parents of the kids, or single adults who are working but do not get health care on the job. In New Jersey, the Governor has already announced that he has to get rid of those. There is even a question now about whether all the kids are going to be covered. So this is not something that is abstract.

The President would have to make sure that he provided significantly more resources to programs like S-CHIP or to Medicaid in order to guarantee that the programs continue to exist at the current levels, or to take in the people now that, because of the economic downturn, are not covered by health insurance.

What the Democrats propose, the gentleman remembers, in our economic stimulus package is that we would give more money to the States for Medicaid. We would up it by another 2 percent so they would not have to put out as much State dollars, which they do

not have to cover everyone eligible for Medicaid.

We are saying in these hard economic times the Federal Government should do more to guarantee that working people that cannot get health insurance are covered. The President is doing the opposite at the very time when there are more and more people who have the need. It really is a wrong thing to do.

Let me just indicate, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) said it, we have a problem in health care out there. We would think that as a way of responding with the stimulus package, that we would not only answer a problem that exists out there such as health care, but we could also address the problems that our States are having.

One of the biggest problems and one of the biggest budget problems they have is health. So not only do we help the States in addressing the problem of the issue of health care and the deficits, but we would also be stimulating the economy by doing just that, and solving a problem and doing a good deed in terms of making sure that people have access to good quality health care.

So Mr. Speaker, if I can, I have seen the President in terms of his pattern. In Texas, he did exactly the same thing. He reached out to the Democratic side, and he was very open about reaching out and trying to help in education; but he also did a tax cut.

In Texas right now they have about a \$12 billion deficit also. Now, yes, they have a great education bill, but they have no money to fund it, very similar to what he did over here. He came out here and reached out to Senator KENNEDY and the liberals and the Democrats and talked about education, did his tax cut and did the education. Now we do not have the resources, or we do not have the priority of the resources, to fund that same education bill that he has authored, and that same bill that he ought to be proud enough to put in the \$9 billion that he agreed to when he cut that agreement. So we are hoping that he does not go back on his word, and that he fulfills that promise of leaving no child behind.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman. I thank him for coming down.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to have two Members of the House from the State of Texas. It is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), because he has been a leader on focusing us on the choices that have to be made.

Certainly, my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), chairman of the Hispanic Caucus, in his prior life was such an advocate for health care issues in our own State. I know that the State legislature misses him and his leadership. He spoke eloquently of so many important issues.

It concerns me to bring Texas to the forefront again, but as we do so, we use it as somewhat of a model. It is symbolic, if you will, of the plight of States around the Nation, which is one of the reasons why I support the Democratic economic stimulus package and our approach to the budget, which is to make the choices but make the choices as it relates to the domestic agenda, if you will, and, as well, be very cognizant that we cannot have it all.

Whatever side of the war question we happen to be on, and many of us have expressed our opposition, but whatever side Members are on, we have to realize that this war, if we enter into it, is going to cost at least \$9 billion to \$13 billion a month. That means that we will have to make choices as to how we design the budget; whether or not we take the leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, who has raised a very important question of making sure that we respect or show concern for the deficit and make choices for helping people climb out of poverty and climb out of a state of economic, if you will, deterioration.

But, unfortunately, I come to the floor to share the laundry list of concerns that I have that are not being considered by the present administration, that are now the fallout because of the proposed tax cut of the present stimulus package, but really the impact of the tax cut of just the last fiscal year that is now trickling down to the States.

I left Houston under the very terrible shadow of my community coming together to reach out, with community leaders pleading to prevent cuts in mental health services. We are at a point now where we are actually closing down services, closing offices that serve outpatients in our community for mental health, mental illness, because we do not have the funding.

We have policemen, firefighters, counselors, academicians, city council persons, mayors, coming together to plead with our State legislature. Let me say that the State legislators are certainly struggling with the \$10 billion to \$12 billion deficit in the State itself, trying to be responsive; but frankly, the counties and cities are feeling the brunt. We are literally closing facilities in Houston as we speak. We are literally not responding to the needs of our constituents for services dealing with mental illnesses.

Just yesterday I spoke to a constituent who had a family member living with them who truly needed to have outpatient services, truly was suffering; one who was in denial and needed services for the mental illness that they had but could not get it.

This is part of the laundry list. If we do not look at a budget that is able to be grounded not in a huge \$600 billion-plus tax cut to the top 1 percent of the Nation, leaving those in the working middle class economic level without any remedy whatsoever, this is the real

face of the huge deficit that this administration is building, people who are now being closed out of services.

Let me mention something that only gets mentioned, I guess, when we go to town hall meetings. I think we frankly, and this is to the Speaker, need to address this, and this is what we call the notch babies, or the question of making fair that unequal pension program where teachers are not able to access the Social Security system because of a certain pension system that they are in in particular States. That hits Texas a lot and several other States. Those are some of our senior citizens who are in a program that now cannot be funded, or they cannot move out of that program to access Social Security, and they are barely making ends meet.

The gentleman has been a leader on the guaranteed prescription drug benefit through Medicare. One of the issues that Democrats, I believe, to a person, have made a commitment to see through, and frankly I believe we have made a very strong and valiant commitment to see it through in this session; but that, of course, is a choice that would have to be made in a budget designed to make choices for social needs and needs of individuals' domestic agendas as opposed to the agenda that may lead us into war.

That is a concern that I have: Are we going to be able to tell those seniors who are today making choices of rent, making choices of utilities, and making choices of cutting their drug prescriptions in half? Of course, what they do is, they do that themselves. Therefore, they cause detriment to their health because of the fact that we are not able to build into our budget or be able to fund a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit.

I just came from a reception honoring a group that deals with world hunger. I was told at this meeting that we are not able, or that we have some of the highest percentages of malnutrition in the United States, that our children are malnourished.

I will say to the gentleman that Texas is again at the top of the list for malnourished children and children living in poverty. The key is that many people complain about the school breakfast and lunch program. We are being told that some children in America are not even able to match the 40 percent amount that they need to be able to pay for lunch and pay for breakfast.

□ 2130

I have heard a lot of complaints. I remember 2 years, 4 terms ago, I am trying to remember, 1995, I guess, when we had a valiant fight to preserve school lunches or to make sure that people knew, this Congress knew, in fact, some of our colleagues knew that school lunches or the cuts in school lunches were just unacceptable. I think we prevailed upon that. But here we are now, full circle, where the funding for school lunches, where the States

are suffering, and the children of families cannot afford the matching amount. This is a question of making choices, of living in poverty or accepting the fact that our children live in poverty and are malnourished.

I heard my good friend from Texas talking about Medicaid, but I hope it was mentioned that we have a trickle-down effect from that because we have HHS regulations loosening the, if you will, the sort of guidelines that the State may utilize. What is the reason? Not to make it easy on the State to be able to serve its constituency but to make it easy on the State to cut people off of Medicaid.

I think in this day and time, some of those very families on Medicaid have young men and women now facing harm's way in the United States military. Some of those very same families are families that are in need of Medicaid. And now because of loosening guidelines, the State may pick and choose who will be able to access health care in our community. We just passed a welfare bill, and you heard the debate on the floor of the House. We had a bill that would provide a safety net for those who are trying to move themselves out of welfare who may be coming to a point of reaching sort of a cap on Medicaid and child care. And now we have passed a bill that did not provide a safety net in child care. In fact, there were not enough dollars for those mothers who want to be able to move or those parents, single parents, whoever it might be, to step out of welfare and have children that need child care. Here is a safety net that is going by the wayside.

So I believe the budget approach that we want to take is reasonably adjusting to and addressing a domestic agenda that this Nation can be proud of; a domestic agenda that would include a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit, that would include recognizing the needs of the individuals suffering from mental illness. We have always had a problem with that. We have yet to pass in this Congress the issue of parity. And I say that I always have to bring up my dear friend and all of our friend, Senator Paul Wellstone, who was a vocal fighter for parity in mental illness. We have not reached that. And the reason why we could not complete that deal, if you will, was on the question of the budget and finances and choices. Why should we, this Congress, year after year and session after session deny people who rightly deserve the consideration of the people's house and their representatives in Washington to be able to provide funding or at least matching funds to their State governments?

Frankly, I believe that it is a shame on us, shame on our House and shame on all of us that we are not able to address these questions. We will not be able to do this if we do not sit down in a reasonable manner and put forward a budget that does not spend all of its time carving out the needs of others

just in order to respond to a \$600 billion permanent tax cut or more. And I want to put the word in there "permanent," and I think my good friend who is on the floor said in times of need we always made sacrifice.

I am not a supporter of the war but if, for example, that occurred, that is time for sacrifice. A sacrifice does not entail a \$600 billion-plus permanent tax cut to individuals at the 1 percent tax bracket. But let me add this as I close. Not only the 1 percent tax bracket but the, I believe, nonsensical explanation of giving relief on dividend income suggesting that it has been taxed twice. It has not been taxed twice. It is taxed as income to the corporation. They then give the dividend to the recipients of the dividend. It is income and the income of the individuals. So you are taxing the dividend. The dividend should not have a life of its own. It is taxing the individuals who, I believe, would be willing to sacrifice while we are in a state or a condition that requires sacrifice of all individuals. That is ridiculous.

And let me close on a personal note, because it is very near and dear to us in my community and that is NASA. And, of course, there is a great debate and will be a great debate on the human space shuttle, but I am very gratified that over the years we have gained friends in this House realizing that the human space shuttle generates research in HIV/AIDS and stroke, heart disease and cancer. And all of us have offered our deepest sympathies to the *Columbia 7* families and to the NASA family, people who are committed to expanding our horizons. Well, that is something that we considered a part of America's culture and achievement.

Now, I hear discussions of budget cuts that may be looking at cutting human space flight before we even find the answers of the *Columbia* tragedy and not looking at it for what it has done for Americans and America and the world, giving us the opportunity to push the intellectual research, scientific and medical envelope to provide new discoveries that would help create better lives not only for Americans, for people around the world.

We have to make those kinds of choices if we continue along these lines of deficit building, huge tax cuts and a budget that does not focus itself on the needs of people in this Nation, and of course the pending winds of war that may cause us to spend enormous amounts of money, and not only at this time but in the rebuilding of the nations that may be impacted as we are already doing in Afghanistan.

So I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for coming to the floor and bringing these very vital issues up. It pains me to have to be able to say to constituents over and over that we are trying to work on your issues and we are seeking relief when they are suffering on a daily basis. I think we need to get to work and focus on a budget

that focuses on a domestic agenda that makes sense to Americans, but most importantly addresses the pain that many Americans are suffering right now today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think we have just a few more minutes, but I am really pleased that the gentlewoman raised the issue, first of all, of the cost of war and some of the aid packages like to Turkey that has been in the paper the last few days and also to NASA. Again, my point this evening when we started this Special Order was to discuss the President's rhetoric versus what he is actually doing with the budget and all of promises, if you will, that are made about turning the economy around, creating more jobs, providing health care, providing prescription drugs, not raising the deficit. And then what we find is that these tax cuts do not really help the average guy, do not do anything really to stimulate the economy and are creating these huge deficits.

But what the gentlewoman is pointing out is that in addition to that is we do not have a true budget at all because we are not including the cost of the war which, as the gentlewoman said, is estimated at something like \$100 to \$200 billion. And that does not include the AID package. Of course, I point to Turkey because that has been in the paper. I do not know how many other countries will be asking for money. I think that was in the tens of billions, what is being discussed.

