that in a democracy there should be open debate. Both sides can make their case, and try to win it to a vote and the majority should rule. We have the majority of votes. The leadership is just using all the maneuvers of the parliamentary system to keep it locked up. But the ones they are hurting, not themselves perhaps, maybe they have not had the experience yet, but we are hurting are the American people; and that is unconscionable, should not happen.

We have been too long on the road on this, and I congratulate the gentleman again for putting his time and effort into making this happen.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman again.

TRIBUTE TO VETERANS OF PACIFIC THEATRE DURING WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for the time remaining until midnight.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the veterans of the Pacific theatre during World War II, especially for those who participated in the battle for Guam; and I also want to take the time to honor the Chamorro people, my people, the indigenous people of Guam, for their show of courage during the 2½ years of enemy occupation, and most especially to pay homage to the many lives lost during World War II, both by men in uniform and by the civilian population in Guam, particularly the lives lost at the Pena, Tinta, and Chague massacres that occurred near the end of the Japanese occupation. I will be submitting a list of names for the record of those who suffered the fate of death at those massacres.

On July 21, 2001, at the end of this week, the people of Guam will be celebrating the 57th anniversary of the liberation of Guam. It is that day that commemorates the landing of the Third Marine Division on the shores of Asan and the first Marine Provisional Brigade, supported by the 77th Army Infantry in Agat. I wish to extend a very warm Hafa Adai and sincere Si Yu’os Ma’aase’ to the veterans of that conflict who liberated Guam. I would also like to honor and pay respect and remember the people of Guam and the suffering they endured for some 2½ years under the enemy occupation of the Japanese Imperial Army.

On the morning of December 8, 1941, Japanese troops bombed and invaded Guam as part of Japan’s attack on U.S. forces in the Pacific, including the attack on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines, both areas also having significant U.S. forces. They all occurred on the same day, except that Guam is on the other side of the date line. This commemoration, which I do annually, and try to bring a little honor and recognition to the people of Guam, is marked by a laying of the wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns, which honors both the American veterans and remembers the sacrifices of the people of Guam.

This is also a tribute of the necessity for peace, for it is only in the remembrance of the horrors of war that we truly remain vigilant in our quest for peace.

I was privileged to lay a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknowns yesterday at Arlington National Cemetery honoring the liberation of Guam; and I was assisted by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and a World War II veteran.

My purpose this evening, in the time that I have, is to give a historical perspective to the events we are commemorating on Guam at the end of this week, and to enhance the understanding of the Nation of the wartime experiences of the people of Guam and the postwar legacy which has framed the relationship of my island with the United States. It is a story that is both a microcosm of the heroism of soldiers everywhere and the suffering in particular of civilians in occupied areas during World War II.

This is encapsulated in these three pictures that I brought with me today, and it is part of a lengthy display that we have had called tempon gera, the time of war. And down here we have basically the cemetery, a temporary cemetery, in which servicemen were buried right after the battle of Guam. Here we have some servicemen entombed right after the liberation of Guam. And this is the most poignant picture of all. Actually, these are a couple of kids from the Cruz family. This is a young lady and a young man, and this is probably the most remembered picture of the wartime period in Guam. Their mother has made a flag. Their mother was a seamstress, and she hand made this flag; and they carried it around at the time of the liberation of Guam.

Guam has a unique story all to itself. It is an island in the midst of political and wartime machinations of larger powers over smaller peoples as well as a story of loyalty to America and a demonstration of loyalty that has not been asked of any civilian community, I believe, during the entire 20th century.

It is important to understand that Guam was an American territory since the end of the Spanish-American War in 1898. It was invaded, as I pointed out earlier, in the early morning hours of December 8, 1941, and thus began a 32-month epic struggle of the indigenous people of Guam, the Chamorro people, to maintain their dignity and to survive during an occupation by the Japanese.

