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We have a sense about what George W. is about; and I believe that George W. is a great man, in himself to be a great president and that, as time goes on, we will find that this gentleman, who has been castigated by his opponents in some very vile characterizations, is actually a very thoughtful person, and a person of high character, and a person of strength.

President George W. Bush has been willing to say things straight, in a straightforward manner that has engendered his political opposition, but yet by standing strong and tall, like President Reagan before him, who was also a politician with a liberal's view, our new president is finding that if he stands strong, that people will go in his direction. Because the things that he believes in, many of the things that he believes in, are clearly true, but not in line with the liberal ideology that has dominated the American government and dominated the news media and communications in this country and in Western Europe.

Our new president, for example, has stood firm on the idea and the concept of missile defense. Prior to going to Europe recently, the President was under severe attack by the leading Democrat in the Senate, Tom Daschle, and he was being told that by insisting that the United States move forward on missile defense that it would in some way bring about a renewal of the arms race. How many of us heard that?

Now, I believe the Democrats certainly have a right to attack a Republican president or vice versa, that is what democracy is all about. We all have the right to criticize. But let us point out that while some people seem to be upset that the President was being criticized overseas, I am just upset with the fact that the Democrats were so adamant in their opposition to missile defense and that, now what, they were wrong, not that they were criticizing the President.

Missile defense is something that now seems to be becoming more acceptable to our European allies. And in fact, instead of being this roadblock to any type of good relationship with the government in Russia, now we see President Putin in Russia edging towards President George W. Bush's position.

Let us note that President Ronald Reagan first stepped forward with the idea that if we are going to be spending billions of dollars in order to protect the people of the United States it is one of Ronald Reagan's great moments, when he went to the Senate and said he wanted to pressure him and say back down. He kept us in compliance with this treaty that we signed with old Communist dictators, even though communism and the Soviet Union no longer existed in Russia. We could have gotten out of that treaty.

Now, the Democrats have done everything they can to prevent this type of technology from being developed. During the 8 years Bill Clinton was President of the United States, he spent those 8 years spending the money on missile defense and channeling it in a direction so that that technology would not succeed. He kept us engaged in a treaty with the former Soviet Union, even though the Soviet Union had ceased to exist. He kept us in compliance with this treaty that we signed with old Communist dictators, even though communism and the Soviet Union no longer existed in Russia. We could have gotten out of that treaty.

And this is one thing where George W. Bush is pushing for, out of the treaty that prevents us from thoroughly developing our anti-missile system. We could have gotten out of that, and by now have developed a system so that if China would launch a missile towards the United States that we could knock it down and protect Los Angeles or southern California or northern California, or even parts of the United States as far as Chicago. We would be able to protect the United States from a missile attack. But Bill Clinton decided, as President of the United States, that he did not support missile defense. So the money that we spent on missile defense was frittered away, frittered away and, we are very vulnerable and we have George W. Bush standing firm against all those who try to pressure him and say back down.

Well, I think it was one of Ronald Reagan's great moments, when he was willing to meet with Gorbachev and Gorbachev told him he had to agree not to develop a weapon system that could protect rather than kill people, and if he did that, if he stopped or gave up this idea of missile defense, he could sign a big treaty and be the biggest hero in the world, that Ronald Reagan walked away from it. George W. Bush is proving himself to be that same type of
strong leader who will bring about a more peaceful world.

Ronald Reagan had no idea when he turned that down that the people of the world would see him as a strong and a tough leader who they could trust to make a decision and that that in and of itself would have a dramatic impact for the promotion of freedom and peace on the planet.

By the time Ronald Reagan was done being president, even though he had been nitpicked to death by people on the other side of the aisle, the Cold War was over, the Berlin Wall was on its way down, and democracy and peace were given a better chance than ever in my lifetime and in the whole 20th Century, all because Ronald Reagan stood tough.

George W. Bush is making those same tough stands against the same type of nitpicking that went on during the Reagan administration. Every time we took a stand against communism, there were those on the other side of the aisle trying to find a mistake that we made in order to thwart our efforts, whether it was in Latin America or whether it was with the Mujahedins against the Russian expansion in Afghanistan or elsewhere, or in the development of missile defense.