None of this is in the budget. And so the reality is we may wind up with a situation that by the time this budget is adopted in the appropriation bills by the end of the fiscal year where there have to be even more cuts if you are going to implement, more cuts in health care, more cuts in the things that we were discussing, education, if you are still going to have these tax cuts and pay for the cost of the war or perhaps bigger deficits.

Again, it is just a very sad situation because I think that the President has to be forthright with what he is really doing and not say that we are going to be able to turn the economy around and do all of these things and give tax cuts and fight a war and not increase the deficit. It does not add up. It just does not add up. And it is really incumbent upon us over the next few weeks as we move forward and adopt some sort of budget to make the points that the two of you have been making tonight because we are not, I do not think we are being honest with what is really going on around here and we are trying to be honest. And we have to call the President and the Republican leadership to task about what they are really going to be able to accomplish. So I want to thank my colleagues.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just for a moment, I want to make sure the gentleman emphasizes that they are promises made, but they are promises not kept.

The one point I want to make on a prescription drug benefit, while we

have such a disagreement, if you will, is because the one that has been promised that has not yet been consummated, if you will, still requires seniors to take money out of their pocket, still is sort of a managed-care-type proposal. And my only fear, as I mentioned by starting out by saying that I have doors closed on those suffering from mental illness, is that I have experienced 2 or 3 years ago HMOs just closed up shop on my seniors and left. So I just do not want to see that happen again, and that is why I think this is an important challenge.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the notion that we will be able to rely on the HMOs in the private sector to provide the drug coverage or any kind of coverage is totally belied by the reality of what has happened in the last few years. In New Jersey alone in the last 2 years 80,000 seniors taken off, HMOs dropped them.

If we do not provide across-the-board prescription drug plans the way the Democrats have devised, we have no guarantee that the seniors will get their drug coverage. I cannot believe after the experience we have had the last few years that has dramatically shown that HMOs will not provide the seniors with the drug coverage, that anyone, including the President, could suggest that somehow that is not the answer. It is, again, the suggestion or the promise that you will do something. The reality will be very different because they will not be able to find that kind of coverage. It will not exist.

NO SUPPORT FOR MIGUEL ESTRADA NOMINATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker for allowing us the opportunity to be here tonight.

I wanted to come out tonight to talk a little bit about the issue that the Senate is having to deal with and that is the issue of the nomination of Miguel Estrada. And I want to personally, first of all, thank the Senators that are choosing not to support the nomination. And I want to personally thank them because I know that as a caucus we had appointed the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and several others to look at the nomination process. And we have had a process where we have asked Members to come forward, and my understanding is that we have always, every single Hispanic that has ever come before us we have approved. This is the first nominee that we have chosen not to approve.

And the reason we have done this, and it was not an easy decision, it was a hard decision because of the fact that, after all, he is a Hispanic and we

recognize that it would be very difficult for us to go against him. But the reality was and what we were all unanimously in agreement that we could not endorse this nominee and, in fact, that he did not deserve our nomination, our recommendation. And the reason we came to those conclusions was after we had had the opportunity to interview him, after we had an opportunity to look at the documentation, and, first of all, we found that Mr. Estrada has no judicial experience. And when we have looked at the fact that we are going to be nominating this person for life to a court that will be the second most powerful court next to the Supreme Court, we really need to take note that he has to be a little bit more responsive about answering the questions that come before him. He has to be a little more truthful about coming forward because either he is naive about some of the questions or the fact is that he chooses not to respond on the questions that were asked of him. And that really disturbed us.

One might ask, well, let us give him a shot. Well, the reality is that that might be the case for elected officials, individuals that might be here who get elected. But here is a person that we are going to be appointing for life. Here is a person that we recognize that we do not, if we do not ask those questions will be there for rest of his life.

It is not a typical appointment of someone like ourselves that we run for office that you might say, well, let us give this candidate an opportunity to serve. If he does not make it, then we will not vote for him the next time. That is not the case when it comes to Federal appointments. They are in there for life. So it becomes really important that the Senate have the opportunity to have the documentation that is needed, to have the documentation that is asked of them, and it is something that is fair.

□ 2145

As elected officials, one of the things that we are told from the very beginning, at least the advice I was given some time back, was that be very careful as an elected official about writing letters of endorsements, and so I take that very seriously. I never write letters of endorsement unless I know the person, and even then, in certain cases, if I know the family, but we have to be very cautious because we do not know.

In this case, the Senate has an obligation, a constitutional obligation, a responsibility, to make sure that if they nominate someone, that they have had a chance, because it is kind of giving a letter of recommendation, and this is a letter of recommendation as a form of a nominee and accepting the nominee for life. So they have to make sure that, if nothing else, the person is able to respond to some of the questions that are up there and to be able to respond in a way that allows an opportunity for us to learn a little bit about the candidate.

One of the things that I know he has been asked time and time again about, for example, simple questions about which court cases does he think have been wrong or have been decided or have been harmful, which court cases have not. I am not an attorney but I could tell my colleagues that there have definitely been some court cases out there, some of the cases that allowed for slavery, *Plessey versus Ferguson*, and a lot of those cases that allowed us not to treat African Americans as full human beings. Those could be easily responded to, but he chose not to do that. He chose not to open up and talk about his concerns.

We asked the Senate to continue this effort until we get a response from the candidate. And one of the things that I want to share is I know there is a lot of dialogue about the fact that we are Hispanics and we ought to be supportive. The reality is it is because he is Hispanic. We also want to hold that anyone accountable, but more so anyone who is Hispanic; and before we would ever go against it, we would make sure that it would be for the right reasons. One of the concerns that we have is that he is just not responsive. He has not, and the reality is that he does not have the experience that a lot of other attorneys have had.

Once again my colleagues say, well, he is well qualified. But we have a lot of municipal judges out there, we have district judges out there, we have had some of our own Members, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALES), has been a judge and has had some experience in that area. There is a great number of other people that are well qualified that could basically serve, but the administration chose to bring one of the most difficult candidates. At the same time, I know that the Senate has confirmed more than a hundred other candidates. So this is one candidate that we have a problem with.

The other side talks about the fact that, well, he is a Hispanic and that we ought to push forward because of the fact he is a Hispanic. Well, someone has to stand up and say the king has no clothing, and in this case, there is nothing there. Maybe there is. Maybe after he opens up and addresses the questions that are out there, we might decide that, yes, he ought to be nominated; but at this point, we stand on the fact that we are not endorsing the candidate and we are hoping that the Senate stays with that.

Let me talk about a couple of other nominees. I know we have had Richard Paez on the Federal district court in Los Angeles. On June 16, 1994, the Senate unanimously confirmed Richard Paez to the Federal district court. That was after he had waited for a long time before that ever occurred, and he was one of the ones that I think waited the longest, with difficulty. So we have had a lot of nominees that have waited a long time, and I would ask the Senate to take this nomination extremely serious and would ask them to really look at those issues that are before us.

I want to ask my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) who is here with me to say a few words because I know he participated on the committee, and I want to ask if he would come forward.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). If I might remind Members to be very cautious in their reference to the Senate. Members should not urge action by the Senate.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair. I will be.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), and I want to thank him because I know that in California LULAC has also decided to go in opposition to the nomination. So I know, coming from California, I want to thank him personally for that.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, let me begin first by thanking the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for yielding me some time and for taking this opportunity to speak on a very important issue which oftentimes, given the crush of the agenda here in Washington, D.C., potential war with Iraq, potential war with North Korea, with a growing budget deficit that is now surpassing \$200 billion for this year and we thought we were going to be looking at budget surpluses, the fact that more and more Americans are losing their jobs, the fact that we have more than 42 million Americans today that are without health insurance, the fact that in almost every State in the Union, Governors are talking about having to cut back on what they will do for schools, and as a father with three little girls, all of those things have to concern us. They certainly concern me.

So without putting aside those very important issues, I believe that it is important this evening to talk a little bit about another very important role that Congress plays with regard to the Nation's life; and, that is, helping select the lifetime appointees to our Federal courts. And I believe it is very important to point out that we are talking about a lifetime appointment. Once this individual who must be nominated by the President, then confirmed by the Senate, is so confirmed, that person is entitled to remain in that position until he or she expires. And so that person will be setting the course of this Nation's future, not just for us but for our kids and well beyond that with his or her actions and words.

For that reason, the Founding Fathers of this great Nation decided that while the President has the right to nominate, it is the obligation, the duty under the Constitution of our country for the U.S. Senate to confirm, to provide, as the words of the Constitution say, its role is to advise and consent the President of the United States.

It is very interesting in this particular case, as my colleague and friend from Texas has pointed out, that we have a nominee who has been nominated by the President, Mr. Miguel Estrada from the Washington, D.C.

area, to serve on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Some consider the Second Circuit Court of Appeals the second most important court in the land after the U.S. Supreme Court.

This individual who has been nominated by the President is in many respects a blank page. He has never served as a judge. He has not, as far as I know, written any legal articles, certainly not since his law school days. He has not provided any writings that are essential to determine what his philosophy is, what his background has been in the law. He is a question mark. Some would consider him a phantom candidate. And to believe that the U.S. Senate would just vote to confirm an individual, without going into the qualifications of an individual, is not only unconscionable but it is downright scary, and yet that is where we are today.

The worst part about this whole situation with this confirmation process is that it seems that some are trying to toy with this nomination and play this as a battle on ethnicity; that because Mr. Miguel Estrada, a U.S. citizen, is not being confirmed automatically because the President has nominated him, that it must be because people are anti-Hispanic.

I thought quite some time ago, the most important court of the land, the U.S. Supreme Court, decided that we do not operate in this country based on quotas and that a person does not get in because they have a particular ethnicity or they are a particular race or because they are a particular gender; that they must prove themselves. Certainly we can consider everything that makes a person an American, their background, all those factors, but that one factor alone does not grant a person the right to such an important position, certainly one where a person would serve for a lifetime.

But yet this controversial nominee, and across the Nation everyone is calling this a controversial nominee, is before the U.S. Senate. The President is asking for a vote on this gentleman, and this is an individual who has refused to answer some of the most basic, most fundamental questions that have been asked of previous nominees in the past, and it makes it very difficult to understand why we would want to go down the route of ever, ever confirming any individual who is not willing, who refuses to disclose information about himself or herself, that would lend to the Senate the ability to cast an informed judgment on whom should serve in the courts of this country to dispense justice for all of us as American citizens.

That constitutional duty that the Senators have should not and never has, as far as I know, been taken lightly. But in this particular case, when we have someone who has refused or failed to answer simple questions, who is your role model on issues of judicial philosophy, what cases have you seen as important in driving the legal agenda and the direction of our judicial

process in this country, simple questions are still unresolved.

Basic information in document form, at a time when we have a nominee who is such an unknown, open question, basic documents that relate to his work when he worked for the Solicitor General's Office for the Federal Government have not been disclosed, and the White House refuses to provide those documents.

It almost seems as if we are being told in this country that because Miguel Estrada happens to have a last name that is Hispanic, because he is of immigrant background, and I applaud all those things, what he has succeeded in doing in getting himself educated and hopefully becoming a successful citizen for the rest of his life, but because of that, does he receive a free pass to a lifetime appointment as a judge on the Federal bench?

I know that most of us here are very proud to be Members of an institution that has reflected a democracy older than any in the world's history, and I believe each and every one of us would say that we are proud that we have earned the right to be here because Americans helped us, through their vote, to get here. But we had to earn the opportunity to be here. No one granted us, as a result of some quota, an opportunity to serve in this House, and there is no difference in the importance of that other branch of government, the judiciary, than there is in the legislative branch, to prove your mettle, to show your qualifications, to indicate that you are prepared to demonstrate you have the disposition to be a judge.