In the months leading up to the war in the Pacific, many of the planners had decided that it was not feasible to defend Guam against the possible invasion by Japanese forces in the surrounding areas. All of the areas in the Micronesian region were held by Japan, save for Guam. The rest of the islands in the central Pacific were held by the Japanese under a League of Nations mandate, the most significant Japanese installations being held in Saipan, 100 miles to the north, and the naval forces in the Truk Lagoon, some 350 miles to the south.

This decision not to build up Guam became a major controversy in the latter part of World War II as people reviewed the records of Congress. Even though an effort was made in Congress, by amendment, to try to reinforce Guam, it failed; and subsequently the people of Guam, as well as the island of Saipan, was laid defenseless.

When the Japanese Imperial Forces landed on Guam in December of 1941, they basically found 153 Marines, 271 Navy personnel, 134 workers associated with the Pan-American Clipper Station, and some 20,000 civilians, Chamorro people, who at that time were not U.S. citizens but were termed U.S. nationals. All of the American military dependents had been evacuated from Guam in anticipation of the war, with the last ship having left on October 17, 1941.

Despite the fact that of course we all think of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor as a surprise attack because of where it took place and the suddenness of it, I think most people at the time were fully cognizant of the fact that war was eminent in some fashion in the Asian Pacific area. And proof of that is the fact that the American military dependents were evacuated from Guam.

But, of course, the people of Guam were not evacuated.

□ 2330

And it was the people who were left faced to confront the cruel occupation that they did actually experience in subsequent months. The actual defense of Guam then fell to these handful of Marines and handful of sailors and actually to the Guam auxiliary guard and Guam militia consisting of civilian reserve forces.

The insular force, which was a locally-manned type militia, actually were the ones who faced the Japanese. The Japanese invasion force numbering some 5,000 easily overwhelmed these men in uniform. Ironically, the only ones who really fired any shots in anger were Japanese Imperial Forces, were members of the Guam insular guard who had set up some machine guns in defense of the Plaza de Espana and at the governor’s offices.

Throughout the ordeal of the occupation, the Chamorro people maintained
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their loyalty to America and their faith that American forces would soon return to liberate them from the Japanese.

The resistance against the occupation manifested itself in many, many direct forms, but none so powerful and costly as the effort designed to help some American servicemen who had decided not to surrender.

When the Japanese took over Guam, some seven sailors decided that they would rather hide in the jungle than surrender to the Japanese. All of them, save one, were captured and executed by the Japanese Imperial Forces.

The one fortunate sailor who evaded capture throughout the entire 32 months of occupation with the assistance of the Chamorro at the cost of numerous atrocities to them, the story of this sailor, George Tweed, was made into a movie entitled, “No Man is an Island.”

The actual attack on Guam, the actual liberation of Guam began on July 21, 1944. As I have indicated, this Saturday is the 57th anniversary of that time period. But beginning in mid-June Guam started to experience a series of bombing runs as a result of a series of preinvasion bombardment.

The preinvasion bombardment off the coast of Guam was very intense, perhaps amongst the most intense during World War II, made more intense by the fact that in June U.S. forces had landed in Saipan and their struggles against the Japanese forces in Saipan was additional reason to increase the ferocity of preinvasion bombardment for Guam. As well as the experience of Normandy in Europe also led to the reconsideration of the preinvasion bombardment of areas that were to be invaded.

After U.S. forces began their preinvasion bombardment, which lasted over a month, they were called back only two hours after the initial bombing because of the ferocity of the battle for Saipan.

When the preinvasion bombardment began in mid-June and the actual invasion occurred toward the end of July, this time period experienced by the people of Guam was the most intense period of cruelty and atrocities that had been experienced by the people from the Japanese forces.

This actually gave some time during that 5-week’s time for the Japanese forces to reinforce their position in anticipation and of course gave them additional opportunity to amass the Chamorro people on one side of the island to get them out of the way of the battle because they knew that the Chamorro people would be of assistance to the American forces.