Our President today, George W. Bush, has that same strength of character. And if he maintains his courage, as he has been doing and as we have seen, and for the first time the world is starting to lean in his direction already in terms of the things he has said on missile defense, George W. Bush, like Ronald Reagan before him, will be able to make an incredible contribution to the contribution of freedom and peace on this planet.

Now one of the other areas that George W. has been standing firm on is his refusal to submit the American people to the dictates of a Kyoto global warming treaty. For this tough stand that he has taken, George W. has been under vicious attack. But those of us in the United States who are proud that our country has a high standard of living and that in our country ordinary people can live decent lives, we applaud George W. Bush and his wisdom and his courage when it comes to the Kyoto Treaty.

Many people have heard congressman after congressman come to the floor of this body attacking George W. for not being part of the team when it comes to global warming and supporting the Kyoto Treaty. Time and time again we hear, “America is doing nothing on this global warming.” Well, maybe the American people should understand when these Members of Congress get up and start talking that way and condemning George W. Bush for doing nothing what it is they want him to do. What is it that the Kyoto Treaty is demanding of the American people that George W. Bush is saying, no, I do not think that we are going to do that? What we are talking about are severe restrictions on our standard of living.

They say the United States should be ashamed that we put more CO2 into the air than any other country. That is the way they judge it. The United States puts more CO2 into the air. Well, what does that mean? Well, that means that we have the highest standard of living of any other country of the world. And, yes, there is some CO2 we put into the air. But in terms of the standard of living, if we put per $1,000 of GNP, we actually put less CO2 in the air than anybody else.

So if we just judge it by how much we are putting in, of course that is a mandate for what? For lowering the GNP, for lowering the standard of living of regular people. That is what they are trying to force George W. to agree to, lowering the standard of living of ordinary Americans. Is that what we want?

By the way, the same fanatics who are trying to convince us about this global warming issue do not even take into consideration that America, through its agriculture, has had a vast tree planting over the last 100 years. And by the way, we have many more trees in America today than we had 100 years ago. Because at the turn of the century there was a replanting of trees across America. Up in the Northeast, up in Maine, and up in New Hampshire and Vermont and those areas that were treeless by the turn of the century, or the 1800s, those were replanted. Go up there today and there are vast forests there. Those trees take the CO2 out of the air. We actually take more CO2 out of the air than any other country in the world.

The fanatics that want us to get involved in the Kyoto Treaty do not take that into consideration. Instead, they would have us, for example, pay $5 a gallon for every gallon of gas that we buy. Now, what is that going to do for the price of goods that are sent by truck? What will that do for the standard of living of average Americans, that $5 a gallon for gasoline? It will dramatically reduce the well-being of our people.

When we see people up here attacking George W. Bush on the Kyoto Treaty, that we are doing nothing, they will say what they want us to do is be engaged in a treaty that will lower the standard of living of ordinary people in this country, that will suck money right out of our pockets that could go to better food, better health care, better education. Instead, they are going to put it into higher prices for gasoline and other types of fuel.

It is vital that the public know what is going on. It is an attack against George Bush. Global warming, first and foremost, is not a scientific imperative. Let us talk about global warming for a minute. It is a politically driven theory. The people who are pushing global warming are not, by and large, being pushed by some scientific motivation, but instead have a political agenda. Those people who are in the scientific community that have signed on have done so realizing that they are kowtowing to political powers and not to scientific knowledge.

Those exposing global warming, those scientists who are brave enough to step forward, do so knowing that they might be retaliated against. Our young people, for example, are being lied to about the environment in general, and they are being lied to especially about global warming. I see this every time a group of young people from my congressional district comes to Washington, D.C.

As a member of Congress, I represent Huntington Beach, California, Southern California, I went to high school in Southern California and now that I am a member of Congress, I have a number of Congressmen that come from my congressional district who have come to the floor of this body, some with some propaganda about the environment in general.