It boggles the imagination to believe that in the Senate we may see a vote on an individual who is still an unknown commodity to the American public, someone who will be dispensing justice on the most important issues of the day: war, abortion, the right to education, health care, the rights of seniors. It seems incredible to believe that we have to stand here today to talk about this, but this controversial nominee has put us in this position.

I applaud those Senators, all of those Senators who are standing up not just for what they believe is right, but for the history of this country and standing up for the Constitution of the United States of America that says the Senate must, must perform its obligation to advise and give consent to the President of the United States on judicial nominees. I hope that they will continue to insist that anyone wishing to serve in a lifetime capacity dispensing justice in this country as a judge in the Federal courts will provide that information.

□ 2200

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Members are reminded to be very cautious about urging action by the Senate.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the Speaker for that admonition.

I believe it is very important as we move forward that Congress fulfill its obligations, and they are obligations that none of us here voted on to make it the law. It is something that was done more than 200 years ago by our Founding Fathers who believed when the Constitution of the United States was written back in 1787 that it was important to make sure that that co-equal branch of government, the legislature, participated in decisions that would be made by the executive branch, the President, to fill the third coequal branch of government, the judiciary.

I am very pleased that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) has taken the time to call for this special order to give us an opportunity to talk about this particular controversial nominee and what it means to the American public and to the American future when it comes to dispensing of justice. I hope that we can engage in further conversation.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) for being here tonight because I know that he worked diligently on that committee established by the Congressional Hispanic Caucus of which we, over 20 Congressmen throughout this country, represent a good number of the Hispanic population throughout this country. I know that as you well know how difficult it was for us to make this decision but we felt an obligation and responsibility.

I want to share with the gentleman, we had the LULAC group, the State group out of California, come forward.

Mr. BECERRA. For those who may not know what LULAC is, it is the League of United Latin American Citizens. It is the oldest civil rights organization representing Hispanics nationwide in the country.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I want to thank you because I know the State LULAC group out of California went forward in opposing the nomination. I have two letters here that I want to talk briefly about. They are both past Presidents of LULAC, they are all leaders in our community; President Robles, Belen Robles, in opposition to the confirmation of Miguel Estrada.

President Robles, President, National President of LULAC, past President, writes, I write to join other Latino leaders and organizations in opposing the confirmation of Miguel Estrada to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. As a native Texan, she writes, I have a very long and active involvement in the Latino civil rights community and have worked hard to ensure that Latinos have real choices about their lives. I am a past President of the League of United Latin American Citizens, LULAC.

I am deeply troubled with the nomination of Miguel Estrada. I am very troubled with the positions he seems to have taken about our youth being subjected to racial profiling. As I understand his position, he does not believe

that racial profiling exists, and has many times argued that the Constitution gives police officers unbridled authority and power. In our community, she writes, racial profiling does exist and our children have been subjected to it. This is an issue that Latino organizations, including LULAC, have long cared about. In all of the years that I was involved with civil rights, LULAC always stood to protect our community, including our youth, when law enforcement exceeds their authority.

I am also concerned, writes President Robles, that Mr. Estrada did not allow the Senate to fully evaluate his record. He was not open in his responses, but instead was evasive. Yet anyone appointed to a lifelong position has to be willing to answer questions fully. The American people have a right to know who sits in our seats of justice and to demand that person be fair.

Mr. Estrada has also taken actions against organizations that make me believe that he would not be fair. For example, she writes, as an attorney, he argued that the NAACP did not have legal standing to put forward the claims of African Americans who have been arrested under a particular ordinance. As a former National President of LULAC, she indicates, I know very well that on many occasions LULAC has been a champion of the rights of its membership in civil rights cases. We asserted those rights on behalf of voters in voting cases in Texas and in many other civil rights cases. Under his view, Mr. Estrada could decide that a civil rights organization such as LULAC would not be able to sue on behalf of its members. No supporter of civil rights could agree with Mr. Estrada's confirmation. For that, she writes, I oppose the confirmation of Miguel Estrada.

I know the gentleman has had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Robles, a great leader in this country, and has been there working in behalf of our constituency and continues to do that, and so I was very pleased to also have received her letter. I know the gentleman from California has had the pleasure of knowing her.

I also have before me, I wanted to share with you, because I was also pleased to hear from another past President of LULAC, and this is President Ruben Bonilla, in opposition to the confirmation of Miguel Estrada.

President Bonilla, as he expressed his concerns, talks about, and I will read just part of that. He says, it is particularly troubling that some of the Senators have accused Democrats or other Latinos of being anti-Hispanic, or holding the American dream hostage, he writes. Yet these same Senators in fact prevented Latinos appointed by the Clinton administration from ever being given a hearing. Notably, Corpus Christi lawyer Jorge Rangel, he recalls—President Bonilla is from Corpus—and also El Paso attorney Enrique Moreno and Denver attorney Christine Arguello never received hearings before

the Judiciary Committee. Yet these individuals who came from the top of their profession, were schooled in the Ivy League, were raised from modest means in the Southwest and in fact truly embodied the American dream. He further says, these highly qualified Mexican Americans never had the opportunity to introduce themselves and their views to the Senate as Mr. Estrada did.

In addition to my concerns regarding this double standard, and he talks about a double standard in his letter, I am also concerned that Mr. Estrada showed himself unwilling to allow the Senate to fully look at his record. He was not candid in his responses, as anyone who saw the interview would have come to that conclusion. Yet Mr. Estrada, as every other nominee who is a candidate for a lifelong appointment, must be prepared to fully answer basic questions, particularly where there is no prior judicial record.

In this case he has no record because he has never been a judge, so it is difficult, and you being an attorney can understand that, in terms of looking at how we can scrutinize or whether he is scholarly or not.

This is a comment by Ruben Bonilla, the past President of LULAC, also: By declining to give full and candid responses, he frustrated the process. Individuals with values should be called to explain those values honestly and forthrightly, he adds. He also indicated, we can demand no less from those who would hold a lifelong appointment in our system of justice.

Finally, I am also concerned, writes President Bonilla, with some of the answers that Mr. Estrada did give when he was pressed. For example, I understood that as an attorney, he argued that the NAACP did not have legal standing to press the claims of African Americans who had been arrested under a particular ordinance.

And he writes, as a former National President of LULAC, I know that on many occasions LULAC has represented the rights of its membership in voting cases and in other civil rights matters. I would be troubled that if he were confirmed, Mr. Estrada would not find a civil rights organization to be an appropriate plaintiff, and would uphold closing the courthouse door on them.

As we see these letters of these leaders, two Presidents of LULAC, we see the concerns that they have expressed, and mainly because of the lack of information that we have received and the fact that he has been unwilling to come forward. I am hoping that as we move forward, he might come back and respond to some of those questions.

I know that the gentleman from California wanted to make a few more comments.

Mr. BECERRA. I cannot agree with what the gentleman has said more. I believe the gentleman from Texas is helping to set the record straight. It is fascinating that as we are here discussing a very important subject of

who will serve for a lifetime on our judicial courts, that we have to discuss this in terms of brown versus white, Republican versus Democrat. I think it is unfortunate because, quite honestly, Miguel Estrada has been his own worst enemy, because he has refused to provide information that would give people sufficient ability to discuss and then entertain his nomination and vote on a confirmation. I think at the end of the day, if Mr. Estrada does not move farther through this confirmation process, he has only himself to blame.

Certainly I do not believe the administration, the White House, has done him any favors in refusing to produce the documents that would give the Senate a better sense of who this person, who has never served as a judge, who has never taught a class in law, who has not published an article on the law since law school days, is not willing to provide any additional information.

Because this has become a very intense debate by those wishing to make this into more than what it is, I think it is important to address those issues. Some people are saying, well, Democrats don't want this gentleman because he is Republican and he is conservative. You don't want a conservative Republican Hispanic. That goes contrary to the fact.

Last Congress when the Senate, in majority, was Democrat, you saw the Senate Democrats swiftly confirm six Hispanic judicial nominees who were chosen by President Bush: Christina Armijo of New Mexico, Judge Phillip Martinez of Texas, Randy Crane of Texas, Judge Jose Martinez of Florida, Magistrate Judge Alia Ludlum of Texas, and Jose Linares of New Jersey, all Republican, all Hispanic, all swiftly confirmed by Senate Democrats.

Then we have heard the charge made that, well, you don't want him simply because he is Hispanic, that Senate Democrats are anti-Hispanic; which would be farthest from the truth, because if you look back at the record, most of our appellate court judges, most of our district court judges, have been appointed by Democratic Presidents. I should only remind those who keep saying that of the 10 Hispanic appellate judges currently seated in the Federal courts, 8 were appointed by President Clinton. Three other Hispanic nominees of President Clinton's to the appellate courts, I should mention, were blocked by Republicans, as well as other district courts, the trial court level nominees by President Clinton, also blocked by Republicans when they controlled the Senate.

Some will say, well, what we are really finding is that you are just trying to get your kind of judge. The problem here is we do not know what kind of judge Mr. Estrada might be. We have no concept of it. He has been unwilling to volunteer information on that. So, first, that is an unfounded accusation because no one knows enough to say what kind of judge he would be, and,

secondly, everything that has been uttered or provided seems to indicate that he is far from the mainstream. But again it is tough to say. Maybe he is close to the mainstream. It would help if he would disclose some of that information so we could make a decision on this very controversial nomination.

It is interesting when you think that if the President really wanted to make a point about appointing an Hispanic as a judge, and I hope what they were looking for was an American who was extremely well qualified and prepared and happened to be Hispanic to be judge, but it seems like it was just the reverse, he was Hispanic and put him out there to be the judge, that the President would have taken the time, and others would have taken the time to recognize that if you want to get qualified individuals, there are over 1,000 sitting judges today in America, over 1,000 judges, State, Federal, local level judges throughout America who are American and happen to be Hispanic. But, no, instead of that, it looks like the White House picked someone who has very little record, very unwilling to disclose, and the White House is unwilling to provide documents to help us understand.

It is unfortunate but there is a constitutional obligation here and we must recognize that the Senate must do its job. As much as I want to see a diverse America prosper with a diverse judiciary, I will stand here and say that I am first and foremost an American, and I am very proud of it, and I am very proud of what I have been able to accomplish in life, having grown up in a home, was the first born in a place where we had about 580 square feet of house in a one-bedroom home for my three sisters and I, with parents who did not have much of an education. But we were very fortunate. We had great parents. They to this day continue to be great parents. That will drive others to greatness as well. But let it be that we prove ourselves. Let it be that we are willing to show who we are.

Is there something that Mr. Estrada is hiding? Is there any reason why the American public should wait until after the fact instead of before the fact to know about this gentleman that wishes to have a lifetime appointment?

□ 2215

Let us know now so we can make informed decisions on who will serve us on the bench, and I believe Congress that when we stand here and say that we find it very difficult to support a process to move forward on confirmation of Miguel Estrada, it does pain us. It pains us quite a bit because we know that on the judiciary we do not have the kind of diversity that we see today in America; but we want to see it filled with the most qualified, the most prepared individuals, those who have shown the temperament, the disposition to dispense justice for all Americans, whatever their color, whatever

their background; and that is why we have an obligation to insist as Americans and as Members of Congress that the Senate abide by the Constitution and its role to advise and consent and make sure that when the decision is made, they have made it for the right reasons for the entire American public.