In April 1944, approximately 20,000 Japanese troops were brought in from Manchuria, and they began a wholesale series of agricultural projects designed to feed the soldiers in which people started to experience widespread malnutrition. Then you had the preinvasion bombardments, a lot of these civilians who were living there faced further brutality and forced labor as the Japanese tried to build various installations on the island in anticipation of the invasion by the American forces.

The preinvasion bombardment on July 21, 1944, invasion of Guam were 13 days of preinvasion bombings that leveled almost all standing structures in Guam. It also served to act as a further stimulus for atrocities against the people of Guam. As the bombardment continued, the Japanese Imperial Forces, who basically realized their fate, that they were going to die either in suicide attacks or at the hands of the Americans, inflicted further brutality and mass slaughter against the people of Guam.

The most known and remembered massacres were those that occurred in Tinta at the southern end of the island near the Fena Caves.

Tonight I try to bring attention to another massacre that is really not known by very many and has not really been widely explained.

Immediately after the island was secured, U.S. Navy Commander Roger Edison Perry filed a report on atrocities committed by Japanese Imperial Forces. A specific report dated August 16, 1944, mentions the decapitated bodies of 45 men who were discovered in the municipality of Yigo around the vicinity of the present Andersen Air Force base. What happened was these men were forcibly conscripted by the Japanese forces to be of service to them during their retreat from the central part of the island. Commander Perry’s report indicated that the men were summarily executed because they knew too much about Japanese activities. The story of these men has largely been forgotten, and for over 50 years these men have remained unnamed and have hardly received any mention.

Mr. Speaker, today I am going to enter what are very familiar Chamorro names into the RECORD. The fate of these and a number of other unnamed men who paid the ultimate sacrifice during the occupation and eventual liberation of Guam indicate the height of indignities, pain and suffering endured due to the Occupation, due to their loyalty to the United States. Men were taken away from their homes and families, forcibly made to serve the enemy occupiers, and ultimately paid dearly with their lives because of their allegiance to the United States.

On July 21, 1944, the actual liberation began. U.S. Marines landed on the northern beaches of Guam andAgat to crawl up their way to what is now known as Nimitz Hill. The men of the Third Marine Division were thrust wave after wave onto Asan Beach already littered with Marines that had come before them and once on shore the U.S. forces were in the heart of Japanese defense. Simultaneously the southern beaches of Guam were bravely by the First Marine Brigade and this was quickly interrupted by the only Japanese counterattack of the first day. It is also on those beaches that former Senator Hattori was wounded as a Marine in Guam.

The people of Guam are a resolute and tenacious people as was proved some 57 years ago as they helped the Marines participating as scouts, look-outs and even forming little pockets of armed resistance to Japanese occupiers.

The liberation of Guam is commemorated as a time of solemn memory and remembrance every year since World War II, because it is a very special time in Guam two sets of liberators are usually seen as Americans liberating people who were their fellow Americans. This serves as a reminder of the spirit of freedom and democracy and the high cost that must be paid to maintain it.

In the family of Guam the people of Guam suffered severe privations and cruel injustices. It is hard to perhaps explain that every family on Guam has a whole series of stories related to the Japanese occupation and that these stories form the corpus of a series of attitudes about the relationship to the United States, the tenacity of the Chamorro people to endure privation and still manage to survive and to thrive. In my own family, I am one child that was lost two children during the occupation. To this day I cannot remember where her two children were but we are not there where they are at this day. That is not an atypical story. It was a story that almost every family in Guam experienced. In the interplay between these men who were coming as Marines and as soldiers and as sailors, interacting with these people who had been under American sovereignty since the Spanish American war, and in that interplay, there are many, many stories about the meaning of that. In a very powerful and poignant sense, you had a clash of who sets of liberators. You had the liberators that were coming in on the beaches and coming in from the ships, and you had the liberators who were hiding in the mountains and they were coming down from the mountains. In that meeting in which these stories are very much documented, people wept and cried for joy and the soldiers and the Marines themselves frequently broke down in tears as they understood that something very special was going on in this particular liberation operation.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity to discuss this, not only with the people of Guam obviously but also...
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with the men who came in uniform. To
this day I am constantly amazed at the
number of veterans who continue to
show up, both a bit older but continuing
to show up at our events. Last week-
end, I was at an event in San Antonio,
Texas, commemorating the liberation of
Guam in which there were over 700 people
there. That weekend there will be
corporal events not only in Guam
but around the country. In San Diego
which has the largest Chamorro com-
munity in the U.S. mainland, they are
having a very special event to honor
and bring in the veterans as their spe-
cial guests, and there will be an event
here in the Washington, D.C. area down
at Fort Belvoir. Of course in Guam
we will have a large parade, it is the single
biggest holiday of the year, and march-
ing down the main drive which in honor
of Iwo Jima. Admiral Nimitz Drive, we will hopefully pay witness to
some Marines marching and when they
march, they will surely bring the big-
gest cheer.