I ask them the same question, every single time, every group. How many of them believe, these are students from Southern California, believe that the air quality today in Southern California is cleaner or is worse than it was when I went to high school 35 years ago in Southern California? Ninety-five percent always say the same thing, almost every group says the same thing. They believe, 95 percent of them believe that the air quality in Southern California today is so much worse than when I went to high school 35 years ago. I was so lucky, they say, to have lived in a time and went to school in a time when the air was so clean. Of course, they are surprised when I tell them that they are absolutely wrong, that the real answer is 180 degrees in the other direction.

In fact, the air in Southern California has never been cleaner in my lifetime and they enjoy some of the best clean air ever in Southern California. These young people have been systematically lied to and been told that the environment is killing them. They are being told that the water is so much worse than it ever was. The fact is that water quality in the United States has been vastly improved in these last 4 decades. Forty years ago if you tried to put your finger in the Potomac River, you would come out and say, What the heck are you doing put your finger in the Potomac for? Do you want to get the acid burn on your finger?

Today you go out and people are swimming in the Potomac. People are
fishing in the Potomac. What happened? I will have to admit that many regulations, many are regulations that the Democrats put through. Let me make no beans about it, the Democrats were in the front of the reform effort. That over the years tough measures were put in and there has been an enormous amount of environmental clean up that has taken place.

Unfortunately, the information about that cleanup has not made it to the American people and especially to our young people. They are being told the water is getting a lot worse. They are being told that the land is much more foul. Over the years of our country’s history there were toxic waste dumps all over the place. There was no hope of cleaning them up. The land was spoiled. This was a horrible situation. Unfortunately, the technologies that have developed today, we can clean up those sites. In fact, in my own district I worked with a company called Simple Green Company that has developed a way that in 60 to 90 days can take a contaminated soil and turn it into clean soil so it can be used for homes or schools or whatever.

We tried a demonstration project in my district. We took 10 acres of soil that used to be an old oil sludge dump, and sure enough, in about 90 days Simple Green, this company in my district, was able to turn that into a usable piece of property again. Mark my words, when people find out about this process, we will have toxic waste sites being cleaned up all over the country because it will be profitable to do so and we have the technology to do so.

But our young people are not being told that. Our young people are being told it is technology, the machines and the industrialization that has caused the problem. The fact is people are living longer today than they ever have. Although, yes, there are the diseases we face, other generations faced many of these same diseases long before there was this industrialization. Not to say that there is not some collateral impact, and we should be aware of that and study that.

This President has not only full funded but doubled the budget of the National Institute of Health so that we can science with the technologies that patterns to see if we can help to curb some of those problems.

But in terms of the overall environment, it is so much better. For example, in 1966 a Mustang that my father owned, if you take the pollution coming out of that tail pipe and you examine the new Mustangs today and examine how much pollution is coming out of that tail pipe, 96 percent of the air pollution has been captured. The engines are much more effective. They have cured 96 percent of that problem.

In Southern California, what that has meant is we have doubled or maybe even tripled our population. Yet the air quality is much much better.

If you take a look at all of the media reports on global warming, you will find when you look into the details, by the numbers throughout the whole report be-
words that they can point to and say, well, we did not really say this. We said maybe. We said could lead to the conclusion that or possibly.

Look at these reports. Do not believe when you read something in the newspaper or hear it on television that some scientific body has conclusively decided this, do not believe it because it is not true. Not only is that not true, it is about as true as the fact that those poor kids in my district are being told that air pollution in Southern California is worse than it has ever been and they are headed to death that it is hurting their life.

Climate science, by the way, had become really a new entry into this whole idea of scientific study. Prior to 1980, there were only a handful of climatologists. Now they are everywhere. Why is that? How come there are so many climatologists all of the sudden? The fact is that it is easy now to get a government grant if you are going to prove that global warming exists and it is very difficult to get a grant if you are trying to have a scientific study that will or will not prove that global warming exists.

Eight years ago when President Clinton took over the Executive Branch, he saw to it that there would be no scientific research grants going from the government to scientists who did not support the idea that we were under attack from some global warming trends. Unless they furthered the global warming theory, they were not going to get a government grant.

We were tipped off to this when the lead scientist, the Director of Energy and Research for the Department of Energy, Dr. William Happer, immediately when Clinton was elected and took office, they could not move fast enough to fire this guy from his position because he did not agree with the global warming theory. Dr. William Happer, by the way, now is a professor of physics at Princeton University. But his removal back in Clinton’s first few weeks in office sent a message to the scientific community.