And I cannot say at this stage that any of us can believe that this controversial nominee has gone anywhere near the point where anyone can feel comfortable voting to confirm him to a lifetime position. It is difficult to say; and I wish we did not have to stand here when there are other issues like potential war, poverty, unemployment, lack of health care, failing schools. Yet we must discuss this because we know the courts and these individuals who wish to be judges will be making decisions for all of our kids, all of our grandparents, our parents, our brothers and our sisters, our military men and women. They will be making decisions that affect their lives, and we have to make sure that the Senate does the right thing. So at this stage what can we say but continue, Senate, to fulfill the obligation, to receive the information they need, to be able to advise the President and then give consent if it is merited to any nominee that the President wishes to put before the Senate for confirmation as a lifetime judicial appointment.

I think it is great that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) has taken the time to have this Special Order here, and I hope we will continue to have this discussion. We are not debating. It is hard to debate someone we know little about. But it is great to discuss it because that is what America is all about.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) personally, but also maybe he can correct me if I am wrong, but I have been here 6 years and in the whole process this is one of the first nominees, I think, that we have opposed and the gentleman would correct me if I am wrong, and I know that we took it very seriously. We did not take it lightly. We recognized the importance of the nomination process, but as Latinos in this country, we also felt an obligation and responsibility to make sure that if there is anyone who is nominated up there that we feel that maybe they have not been forthcoming in their answers that that needs to happen, and so one of the things I think it is important is that here we have a Latino Hispanic who is not being responsive and for them I think the gentleman mentioned the issue of being anti-Hispanic. We are asking the person just to respond to the questions. Just as there would be an Anglo or anyone else, we would expect them to do the same.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, could I stop the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) on that point?

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECERRA. That is a crucial point because people are saying, you would not do this to anyone else and we have never done it to anyone else in the Senate. That is not true. What is being asked of the White House to produce memoranda that were prepared by Mr. Estrada during his time with the Solicitor General's office is no different than what was asked for of Judge Bork when he was before the Senate for confirmation to become a Supreme Court Justice. It is no different than what was asked of Mr. William Bradford Reynolds, who was nominated to be the Associate Attorney General for the Department of Justice. It is no different from what was asked of Benjamin Civiletti, who was nominated to be the Attorney General. It is no different than what was asked of Steven Trott, who was nominated to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, and it is no different than what was asked of today's Supreme Court Justice, Chief Justice William Rehnquist, when he was nominated to be the Supreme Court Chief Justice. No different.

People say we have never seen a process where Senators are on the floor preventing a vote on this through a cloture motion trying to prevent a filibuster. There is no filibuster. Business can take place in the Senate. That is something that is occurring not as a result of those objecting to this process on Mr. Estrada; and it should be mentioned that since 1980 there have been, I believe, some 15 to 18 occasions where this process which we are seeing played out in the Senate has occurred where in order to have a nominee before the full Senate for a vote, we would have had to have the 60-vote majority in order to get there. So when people get out there and say this is unprecedented, it has never happened before, that is just not the fact; and we should know that there is history to prove that we need Senators who will stand up for the American people and the Constitution to make sure that that person, once lifetime appointment is granted, will do the right job because he or she is qualified.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce the importance that people understand because I know we have heard some people say he is well educated, let us give him a chance. You might say to someone who is going to be elected for 2 years, let us give him a chance. That would be fine. But here is a person we are going to appoint for the rest of his life. It is not a chance. We do not have a chance to come back and take him down, if they are not qualified, if we find something else that they might have responded to or done or whatever. This is the time to do the right thing. These people get appointed for life. They do not have a second chance on this. So as an attorney, I know the gentleman recognizes that fully.

I also wanted to share that I got a letter that is signed by about 15 presidents of the Hispanic National Bar Association.

Mr. BECERRA. Hispanic presidents. Correct.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Fifteen members. Not just one, 15 past presidents of the Hispanic National Bar Association; and in their letter, if I can, let me just read a couple of quotes. It says: "We the undersigned past presidents of the Hispanic National Bar Association write in strong opposition to the nomination of Miguel A. Estrada for the judgeship on the Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia.

"Since the Hispanic National Bar Association, establishment in 1972, promoting civil rights and advocating for judicial appointments of qualified Hispanic Americans throughout our Nation have been our fundamental concerns. Over the years we have had a proven and respected record of endorsing," and I say again, "of endorsing" and also "not endorsing or rejecting nominees on a nonpartisan basis of both Republican and Democratic Presidents."

This is a group that has been both Democrat and Republican; and they go on to talk about their criteria, and they do a very good job of how they evaluate the nominee. And the gentleman's being an attorney, he probably understands some of this. Then they finally at the end say: "Based upon our review and understanding of the totality of Mr. Estrada's record and life's experiences, we believe that there are more than enough reasons to conclude that Mr. Estrada's candidacy falls short in these respect. We believe that for many reasons including his virtually nonexistent written record, his verbally expressed and 'nonreputed' extreme views, his lack of judicial or academic teaching experience (against which his fairness, reasoning skills and judicial philosophy could be properly tested), his poor judicial temperament," of which we experienced personally, "his total lack of any connection whatsoever to, or lack of demonstrated interest in the Hispanic community, his refusals to answer even the most basic questions about civil rights and constitutional law," and they go on, "his less than candid responses to other straightforward questions of Senate Judiciary Committee members, and because of the administration's refusal to provide the Judiciary Committee the additional information and cooperation . . ."

So it seems like the administration is kind of deliberately putting him on the front, knowing full well that there were concerns with this candidate; yet they chose to bring him forward, and we wonder why when my understanding is that the Senate has looked at over 100 candidates and they have all been approved. This is the first one that we have decided we are not going to approve because we do not have the right information.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is pointing out, I think, so very well is that no one wants to get up

and speak out against a nomination of an individual whom the President puts forward if we do not have to because we want to give respect to the decisions of the executive to move forward, but we have to do something. We have to speak up for what the Constitution stood for. And as someone who, as I said before, would love to see a diverse America reflected in its judiciary as well, it pains me, but we are acting now not as Hispanics. We are acting now not as Latinos. We are acting now not as minorities. We are acting as Members of Congress, the 435 of us in the House and 100 in the Senate, with the responsibility to act for the entire American public of some 280 million people.

Those 280 million people depend on us to make the right decisions, and it is not just for the 37 million Latinos in this country. It is not just for those who are immigrants. It is for everyone. And I would hate to see the day come when we believe that simply because the person is nominated by the President or the person looks or sounds a particular way that we will act a certain way. We have to be prepared on issues that require constitutional confirmation, that we move forward deliberately, that we have all the information that the public would want to have. No one back home, whether in the gentleman's district in Texas, my district in California, or any other district in this Nation, no one would go and look for an attorney or a doctor or a dentist or an accountant not knowing anything about the person's background. One would not have surgery by some doctor one has never met and know nothing about. One would not give an important case to an attorney that one knew nothing about, that one met on the street. One would not go to a dentist to pull out his wisdom teeth if they had no way of knowing that this person would do a decent job, and someone is not going to send their kids to any school without having some idea of what kind of education their child can receive.

And the same applies in the case of the courts of the United States for lifetime appointments. This controversial nominee should not expect that the American public will let his name move forward without knowing something about him; and when we have that information, then we can make some decisions. And I believe that there must be something he is hiding because for him not to come forward with it, if he is so qualified, he is so prepared, then he is holding himself up. As we say in Spanish, *es una hoja en blanco*, he is a blank page. *Es su peor enemigo*, he is his worst enemy, because it is he and the White House who have placed him in this predicament; and it is only he and the White House who can remove him from this predicament, and by goodness I hope that sooner or later they recognize that there are Senators who determined to fulfill their obligation to make sure

that we have the most qualified people serving on our judicial bench, and I hope they will continue that; and we are going to stand here day after day in vigil to make sure that we get across to the American public what is at stake here, not as Hispanics, not as minorities, but as Americans who are fighting to make sure that the best people are going to make those decisions on those courts for all of us.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is also from L.A., and I wanted to also mention to him that one of the leading organizations that is stationed there as an office in Los Angeles is MALDEF, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, and they have openly come out in opposition also of the nomination of Miguel Estrada, and I know the president and general counsel of MALDEF, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund, Antonia Hernandez, has strongly opposed the nomination; and I know that she has written letters on their behalf, and this is a well-respected organization within the Hispanic community throughout this country that when it comes to the legal area, the gentleman's being an attorney understands that they have been there on the forefront for our issues that confront us, and one of the things that I know concerned us when we did the evaluation was that here we had a candidate who was not willing to come forward and respond to the questions, and in some cases I kind of felt whether the person was either naive about our history as a community, as a Latino community in this country.

There is a history that has been out there, a history that depicted the struggle of Latinos in this country as we have confronted the issues of bilingual education, for example, that has been so important in our schools, and when we asked him whether he was aware or not of the *Lau v. Nichols*, I am not an attorney, but I know about *Lau v. Nichols* because it is a decision that has had a tremendous impact on the Hispanic community in this country because it is about bilingual education.

□ 2230

He was either naive about the law or chose not to respond in reference to the law.

So that really kind of concerned me, that he was not willing to come forward on that basic law that has meant so much to us. If someone, whether they be Anglo or Hispanic or whoever, if they have no history in terms of the importance of the struggles of African Americans in this country, the struggles of Hispanics in this country, the struggles of women in this country, what kind of judge are we going to be having?

So I think it is important, if nothing else, in terms of hearing whether there is even an understanding that there has been a struggle out there, whether he

has any history or understanding of what has occurred in the past, that has bothered me when we asked those questions.

Mr. BECERRA. In pointing out that the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund has taken an explicit position against him, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is absolutely right, that MALDEF has been at the forefront of issues affecting Latinos, and if anyone understands what the courts have meant to minorities and to the Hispanic community specifically, it is MALDEF; and having, I assume, tried to piece together whatever information they could get about this controversial nominee, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund has taken a position opposed to this controversial nominee.

I, with great respect, listened to what MALDEF says because they have been at the forefront. The gentleman mentioned *Lau v. Nichols*; *Plyler v. Doe*, which dealt with education, the basic right of education; *Bakke v. U.C. Board of Regents*, which dealt with diversity in our universities and colleges; MALDEF, they are at each one of those cases.

We need to know. What will happen when we have a court that is very divided on choice for women, where one vote could turn the situation in America on the Supreme Court, where we are right now debating whether there will be diversity in our institutions of higher learning before the United States Supreme Court? All of these things matter. The decisions made by the Senate to confirm or not an individual matter, because they will have an impact.

So before the decision is made, before the vote is cast, before the confirmation occurs, the Senate and the American public are entitled to know who this phantom nominee is.

Controversial nominees go the way of controversy, and in America I hope that means that they will not prevail. Controversy is not the way this democracy has operated. We try to come together as a people.

I believe that we have an opportunity to come together as a people and have the President put before the Senate individuals of full qualification who have the preparation to serve on our courts, the highest courts of the land.

I believe that we still can resolve this in a way that will be constructive for all. But let there be no mistake; there should be no give on this issue by any Senator, there should be no give by any American in this country, to the standards set forth by the Constitution more than 200 years ago. Those standards have served us well and we should continue in that vein.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BEAUPREZ). Members are reminded to be very cautious, once again, about urging action by the Senate.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for having yielded me so much time. I believe this is an important issue.