The war also changed the relation-
ship of the people of Guam to the
United States. Immediately Guam was
taken for a number of reasons. Obvi-
ously it was part of a general strategy
to cripple Japan, but Guam and Saipan
and Tinian were very crucial islands
because those islands were fairly large
compared to other Pacific islands in
the central Pacific, and they also could
reach Japan. They had the ability to
reach Japan by air. So these three
islands immediately became enormous
platforms for the continual bombing of
Japan. Of course off the one island of
Tinian is where the Inola Gay took off
to bomb Hiroshima.

So those islands, the islands were
taken for this particular purpose. I al-
ways like to point out that one of my
colleagues here in the House, the gen-
tleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN),
flown many combat missions out of
Guam, out of what was then North Field and what is now called Andersen
Air Force Base. In the context of World
War II, Guam became the forward base
for the United States. What was Pearl
Harbor for the first part of World War
II was basically moved to Guam. It be-
came, in the words of the Victory at
Sea program on Guam, the super-
market of the Pacific. Admiral Nimitz
moved his headquarters there. Admiral
Nimitz strategized, triangulated, fought the rest of the war from Guam.
As a result of the experience of World
War II, and the upcoming Cold War
with the Soviet Union, it was decided
that there would be many, many mil-
itary installations built on Guam. So
immediately, in order to prosecute
World War II, the rest of World War II,
because we still had the invasion of Iwo
Jima and Okinawa and the Philippines
to confront and many of those activi-
ties were triangulated out of Guam,
many, many military installations
were built on Guam. At any given time
from the liberation of Guam until the
end of World War II, you could find as
many as 250,000 people in uniform on
Guam. It had a civilian population of
about 20,000. So it be-
came this military supermarket from
which World War II in the Pacific was
fought for the balance of the war. After
World War II, it became a major Cold
War base and, based upon the ex-
perience in World War II, there were
a number of political changes that
were advocated by the local commu-
nity in order to have, first of all, civil-
ian government and not the pre-World
War II naval government and also to
have U.S. citizenship, and those things
came to pass as well.

All of these things, as we understand
the meaning of World War II for Guam
in its own light, we also have to bring
into consideration the meaning of
war in a broader light, World War II
across this country and across the
world.

One of the things that is upcoming
on the national mall is the World War
II Memorial. Based on what I have out-
lined here because they first con-
ceptualized the World War II Memo-
rail, which will be built on the mall,
least of the ongoing controversies
about it, when that memorial was first
proposed, they proposed having 50 col-
umns to represent basically the 50
States. It was a little incongruous be-
cause at the time of World War II,
there were only 48 States.

But what was particularly disturbing
to me was that given this experience
which I have outlined this evening,
that while it is true that the 50 col-
umns which were being built for the
World War II memorial should include
each of the States, it did not include
Guam. So after exerting some special
effort in this regard, we have been
happy to note, grateful to note, that
Guam will be included in some fashion.
So there are now 56 pillars representing each State
and territory and the District of Co-
lumbia, so that all who participated in
World War II will be recognized.