Perhaps it is cloaked by the many issues that are before us today that are of great importance to the American public. This is one of those issues that in the future would surface if it were a bad decision, and hopefully, if we can deal with this in a good way and make sure that we vote only on those who are forthright and forthcoming in information, that this will be something that in 10 years, in 20 years, in 100 years will not come back and bite us anywhere on our body, because what we do not want to see is that we diminish the standards that we use to place people in lifetime positions on the courts of the Federal Government. That is an important task.

I appreciate that the gentleman has taken the time to call for this special order.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. Nothing would be worse than to set a very negative precedent, where a person would be confirmed without having to respond to the questions that have come before them. Nothing would be more harmful to the Constitution, that allows the opportunity for the Senate to review nominees, than for them to go without asking for those questions to be asked.

Tonight I want to thank everyone for allowing us this opportunity, and I want to thank the Senate and those organizations throughout this country, the past presidents of LULAC who have also gone in opposition, as well as many other organizations throughout.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. 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 the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

THE NEED FOR FURTHER UNITED NATIONS ACTION ON IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to lay on the record information that needs to be brought to the attention of this body and every American as we struggle with the current crisis involving our relationship with Iraq.

We have seen a lot of information, in the media, a lot of public protests, both against and for action that this country might need to take, but there has been one major part of the debate that has been missing.

As we talk about Saddam Hussein and the need for him to abide by the agreement that he reached with the U.N. And the U.N. Security Council 12 years ago, as we discuss the fact that the U.N. inspectors have not yet been able to determine that he in fact has taken apart his weapons of mass destruction, there is in fact one set of facts, Mr. Speaker, that are obvious, that are documented, and that need action.

It is for this reason that I rise this evening to present to this body, our colleagues, our country and the world, the facts that will support a resolution that I will introduce in this body on Thursday of this week, a bipartisan resolution, with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and a whole host of other Democrats and Republicans, that calls for the President to require and request the U.N. to convene a special war crimes tribunal to hold Saddam Hussein accountable for the egregious acts against human beings that he has perpetrated over the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is certainly time that the world holds Saddam Hussein accountable.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are all over the place. They have been documented by human rights groups, by Amnesty International, by agencies of the U.N. and the U.S. Government, and by other nations around the world. In fact, there have been specific actions taken by the U.N. The United States budget in fiscal year 2001 and 2002 contributed \$4 million to a special U.N. Iraqi War Crimes Commission to document the evidence, some of which I am going to put out this evening.

The United Nations Security Council and the Commission on Human Rights have repeatedly condemned Iraq's human rights record. On April 19, 2002, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution drawing attention to "the systematic widespread and extremely grave violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law by the Government of Iraq resulting in an all-pervasive repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination and widespread terror."

In fact, the United Nations Security Council Resolution 674 called on all states to provide information on Iraq's war-related activities and atrocities to the U.N.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me as we heard Americans, especially those coming from Hollywood, recently on our national media outlets, praising and defending Saddam Hussein as a man who can be trusted, as someone who will do the right thing if just given the right amount of time.

It is amazing to me that this country went to war just a few short years ago, pushed very aggressively by France and Germany, to remove Milosevic from power in Yugoslavia because he was allegedly committing war crimes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am no fan of Milosevic. In fact, I think he is where he belongs, in the Hague before a war crimes tribunal. But, Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to lay out the evidence that will make the case that Saddam Hussein makes Milosevic look like a common street criminal. In fact, I am not the only one that feels this way, Mr. Speaker.

Let me quote from a recent op-ed that ran this past Sunday, written by Richard Holbrooke. Now, Richard Holbrooke was the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations under President Bill Clinton. Let me quote from Mr. Holbrooke's op-ed that ran nationwide this past weekend.

"When one considers that Saddam Hussein is far worse than Slobodan Milosevic and that Iraq has left a long trail of violated Security Council resolutions while there were none in Kosovo." So Richard Holbrooke, the U.N. Ambassador under President Clinton, has publicly acknowledged as recently as this past week that, in his opinion, Saddam Hussein is far worse than Slobodan Milosevic.

This country went to war to oust Slobodan Milosevic. This country murdered innocent Serbs with bombs to oust Slobodan Milosevic. And who pushed this country? France and Germany, because the French and Germans were concerned that Milosevic was in their neighborhood.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, in a quote from a book just recently released, *The Threatening Storm*, by the expert on Iraq during the Clinton administration in both the CIA and the Security Council, Ken Pollack, one section documents the Saddam Hussein regime in Iraq, and I want to quote from this book, which I think every Member of this body should read. It is page 122, discussing the Iraqi state and security. Again, this individual, Ken Pollack, is an acknowledged intelligence expert on Iraq. This is what he said:

"Max Van der Stoel, the former United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in Iraq, told the United Nations that the brutality of the Iraqi regime was of an exceptionally grave character, so grave that it has few parallels in the years that have passed since the Second World War."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, that the Saddam Hussein regime has not been equaled since Adolf Hitler. Not Slobodan Milosevic, who the Germans and French supported militarily to remove, but not since Adolph Hitler.

Let me continue. "Indeed, it is to comparisons with the obscurity of the Holocaust and Stalin's mass murders that observers are inevitably drawn when confronted with the horrors of Saddam's Iraq. Saddam's Iraq is a state that employs arbitrary execution, imprisonment and torture on a comprehensive and routine basis."

A full catalogue is not yet totally available, but tonight we are going to put on the record, Mr. Speaker, the examples that are available.

Let me read again some from Ken Pollack's account, and these are not the most pleasant facts, but they are facts, Mr. Speaker.

"This is a regime that will gouge out the eyes of children to force confessions from their parents and grandparents. This is a regime that will crush all the bones in the feet of a 2-year-old girl to force her mother to divulge her father's whereabouts. This is a regime that will hold a nursing baby at arm's length from its mother and allow the child to starve to death to force the mother to confess. This is a regime that will burn a person's limbs off to force him to confess or comply, a regime that will slowly lower its victims into huge vats of acid, either to break their will or simply as a means of execution. This is a regime that applies electric shocks to the bodies of its victims, particularly their genitals, with great regularity. This is a regime that in 2000 decreed that the crime of criticizing the regime, which can be as harmless as suggesting that Saddam's clothing did not match, would be punished by cutting out the offender's tongue.

□ 2245

A regime that practices systematic rape against its female victims. A regime that dragged in a man's wife, daughter, and female relative and repeatedly raped her in front of him. A regime that forced a white-hot metal rod into a person's anus or other orifices. A regime that employs thallium poisoning, widely considered one of the most excruciating ways to die. A regime that beheaded a young mother in the street in front of her house and children because her husband was suspected of opposing the regime. A regime that used chemical warfare on its own Kurdish citizens, not just on the 15,000 that were killed and maimed at Halabja, but on scores of other villages all across Kurdistan. A regime that tested chemical and biological warfare agents on Iranian prisoners of war and used the POWs in controlled experiments to determine the best ways to disperse these agents to inflict the greatest damage.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, I quote, and is from the documentation by Ken Pollack, the intelligence expert on Iraq during the Clinton administration in the book available to everyone in America entitled "The Threatening Storm."

But, Mr. Speaker, it is not just Ken Pollack. In fact, the citations and documentations of the violations of human rights by Saddam Hussein are overwhelming and comprehensive. As a member of the Human Rights Caucus in this Congress, I am outraged that there has been no solid vocal outcry, not just from this body and America, but from those countries in Europe, especially Germany and France, who claim to be for the human rights of innocent people.

Let me summarize. The methods of torture, the human rights abuses documented by our special military commission looking into our own POWs that Saddam held against the Geneva Convention that controls the treatment of prisoners. Let me read the documentation in summary.

Americans experienced the following: 21 service members captured during Desert Storm were all covered by the Geneva protections. They were beaten

to the rhythm of songs. The beatings were done by led pipes, by clubs, by rifle butts, by rubber hoses, by black jacks and batons, by kicks and punches to the face, neck, ears, prior injuries, genitals and kidneys. Malice to their knees, cat-o'-nine tails, burning of individuals with cigarettes, including the butts being placed into open wounds. Urination on POWs. Genital investigations and harassment to determine if POWs were circumcised as Jews. Mock executions, threatened dismemberment, threatened castration, cattle prod shocking, talkman shocking, electrocuted wires run around a person's head attached to the ears, causing massive convulsions in the jaw, knocking out teeth, sexual abuse, fingernail extraction, person hung by their feet with barbed wire.

Mr. Speaker, these were American citizens, and this is how they were treated by Saddam Hussein in direct violation of the international agreements on caring for prisoners of war. This was not made up, Mr. Speaker. These are documented cases involving America's sons and daughters.

Where is the outcry in America? Where is the outcry in Hollywood and from those experts on TV and the movies who claim to know all about how Americans were treated by this madman in Baghdad? And what about the actions that have been documented by Amnesty International, by all of the major groups that monitor human rights of what Saddam did against the Kuwaitis and the Kurds?

Let me again run through some of those cases that have been documented, including knifings, boring holes in bodies with drills, tongue and ear removal, hammering nails into hands, eye-gouging, inserting broken bottlenecks into rectums, pumping air and gasoline through people through their rectums and other orifices and then igniting the gasoline until the bodies exploded. Pouring acid on skin, forcing detainees to watch the torture, rape and execution of others and relatives, random and unjustified killings, electric shocks to the mouth, forcing women to eat flesh cut from their own body, removal of eye balls, placement of people into rotating washing machines, execution by electric drill, cutting with razors, rubbing salt into wounds, castrations, blow torches, suspension from ceiling fans.

Mr. Speaker, all of these actions are documented and conducted and ordered by Saddam Hussein and those people currently in control in Baghdad.

Where is the outrage, Mr. Speaker? France and Germany, pushing America to go in to remove Milosevic who committed ethnic cleansing; none of the charges against Milosevic at the Hague at this point in time come anywhere near the atrocities that Saddam Hussein has been documented as having committed on a regular and routine basis. There is no shame in those countries, Mr. Speaker, because it is unbelievably a double standard and total hypocrisy.

Let us talk about some of the documented human rights violations within Iraq. Again, these are all documented, Mr. Speaker, documented through extensive files, portions of which I will lay into the RECORD this evening for our colleagues to review. In Iraq, this is what Saddam has done: killing of prison inmates to account for overcrowding. Loss of freedoms of speech, press, assembly, association, religion, movement and due process; arbitrary punishment of death for suspected violations of laws, political disagreements and social actions; beheading of prostitutes and displaying of heads. Iraq is the country with the highest number of disappearances reported to the working group on enforced and involuntary disappearances established by the Commission on Human Rights. Beating of Iraqi soccer players because they lost a game. Refusal to permit visits by human rights monitors. Campaign of murder, summary execution and protracted arbitrary arrests against religious followers of the Shia Muslim population, the Kurds. Harassment and intimidation of relief workers and U.N. personnel, removal of children of unwanted minority groups to get them from cities and regions, and only 48 percent of the supplied medicines and equipment to clinics and hospitals. The rest were in government warehouses overflowing.

This is a man who challenged our President to a debate. What an absolute joke, Mr. Speaker. This man deserves to debate no one. This man deserves to be taken to the Hague and deserves to have a war crimes tribunal convened to lay out all of the charges that have been brought forward against him in a formal way by the U.N., and this resolution we will put into place on Thursday will have this body go on record in asking that that be done.

Let us talk about the chronology of murder of Saddam Hussein, Mr. Speaker, again, all documented. Not documented by the U.S. Government; documented by international groups that monitor human rights, documented by the U.N. special rapporteur for human rights. Let us go through them in a chronological order.

In 1979, the purge of the Baath Party leadership, members were forced to confess to invented crimes and then arbitrarily executed. Family members were held hostage. In 1980, Saddam led the attacks on the Fayli Kurds, removal of the Kurds in Baghdad and the southern cities of Kut, Basra and Hilla. Forced expulsions from homes to Iran. Execution of most captured young males; there was an unknown amount of these young males that were executed. Fourteen tons of captured Iraqi secret police documents, videotapes and pictures provided a character of Iraqi rule over the Kurds that has been matched by no one since the great Holocaust of World War II. In fact, there is enough paperwork to document over 200,000 murders.

Mr. Speaker, where are the French and the Germans who cried to America

to get Milosevic out of power for his ethnic cleansing, when we have documentation through the U.N. and these NGOs that Saddam Hussein has been responsible for the murder of 200,000 people? In 1980, Mr. Speaker, the invasion of Iran, a clear violation of article 2, section 4 of the U.N. charter. Launch of indiscriminate attacks on civilian targets. Use of human shields, physical and mental torture of captives, all documented, on-file offenses. Eight military offensives in 1988. Systematic campaign of extermination and genocide waged against the Kurdish population of northern Iraq. Code name Anfal comes from a Koranic verse that legitimizes the right to plunder women and the property of infidels. During this time there were mass executions and indiscriminate killings of fighters and civilians. There was an order very similar to the Nazi order of "sturm and nebel" to proclaim thousands of square kilometers of Kurdistan to be a free-fire zone in which neither human nor animal life was to remain.

Saddam during that time used chemical weapons and poison gas. He forced resettlement. He destroyed between 1,000 and 2,000 villages. The estimated killings during that period was between 50,000 and 100,000; but it may be as high as 182,000 people. There were 16,496 reported disappearances in 1988.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the French and the Germans. Where is their outrage, Mr. Speaker? Are the French so blinded by oil that their principles have gone down the cess-pool? Was Slobodan Milosevic so bad that he is in the Hague being tried, but Saddam Hussein who has committed these crimes is not worthy of action by the U.N.?

Let us go on, Mr. Speaker. In 1990, the invasion of Kuwait, Saddam orders to kill any civilian found after curfew or bearing anti-Iraqi slogans on homes. A violation of the clear contravention of article 2, section 4 of the U.N. charter. Systematic torture as a method of extracting information. Holding thousands of foreign hostages to dissuade their countries from joining the coalition and used as human shields, including Americans.

In 1991, the invasion in March, attacks on civilians following a cease-fire in the cities of Basra, Najaf, Karbala; massive executions, bombarding residential areas, destroying religious shrines. And how about other actions before 2000, Mr. Speaker? Mass executions in a grave in Burjesiyya, a district near Zubair south of Basra, torturing and extended detentions preceding the deaths due to suspicion of political demonstrations. In April 14, 1999, 56 detainees charged with treason who were executed at Abu Ghraib on August 10 of 1999; 26 prisoners were executed at Abu Gharab prison. March of 1999, the bombarding of residential areas of tribes by an armored division number 6 in Basra, Al-Ghameigh, Bail Wafi and Bait Sayed Noor. January, February, 1999, destruction of 52 houses

of political opponents with bulldozers in Basra, nine in Jamhuriyah, five in Al-Zubier, seven in Al-Karmah, 12 in Abo Al-Khaseib, and five in Al-Tanumah. July 20, 1999, demolished six houses in Thawra after the detention of their entire families.

□ 2300

But here is a man, Mr. Speaker, who has a family of human rights abusers of the worst possible kind. It is not just Saddam.

His son, Udai Hussein, created the Saddam's martyrs, who go around, 30,000, dressed in black, and they are known for executing and doing gruesome public spectacles of killing the President's critics. In fact, he is known, when there is a sporting loss, for torturing and in some cases killing the athletes because they have not been successful. His group has also been known to abduct women from the streets.

Qusai Hussein, the deputy for his father's military security and intelligence, heads Amn al-Khass, and they have also conducted outrages against innocent people.

Finally, Lieutenant General Hussein Kamal Hassan al-Majid, is known as "Chemical Ali" for his brutality against the Kurds, especially for his use of weapons procurement and weapons of mass destruction, and being able to sneak in those supplies that the U.N. has prohibited.

This individual defected. He returned to Iraq after having received a pardon. What happened? Saddam murdered him and he murdered his family, his own blood relatives.

Mr. Speaker, we have people in this country and we have people in France, we have Jacques Chirac, saying we should trust Saddam Hussein, just give him time. Mr. Speaker, it is time to lay the facts on the table. It is time to hold Saddam Hussein accountable.

Whether one is for military action or against it, this resolution does not discuss that. Whether one supports Iraq, whether one disagrees and does not support Iraq, whether one thinks there should be more time, 2 months, 5 months, 12 years, it does not apply to this resolution. This resolution simply says that we must hold this regime responsible for the crimes they have committed against humanity.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to hold this man accountable, at least equal to the way we are holding Slobodan Milosevic accountable.

Mr. Speaker, just a few short years ago there were claims from the administration that there would be mass graves that we would find in Serbia containing perhaps millions of bodies. Well, several years after the fact, the truth did not quite bear that out. That is not to lessen the atrocities of Milosevic; he is a war criminal, make no mistake about it. But there was a gross exaggeration of what he had done, even though the crimes he committed were outrageous. He is being

held accountable for those crimes right now at the Hague, in a trial that has been going on for almost a year.

Mr. Speaker, the French and the Germans, where were they in this case? They were pushing America: Get your troops over here, America. Get this man out of power. He is a brutal dictator. He has committed ethnic cleansing. Help us rid Europe of him because of the crimes he has committed against humanity. In the words of Richard Holbrooke, who was our U.N. Ambassador during the nineties under Bill Clinton, Slobodan Milosevic does not come anywhere near Saddam Hussein in terms of committing war crimes.

Mr. Speaker, do I detect a double standard here? Do the French think that Milosevic is worse than Saddam? The U.N. does not think so. Are the French denying the facts of the U.N. special rapporteur? Are the French and Germans not realizing the gross atrocities that have occurred against human beings, or do they not want to admit to what occurred?

Let me go through some more evidence, Mr. Speaker. I take this information from the Report on Iraqi War Crimes prepared under the auspices of the U.S. Army. This was released on March 19, 1993, as a result of an intense investigation of our own citizens who were captured by Saddam. These are specific cases. Americans and members of this body can ask for the documentation of these cases and they can get them.

POW number 1, file number 176.1. Our own Americans were exhibited as war prizes. They were urinated on. They were beaten constantly, including to the rhythm of a song on a radio.

POW number 2, file number 176.2. He was abandoned by his captors in spite of having a broken leg. In fact, they put an Arab headdress on him.

POW number 3, file number 176.3. Saddam's troops beat and kicked him while being transported; punched him in the face; hit him in the head with a rifle; kicked him in a circle, and injured his leg; beaten severely with a lead pipe; and from the guards' boots smeared on the face. He had multiple cigarette burns all over his body from Saddam's leaders.

POW number 4, file number 176.4. American POW. Dragged by the hair, kicked by the captors, sexually molested during transport, slapped and spat upon, threatened with death. That was a female, Mr. Speaker.

Where are those in America expressing outrage at what this man ordered to be done to our citizens?

POW number 7, file number 176.7. Karate-chopped, forced to make a videotape.

POW number 9, beaten with fists, batons, rifle butts; kicked in the head and legs broken; beaten to the rhythm of a song; knocked unconscious many times; forced to make a videotape; beaten in the stomach and back with club, resulting in long-term pain to his kidneys; eye injuries from his beatings.

Mr. Speaker, these are actions documented by Saddam Hussein against American citizens. We have Saddam Hussein now on international TV proclaiming he is for peace, he is against war. Mr. Speaker, cut me a break. Are we that naive? Are we that short of our memory that we do not understand what this man has done over the past 20 years?

Let me go through some more examples, Mr. Speaker.

As we know, in capturing a prisoner-of-war, the only thing a prisoner has to do is to state their surname, first and last name and rank, their date of birth, and their army or unit that they are involved with. That is all they have to give under the special protections under the Geneva Convention. That is it.

In the case of our POWs, Saddam consistently, along with his military, grossly abused their rights and tortured them. In fact, he forced them to do things that are absolutely sickening to read.

POW number 12, assaulted twice with a cattle prod; beaten with a hard rubber stick while being interrogated by the voice; assaulted with a stun gun; an AK-47 placed against his head and threatened with execution as a war criminal; threatened with dismemberment; shocked with a Talkman; multiple beatings.

POW 13, struck with hands, fists, a wooden club, blackjack, and sticks; punctured his eardrums; loosened his teeth from the beatings; beaten so severely he could not walk and could not stand.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lawsuit that has been filed in the courts of the District of Columbia. The lawyer represents these brave American POWs who are suing Saddam and Iraq because of what he did to them. Is America going to stand behind these brave young people? Are we going to stand up and hold Saddam accountable for what he did, or can they only sue civilly in a court, as documented by this lawsuit?

Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask special permission to have texts of this lawsuit entered into the RECORD, even though it will cost extra money, because I want every one of our colleagues and every American to understand the facts of what was done to our citizens by Saddam Hussein and by his evil subordinates in his military.

Let us go on to Article 32, documented by the Army also back in 1993, the specifics of some of which I mentioned already.

Iraq's violation and Saddam's violations of Article 27 and 32, which were absolutely outrageous: torturing Kuwaiti nationals. Widespread and barbaric actions, such as beatings on all parts of the body with various implements; beating people while they were suspended in air; hanging with cables; breaking appendages; knifings; extracting their finger- and toenails; boring holes in their body with drills; cutting

off their tongues and ears; cutting off their body parts with saws; gouging out their eyes; castrations; hammering nails into their hands; shootings; rapes; inserting broken bottlenecks into their rectums; pumping air or gasoline into their orifices; pouring acid on their skin; Asian and Kuwaiti women routinely raped by Iraqi soldiers; all of this documented by the official commission of our Army and sent to the U.N. for further action.

How about some specific cases, Mr. Speaker, that were also filed with the U.N. that took place in Kuwait City?

□ 2310

This Kuwaiti citizen file number 66.01015 was arrested by the Iraqis at his home on the 23rd of December 1990 and held until mid-December. During his captivity he received repeated beatings and electric shocks to his mouth, nose and genitalia. He was suspended from the ceiling and subjected to mock executions. He witnessed the torture of other Kuwaitis by techniques which included forced ingestion of gas causing abdominal pains, forcing a woman to eat flesh cut from her own body, an execution by ax, removal of eyeballs, dismemberment, burning with a hot iron, execution by electric drill, and placement of a person into a large rotating washing machine.

Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with a human being. We are dealing with an animal. We are not dealing with a person that we can have some feeling of a moral authority. This man is the lowest of the low, Mr. Speaker. It has all been documented through thousands of pieces of information assembled by nonprofit organizations, organizations concerned with human rights violations by governments around the world and by the U.N. itself. It has been documented. It is time to hold him accountable.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man, with all the documentation we have, who some people say we should trust. If you listen to Jacques Chirac, whose country has millions of dollars of oil contracts with Saddam Hussein and who himself is a personal friend of Saddam's, we should trust this man. Shame on Jacques Chirac. Mr. Speaker, shame on Jacques Chirac. By defending someone like Saddam Hussein, by not having his government take action to hold this man accountable, he has no moral authority. In fact, in my opinion he has no credibility.