That is particularly important in
Guam’s case, and it is particularly im-
portant to understand the meaning of
sacrifice, and not only subjecting your-
selveto the danger of death, as some-
times men in particular that time pe-
riod are called to do in the context of
war, but to understand that civilian
communities like Guam experienced
war at a more direct level, suffering
untold atrocities, suffering in ways in
which I hope no community is ever
called upon to suffer.

But it reminds us of a basic reality in
human history, that there are times
when we are called upon to suffer,
time times when we are called upon to suffer,
there are times when we are called
up to fight, but there is something
more at stake than that, and that is
when we say we fight for freedom and
when we say we fight for democracy
and when we say we fight for libera-
tion, we may understand that each
generation is commanded, each gener-
ation is responsible to make their con-
tribution to the perfection of liber-
tion, to the perfection of democracy, to
make sure that the sacrifices of people
who came before us were for something
more significant than the sacrifices
just at that time; that it is part of a
continuing saga of struggle, of the per-
fecion of democracy.

It is no secret that today Guam is
what is called an unincorporated terri-
tory of the United States. Its political
development and its political fulfill-
ment has yet to be fully consummated.
Even though we call July 21, 1944, Lib-
eration Day, all of us in Guam are
and people there remark that liberation
was liberation from enemy hands; that
we have many more struggles in our
desire to be fully liberated, to be full
participants in a democratic and rep-
resentative form of government, the
kind of government which we do not
have today, because as a territory you
do not have voting representation in
laws which are made that govern your
existence, the same as any other Amer-
ican. By not having the right to fully
participate in law making, you violate
one of the core principles of American
democracy, which is consent of the
Governed.

So as we look back on this, and there
are many, many stories that come out
of World War II that I can tell, I will
just end with one story about a 13-year-
old girl. Her name is Beatrice Flores
Ensley. This young lady was 13 years
old in 1944. She and a friend of hers
were actually caught by a Japanese
patrol. The Japanese patrol decided to be-
head these two young people. I think
the young man was only 14 and she was
only 13. They cut through her neck,
buried her and her companion and left
them for dead. But by some miracle,
both of them survived.

She was in a very shallow grave, and
Beatrice crawled out of the hole,
maggots covering her wound, and she
then became over the years, and I re-
member her looking at her, I remember
seeing her when I was in high school
and I was remarking, oh, look at it,
you could see the enormous scar on her
neck, and she became over time a sym-
bol of the Chamorro people’s capacity
to survive.

She came on several occasions to testi-
yfy here in Congress at great personal
cost to her own psychological equi-
lbrium, because it was a memory she
did not like to relive. But she came
here and testified on behalf of bringing
justice to the people of Guam for their
World War II experience and to gain
some recognition.

Because of her, we were able to get a
Memorial Wall built in the War on the
Pacific National Park, which is in
Guam, which lists all the Chamorros who suffered during World War II, because of her testimony.

I can think of one thing about Mrs. Esmea, who was a peace warrior as well. She never uttered one harsh word about the Japanese people or the Japanese army at the time. But she took very careful note of her experience, to explain it to other people so that they could understand it in its own light, not as a lesson of bitterness, not as a testament to cruelty, but as a testimony to the human capacity to survive, to forgive, and to inspire others and to command others to make their own contributions to the perfection of democracy and justice and liberation.

I am thankful for this opportunity to present these items. I have a number of names to enter into the RECORD for the Fena massacre, the Tinta massacre and the Chaguian massacre.