Our government, Mr. Speaker, can do the right thing. Members on both sides of the aisle have introduced resolutions in the past 10 years. The Senate has voted on a resolution in the past 10 years. One of my Democrat colleagues offered a resolution, has an amendment in the Committee on International Relations just recently holding Saddam accountable.

This body has repeatedly publicly called on the U.N. to hold Saddam accountable, and I think we should do it again, Mr. Speaker. And so, therefore,

this Thursday I will introduce along with colleagues from both sides of the aisle, there are already over 25 co-sponsors, and I urge all of my colleagues to sign on to a resolution to ask our President to appeal to the U.N. to convene a special war crimes tribunal against Saddam Hussein.

Mr. Speaker, we did that for Milosevic, and he is today being tried for those crimes he committed against innocent people in the former Yugoslavia. Innocent Kosovars, innocent Serbs, innocent Montenegrans, innocent people that Milosevic thought he could abuse. He deserves the full weight of the punishment meted out by that special tribunal.

Is Saddam Hussein any less deserving of a tribunal? Are all of these cases documented by the U.N., by these NGOs, by other governments, should we just discard them and pretend that they do not exist and let Saddam go on as if nothing has happened?

Mr. Speaker, we have not done right by the American people. We talk about the need to deal with Saddam because he has chemical precursors for his weapons of mass destruction, because he has missiles that will go longer than what the U.N. said he could. They are all violations, and they are all material breaches of the agreements that were reached by Saddam and the U.N. 12 years ago. But why, Mr. Speaker, is there not more discussion about this man for the evil person that he is?

The U.N. special rapporteur said, No one has come close to this kind of activity since World War II, since the great Holocaust. No one, Mr. Speaker, including Milosevic. Is the world going to ignore the activities of Saddam Hussein? Are we going to ignore the atrocities he committed against our own people when they were captured? If that is the case, then international agreements mean nothing. The Geneva Convention has no basis. The Helsinki Final Act has no meaning. If we are not going to hold leaders who commit such outrageous acts accountable, then we might as well not have those acts, those agreements existing in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this body, our body can take action soon, to lay out to the world those who support military action and those who oppose military action, that regardless of whether or not you think war is inevitable, there is one thing that we all can agree on: Saddam Hussein is a war criminal. There is no doubt about that.

Those who understand the facts, those who look at the documents, those who see the evidence understand that this man comes as close to Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin as anyone that we have seen in the last several decades.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to our colleagues to co-sponsor this legislation before I drop it. Our colleagues have that opportunity. Democrats and Republicans are already on. We have over 25 Members and that was in the

first day. I would hope that we would end up with over 300 co-sponsors and send a signal to the world that Saddam Hussein is an unacceptable leader because of his war crimes.

Again, Mr. Speaker, and I know I have said this before, but it really irks me because initially I opposed the Kosovo war, not because I support Milosevic, he is a war criminal, but because I felt that we had not brought Russia in to use their influence to get Milosevic out of power. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I led a delegation to Vienna with five of our Democrat colleagues and five of our Republican colleagues. We took a State Department official. And with the support of our State Department, we flew to Vienna; and for 2 days around the clock working with the leaders of the Russian political factions, we fashioned a statement that called Milosevic a war criminal for his ethnic cleansing. We laid the groundwork with the help of the Russians that became the basis of the G-8 document to end the war 10 days later.

Mr. Speaker, we were prodded into war against Milosevic by the French and the Germans. They were bold back then. They did not want to put their own troops in harm's way without America being there. So we went into Kosovo. America was the number one supplier of the military. There were more American planes than there were any other nation, even though Yugoslavia is not far away from France and Germany. The French and Germans came in after us, but they pushed us the whole way. And why? Because they said Milosevic was a war criminal who had abused people. And they were right. But, Mr. Speaker, so is Saddam Hussein, only a far worse war criminal than Milosevic ever was. Those are not my words. Those are the words of Richard Holbrook, U.N. Ambassador for the United States under President Clinton in an op-ed he wrote this past week. Those are the words of the special rapporteur of the U.N. who said that Saddam Hussein's regime has no equal since World War II.

□ 2320

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that every one of our colleagues would cosponsor the resolution to hold Saddam Hussein accountable for war crimes. It is a very simple resolution and I at this point in time enter that resolution into the RECORD so that all of our citizens, all of our colleagues can see the text, the documents, the actions, that we now request of the United Nations against Saddam Hussein.

H. RES. —

Whereas in 2001 and 2002, the Department of State contributed \$4,000,000 to a United Nations Iraq War Crimes Commission, to be used if a United Nations tribunal for Iraqi war crimes is created;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights have repeatedly condemned Iraq's human rights record;

Whereas Iraq continues to ignore United Nations resolutions and its international human rights commitments;

Whereas on April 19, 2002, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights passed a resolution drawing attention to "the systematic, widespread and extremely grave violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law by the Government of Iraq, resulting in an all-pervasive repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination and widespread terror";

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 674 calls on all states or organizations to provide information on Iraq's war-related atrocities to the United Nations;

Whereas Iraq's aggressive pursuit of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and its past use of weapons of mass destruction against its own people and Iraq's neighbors illustrates the danger of allowing Saddam Hussein to go unchallenged;

Whereas torture is used systematically against political detainees in Iraqi prisons and detention centers;

Whereas this regime gouges out the eyes of the victims, crushes all of the bones in their feet, and burns a person's limbs off to force him to confess or comply; and

Whereas citizens of Iraq live in constant fear of being tortured, kidnapped, or killed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That consistent with Section 301 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (Public Law 102-138), House Concurrent Resolution 137, 105th Congress (approved by the House of Representatives on November 13, 1997), and Senate Concurrent Resolution 78, 105th Congress (approved by the Senate on March 13, 1998), the Congress urges the President to call upon the United Nations to establish an international criminal tribunal for the purpose of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials who are responsible for crimes against humanity, genocide, and other criminal violations of international law.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the resolution which does not have yet a number, lays out the fact that we spent, as I said earlier, \$4 million in each of the past 2 years for a special U.N. Iraqi War Crimes Commission. It is already in place, continuing from the 1990s. American tax dollars are being used to support this U.N. effort.

This war crimes commission has, in fact, seen resolutions passed by the Security Council and the Commission on Human Rights as recently as April 19 of 2002, U.N. Security Council Resolution 674, all of which deal with Saddam Hussein's abuses of human rights. This resolution says, and resolves, that consistent with section 301 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, the House concurrent resolution and the Senate concurrent resolution, that the Congress urges the President to call upon the United Nations to establish an International Criminal Tribunal for the purpose of indicting, prosecuting, and imprisoning Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi officials who are responsible for crimes against humanity, genocide, and other criminal violations of international law.

Mr. Speaker, we can do no less.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and February 26 on account of official business.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUPPERSBERGER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MURPHY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OXLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HYDE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RENZI, for 5 minutes, February 26.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, February 26.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 151. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sexual exploitation of children, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent Resolution welcoming the expression of support of 18 European nations for the enforcement of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title,

which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 2. Joint resolution making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on February 19, 2003 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.J. Res. 2. Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 26, 2003, at 1:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

706. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report listing the aggregate number, locations, activities, and lengths of assignments for all temporary and permanent U.S. military and civilians involved in Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106—246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

707. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Report pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

708. 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 under a contract to Belgium (Transmittal No. DTC 004-03), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

709. 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 under a contract to the United Arab Emirates (Transmittal No. DTC 213-02), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

710. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bi-monthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period December 1, 2002 through January 31, 2003, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

711. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Affirmative Employment Program Accomplishments Report for the period of September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3905(d)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

712. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-570, "Exclusive Right Agreement Time Period Temporary Amendment Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

713. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-569, "Disposal of District Owned Surplus Real Property Temporary Amendment Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

714. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-568, "Insurance Compliance Self-Evaluation Privilege Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

715. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-490, "Carl Wilson Basketball Court Designation Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

716. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-571, "Health Organizations RBC Amendment Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

717. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-572, "Uniform Interstate Enforcement of Domestic Violence Protection Orders Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

718. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-573, "Investments of Insurers Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

719. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-575, "Surname Choice Amendment Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

720. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-574, "Housing Production Trust Fund Affordability Period Temporary Amendment Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

721. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-576, "Draft Master Plan for Public Reservation 13 Approval Act of 2002" received February 25, 2003, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting copies of the inventories of commercial positions in the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

723. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on the "EPA's Inventory of Commercial Activities"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

724. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting a report entitled, "Increased Penalties Under The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002," pursuant to

Public Law 107—204, section 1104(a)(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

725. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A, 205A-1, 205B, 212, 412, 412EP, and 412CF Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-37-AD; Amendment 39-12737; AD 2002-09-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

726. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727, 727c, 727-100, 727-100C, 727-200, and 727-200F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-12703; AD 2002-07-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

727. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A Helicopters; Correction [Docket No. 2000-SW-46-AD; Amendment 39-12674; AD 2002-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

728. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700 and 701) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-99-AD; Amendment 39-12731; AD 2002-08-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

729. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, AS350B1, AS350B2, AS350B3, AS350BA, AS350C, AS350D, AS350D1, AS355E, AS355F, AS355F1, AS355F2, and AS355N Helicopters; Correction [Docket No. 2001-SW-20-AD; Amendment 39-12680; AD 2002-06-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

730. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-76A Helicopters; Correction [Docket No. 2000-SW-46-AD; Amendment 39-12674; AD 2002-05-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

731. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-04-AD; Amendment 39-12736; AD 2002-09-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

732. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Model F-28, F-28A, F-28C, F28F, 280, 280C, 280F, and 280FX Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-67-AD; Amendment 39-12710; AD 2002-08-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

733. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-08-AD; Amendment 39-12711; AD 2002-06-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

734. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA341G, SA342J, and SA-360C Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-72-AD; Amendment 39-12725; AD 2002-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

735. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Schweizer Aircraft Corporation Model 269A, 269A-1, 269B, 269C, and TH-55A Helicopters [Docket No. 2001-SW-58-AD; Amendment 39-12726; AD 2001-25-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

736. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-43-AD; Amendment 39-12797; AD 2002-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

737. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. [Docket No. 2002-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-12823; AD 2002-14-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

738. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11 and -11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-33-AD; Amendment 39-12815; AD 2002-14-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

739. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Teledyne Continental Motors; Correction [Docket No. 2000-NE-19-AD; Amendment 39-12792; AD 2002-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

740. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-200 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No. 98-ANE-43-AD; Amendment 39-12797; AD 2002-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

741. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier-Rotax GmbH Type 912 F and 914 F Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-08-AD; Amendment 39-12865; AD 2002-16-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

742. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier-Rotax GmbH 912 F and 912 S Series Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-12889; AD 2002-19-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

743. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. TPE331 Series Turboprop and TSE331-3U Series Turbohaft Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-53-AD; Amendment 39-12922; AD 2002-21-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

744. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757-200, -200CB, and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-392-AD; Amendment 39-12921; AD 2002-21-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

745. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited, Aero Division-Bristol, S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Mk. 610-14-28 Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-12981; AD 2002-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

746. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700 & 701) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-269-AD; Amendment 39-12995; AD 2002-26-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

747. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cirrus Design Corporation Models SR20 and SR22 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-31-AD; Amendment 39-12973; AD 2002-24-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

748. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Britten-Norman Limited BN2T and BN2T-4R Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-34-AD; Amendment 39-12974; AD 2002-24-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

749. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-50-AD; Amendment 39-12975; AD 2002-22-51] received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

750. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; MT-Propeller Entwicklung GMBH Models MTV-9-B-C and MTV-3-B-C Propellers; Correction [Docket No. 99-NE-35-AD; Amendment 39-12953; AD

2002-23-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

751. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, -20, -30, -40, and -50 Series Airplanes; and C-9 (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-287-AD; Amendment 39-12979; AD 2002-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

752. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-293-AD; Amendment 39-12994; AD 2002-26-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

753. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-271-AD; Amendment 39-12970; AD 2002-24-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

754. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Britten-Norman Limited BN-2 and BN2A Mk. III Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-35-AD; Amendment 39-12980; AD 2002-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

755. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, 700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes; Model 747 Series Airplanes; and Model 757 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-309-AD; Amendment 39-12992; AD 2002-24-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

756. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-314-AD; Amendment 39-12993; AD 2002-24-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

757. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor, Inc. Models AT-502A, AT-502B, and AT-503A Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-54-AD; Amendment 39-12991; AD 2002-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

758. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), (DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-216-AD; Amendment 39-12912; AD 2002-21-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

759. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited,

Aero Division-Bristol, S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Mk. 610-14-28 Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-28-AD; Amendment 39-12956; AD 2002-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

760. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited., Aero Division-Bristol, S.N.E.C.M.A. Olympus 593 Mk. 610-14-28 Turbojet Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-29-AD; Amendment 39-12990; AD 2002-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

761. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135 and -145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-348-AD; Amendment 39-13008; AD 2002-26-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

762. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines, Correction [Docket No. 2000-NE-47-AD; Amendment 39-12916' AD 2002-21-10] RIN: 2120-AA64 received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

763. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF34-8C1 Turbofan Engines, Correction [Docket No. 2002-NE-13-AD; Amendment 39-12946; AD 2002-23-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

764. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-48-AD; Amendment 39-12982; AD 2002-21-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 14, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

765. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the fifth annual report on the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOEHRNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 13. A bill to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 254. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to agree to certain amendments to the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States concerning the establishment of a

Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank, and for other purposes (Rept. 108-17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 534. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning (Rept. 108-18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 657. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to augment the emergency authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission (Rept. 108-19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 868. A bill to amend section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 to require that certain claims for expropriation by the Government of Nicaragua meet certain requirements for purposes of the prohibition on foreign assistance to that government; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for host families of foreign exchange and other students from \$50 per month to \$200 per month; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCREERY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 870. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain motor vehicle dealer transitional assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 871. A bill to amend the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995 concerning the applicability of hours of service requirements to drivers operating commercial motor vehicles transporting agricultural commodities and farm supplies; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 872. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that church employees are eligible for the exclusion for qualified tuition reduction programs of charitable educational organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 873. A bill to amend title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to raise awareness of eating disorders and to create educational programs concerning the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. QUINN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 874. A bill to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 875. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for security improvements to over-the-road bus operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 876. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax for expenditures for the maintenance of railroad tracks of Class II and Class III railroads; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 877. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve patient safety; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 878. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services and Foreign Service 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, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 879. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for certain servicemembers to become eligible for educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. FARR, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 880. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to accelerate to 2007 the application of the requirement that a tanker that carries oil in bulk as cargo must be equipped

with a double hull, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KELLER, Ms. HART, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PENCE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

H.R. 881. A bill to disapprove certain sentencing guideline amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLISH:

H.R. 882. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualified small issue bond provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 883. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the fee for collecting specimens for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 884. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Western Shoshone identifiable group under Indian Claims Commission Docket Numbers 326-A-1, 326-A-3, and 326-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 885. A bill to provide for adjustments to the Central Arizona Project in Arizona, to authorize the Gila River Indian Community water rights settlement, to reauthorize and amend the Southern Arizona Water Rights Settlement Act of 1982, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOLDEN (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FROST, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 886. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of former prisoners of war who died on or before September 30, 1999, under the same eligibility conditions as apply to payment of dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of former prisoners of war who die after that date; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. VITTER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. KIND, Mr. FARR, Mr. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr.

WAXMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FORD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. REYES, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 887. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the reductions in Social Security benefits which are required in the case of spouses and surviving spouses who are also receiving certain Government pensions shall be equal to the amount by which the total amount of the combined monthly benefit (before reduction) and monthly pension exceeds \$2,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H.R. 888. A bill to authorize the disinterment from the Luxembourg American Cemetery and Memorial in Luxembourg of the remains of Private Ray A. Morgan, who died in combat in January 1945 in the Battle of the Bulge, and to authorize the transfer of his remains to the custody of his next of kin; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 889. A bill to eliminate the backlog in performing DNA analyses of DNA samples collected from convicted child sex offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 890. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a more equitable geographic allocation of funds appropriated to the Department of Veterans Affairs for medical care; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 891. A bill to provide student loan forgiveness to the surviving spouses of the victims of the September 11, 2001, tragedies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 892. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to expand and intensify research regarding Diamond-Blackfan Anemia; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:
H.R. 893. A bill to provide for the construction and renovation of child care facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 894. A bill to provide for substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries and for women diagnosed with breast cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERRY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. KIND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SABO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 895. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route of the Mississippi River from its headwaters in the State of Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico for study for potential addition to the National Trails System as a national scenic trail, national historic trail, or both, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCINTYRE (for himself and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 896. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 897. A bill to establish a task force to evaluate and make recommendations with respect to the security of sealed sources of radioactive materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUI (for himself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 898. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a project for flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration for the American River, Sacramento, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 899. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require persons to obtain a State license before receiving a handgun or handgun ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 900. A bill to provide incentive funds to States that have in effect a certain law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSE (for himself and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.R. 901. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a bridge on Federal land west of and adjacent to Folsom Dam in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. OTTER:

H.R. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain parcels of National Forest System land in the State of Idaho, to use the proceeds for the acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of facilities in the Panhandle National Forest in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. OTTER:

H.R. 903. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the Secretary of Agriculture of the Sandpoint Federal Building and adjacent land in Sandpoint, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation

and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 904. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to inventory, evaluate, document, and assist efforts to preserve surviving United States Life-Saving Service stations; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the application of self-employment tax in the case of family farming businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 906. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve roadway safety for motor vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians and workers in proximity to vehicle traffic; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 907. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete a special resource study of the national significance, suitability, and feasibility of establishing Highway 49 in California, known as the "Golden Chain Highway", as a National Heritage Corridor; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 908. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to specify that imprisonment for reentering the United States after removal subsequent to a conviction for a felony shall be under circumstances that stress strenuous work and sparse living conditions, if the alien is convicted of another felony after the reentry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 909. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to direct the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office to adjust fees charged by the Office so that the fees collected in any fiscal year will equal, to the greatest extent practicable, the amount appropriated to the Office for that fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 910. A bill to provide for the distribution to coastal States and counties of revenues collected under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TURNER of Texas:

H.R. 911. A bill to authorize the establishment of a memorial to victims who died as a result of terrorist acts against the United States or its people, at home or abroad; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 912. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to establish an awards program in honor of Charles "Pete" Conrad, astronaut and space scientist, for recognizing the discoveries made by amateur astronomers of asteroids with near-Earth orbit trajectories; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the ownership and control of corporations by employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:

H.R. 914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for investing in companies involved in space-related activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 915. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which nonresidents of a State may carry certain concealed firearms in the State, and to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 916. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds to conduct or support research on the cloning of humans, and to express the sense of the Congress that other countries should establish substantially equivalent restrictions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 917. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1830 South Lake Drive in Lexington, South Carolina, as the "Floyd Spence Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. HOEFFEL):

H.J. Res. 24. A joint resolution requiring the President to report to Congress specific information relating to certain possible consequences of the use of United States Armed Forces against Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SABO, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.J. Res. 25. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to repeal the 22nd amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon (for herself and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H. Con. Res. 52. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that all major sports organizations should ban the use of ephedra and dietary supplements containing ephedrine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SANDERS):

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution honoring General Bernard A. Schriever, United States Air Force (retired), for his dedication and service to the United States Air Force, for his essential service in the development of the United States ballistic missile program, and for his lifetime of work to enhance the security of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H. Res. 87. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Government Reform in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H. Res. 88. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Financial Services in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOEHLERT:

H. Res. 89. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Science in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H. Res. 90. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. Res. 91. A resolution providing amount for the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H. Res. 92. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODLATTE:

H. Res. 93. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Agriculture in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 94. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Judiciary in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H. Res. 95. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on the Budget in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. Res. 96. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on International Relations in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 97. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H. Res. 98. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. Res. 99. A resolution providing amounts for the expenses of the Committee on Armed Services in the One Hundred Eighth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H. Res. 100. A resolution congratulating Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations

across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 101. A resolution urging the President to present posthumously a Presidential Citizens Medal to Frederick Douglass in recognition of his achievements in civil rights and service to the nation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 102. A resolution honoring Erika Harold, Miss America 2003; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Res. 103. A resolution establishing a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. NEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WELLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 13: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ISSA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 20: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 21: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 25: Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HALL, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. FLAKE.

H.R. 33: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 34: Mr. SABO, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 58: Mr. OTTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. VITTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BERRY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BELL, Mr. BOYD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GINGREY, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 105: Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 119: Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 138: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 151: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BERREUTER, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 153: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 168: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 192: Mr. WAMP, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 207: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 217: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. FATTAH, Mr.

FOSSELLA, Ms. HART, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. JOHN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 218: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. FORD, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 219: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 224: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 237: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 250: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 278: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 284: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MOLLAHAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 290: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 296: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FROST, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 303: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BERREUTER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BASS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. RENZI, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 308: Mr. POMBO, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 315: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 331: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 343: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 365: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 378: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 381: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 382: Mr. SIMMONS.

H.R. 391: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 394: Mr. OLVER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 396: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 412: Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HALL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 424: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 441: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 445: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 446: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 447: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 448: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 466: Mr. BERMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr.

PASCRELL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FROST, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PORTER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 488: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 489: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 490: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 496: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 502: Mr. PAUL and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 503: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 504: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 517: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 528: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 533: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 534: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURR, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 569: Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 577: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WATT, Mr. KELCZKA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 583: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BOYD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 584: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 588: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 589: Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BASS, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 594: Ms. WATERS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PORTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 613: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 618: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 623: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 660: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 669: Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. MCINNIS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 672: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FROST, Mr. FALDOMAVAEGA, Ms. LEE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BONNER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CASE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 677: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 683: Mr. TERRY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 684: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 685: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. WATT.

H.R. 690: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 693: Ms. HART, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 703: Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 720: Mr. LAMPSON and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 735: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 736: Mr. WATT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 752: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 756: Mrs. MUSGRAVE and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 757: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 761: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 765: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 767: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 768: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 770: Mr. MOORE and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 778: Mr. PETRI, Mr. WOLF, Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 779: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 790: Mr. SULLIVAN.

H.R. 798: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WATSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 801: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 806: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 808: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 811: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 812: Mr. MCHUGH and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 813: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 814: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PAS-TOR, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 817: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 821: Mr. EVANS and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 828: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 832: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 853: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 857: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. HONDA.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. MOORE and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 2: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. STARK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. CASE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. KIND.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. SANDERS and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Con. Res. 36: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Con. Res. 47: Ms. WATSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CASE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. REYES, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 55: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H. Res. 58: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 72: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 81: Mr. HOUGHTON.