VICTIM/SURVIVOR LISTING—2001 FENA CAVES MASSACRE MEMORIAL SERVICES

VICTIMS

1. Aguigui, Baltibin G.
2. Aguon, Jesus
3. Babauta, Joseph
4. Babauta, Juan B.
5. Borja, Vicente Munoz
6. Camacho, Gally Cruz
7. Carbullido, Evelyn T.
8. Castro, Concepcion R.
9. Castro, Dolores Rabago
10. Castro, Maria Rabago
11. Charfauros, Antonio B.
12. Cruz, Dolores J.
13. Cruz, Jose T.
14. Cruz, Maria J.
15. Cruz, Vicente T.
16. Elliot, Antonio Cruz
17. Fejercan, Dolores C.
18. Fejercan, Enrique C.
19. Herrera, Joe
20. Liza, Caridad T.
21. Liza, Gregorio T.
22. Mendiola, Juan Uloa
23. Mesa, Rosalia Pinaula
24. Ana Terlaje Nededog
25. Nededog, Juan T.
26. Perez, Ana L.G.
27. Perez, Ana P.
28. Quinata, Ana L.G.
29. Sablan, Nicolas
30. Sablan, Raleigh Carbullido
31. Sablan, Rosita Carbullido
32. Toves, Frank
33. Toves, Johnny

SURVIVORS

1. Aguigui, Elias San Nicolas
2. Alerta, Maria (Chong) San Nicolas
3. Babauta, Jesus C.
4. Babauta, Rosa C.
5. Babauta, Vicente Torres
6. Bascinas, Joaquin
7. Babauta, Maria S.
8. Borja, Francisco
9. Camacho, Francisco G.
10. Carbullido, Juan Guerrero
11. Castaneda, Ana Muna Salas
12. Castro, Jose Rabago
13. Castro, Santiago Rabago
14. Chaco, Maria B.
15. Charfauros, Francisco Munoz
16. Concepcion, Francisco Perez
17. Concepcion, Eugenio Mendiola
18. Cordova, Maria Mendiola Cruz
19. Cruz, Antonio Reyes
20. Cruz, Joaquin Mendiola
21. Cruz, Jose Ofricido
22. Cruz, Jose Ofricido
23. Cruz, Juan Reyes
24. Cruz, Pedro Ofricido
25. De Jesus, Joaquin
26. Dela Cruz, Antonio Reyes
27. Espinosa, Jesus Mata
28. Fernandez, Catalina C.
29. Garrido, Joseph C.
30. Garrido, Rosa Taitague
31. Guzman, Jesus Concepcion
32. Herrera, Maria
33. Herrera, Vicente Q.
34. Liza, Juan Quitung
35. Manguba, Josefa San Nicolas
36. Munoz, Gregorio Mendiola
37. Naut, Maria Babauta
38. Nededog, Roque Nededog
39. Pangelinan, Francisco Sablan
40. Pinaula, John
41. Pinaula, Joseph
42. Pinaula, William
43. Quita, Jesus Guadalupe
44. Reyes, Emilio Reyes
45. Reyes, Gonzalo Chaco
46. Reyes, Jose C.
47. Reyes, Juan Talibo (Severa)
48. Roberto, Pedro L. G.
49. Sablan, Francisco "Nabing" Manibusan
50. Sablan, Jose S.
51. Sablan Juan
52. San Nicolas, Jesus Muna
53. San Nicolas, Jose Chaco
54. Sulaclido, Agnes Nededog
55. Sulas, Antonio Muna
56. Santos, Jose B.
57. Schmidt-Yates, Alfonso Sablan
58. Taitano, Jose
59. Taitane, Balbino Muna
60. Topasa, Jose Q.
61. Toves, Arthur Carbullido
62. Toves, Joseph Sablan
63. Ulloa, Juan
64. Unsiog, Agustin Nededog

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. Waters (at the request of Mr. Gephardt) for July 17 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on account of a medical appointment.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNulty) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. Waters, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. Maloney of New York, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. Carson of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Cummings of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Davis of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. Kaptur of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Edwards, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pence) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. Bilirakis, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Hunter, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. Pence, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 19, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2951. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Change in Disease Status of Uruguay because of Foot-and-Mouth Disease [Docket No. 00–111–2] received July 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


2953. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Competitive Pricing Division, Commodity Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Exports of Agricultural Commodities [Docket No. 010612152–1152–01] received July 10, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2954. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Ireland, Kazakhstan and Russia [Docket No. 074–01] received July 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2955. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 074–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2956. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Israel, Kazakhstan and Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 049–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2957. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 074–01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(c); to the Committee on International Relations.