There does not appear to have been much information about global warming prior to the mid 1980s. But what we have been able to find out is that that information that was available before the 1980s indicated that there was going to be a new ice age. Back in the 1980s, some of the same scientists who are now warning us against global warming were warning us that there was going to be a new ice age and that global cooling was really the problem. This Member of Congress sat through hearings in which the advocates of global warming would appear and after a few questions they would admit, well, it could be global cooling, yes, it could be global cooling.

What is that all about? Why are we spending billions of dollars? Why are we giving up our freedom? Why are we permitting the standard of living of our people to go down based on that type of scientific logic? I think not. The fact is that in a span of 20 years, climate models have gone from predicting that we would all freeze to death in the new ice age to now we are all going to have to worry about being baked to death in a global furnace.

Some of the leading proponents, as I say, of global warming went from freezing to burning to death. Historically speaking, we know, by the way, let us just take a look at it, everybody should understand it a little bit, that the global climate changes. Global climate changes. There have been ice ages in the earth’s past and there have been tropical ages. Both of those came about off and on throughout the hundreds of millions of millions of years. Both of those came about off and on throughout the hundreds of millions of years of the earth’s life without any interference of man.

Now, the global warming theory, by the way, is that it is getting hotter because mankind is putting CO₂ into the air. Mankind is putting CO₂ into the air. We have to look at what all of these climate changes before humankind, before there were any railroads or industry or cars? Why did that happen? There is no real explanation for that. Well, there is an explanation. What the proponents of global warming will not tell you is that all of this CO₂ that they claim is causing global warming, all of that CO₂ that mankind puts into the atmosphere is only 5 percent of the CO₂ that goes into the atmosphere every year from all sources. Mother nature is putting 10 times more CO₂ into the air than human beings. But human beings are being blamed totally because we want to have a little higher standard of living.

By the way, when there is a volcano that erupts violently, one of a sudden there is dramatically more CO₂ in the atmosphere. One volcano like Krakatau or something can put as much CO₂ into the air as all of our industrialization. So it makes sense for us not to have good jobs? It makes sense for us not to have cars? Give me a break. The fact is that all of the reforms that global warming people want us to go through and restrictions and the Kyoto treaty, it would knock a little CO₂ out of the air but that’s just mankind’s contribution to that CO₂. If there is a volcano that erupts, that is taken care of right away and that does not even count anymore.

I had a Member of Congress grab me by the arm the last time I spoke about this and said, “You know, DANA, you’re wrong. The volcanoes do not put CO₂ into the air.” And he cited all of these scientists.

I went back to my office. I got on my computer, looked up the scientific basis and by the time I had to come down to the floor to vote the next time, I had the report right in front of me and, sure enough, volcanoes do put CO₂ into the air. Three percent every year of all CO₂ going into the air comes from volcanoes. Only 5 percent is coming from human activity. So if we have a large number of volcanoes or one big eruption, that means they just totally cancel out anything that we would do as humankind.

By the way, one other factor is, all of these people are talking about, “Oh, this horrible global warming, you can see its impact starting now.” What is the global warming? What are these people telling us about our weather? Our weather supposedly is 1 degree warmer than it was 100 years ago. Let us look at this. One degree over 100 years and they are saying that that is a trend that is really frightening. These people cannot tell us what the weather is going to be next week but they are afraid because they think that the weather is 1 degree warmer now than it was 100 years ago.

I heard about this meeting President Clinton had of climatologists and we were reported that the United States into the Oval Office, into the White House, about 5 or 6 years ago. He was going to have all these weathermen there, they were going to talk about global warming and this 100 years and the trend that is set up and, oh, my gosh, 100 years from now how bad it is going to be, when they all got to the White House and they had their meeting and during that meeting at the White House, a storm came across Washington, D.C. and there was a deluge of rain. It was raining horribly, but of those hundreds of weathermen and climatologists who knew all about weather so much, they could predict weather for 100 years, only three of them had brought their umbrellas to the meeting. What does that tell you? You cannot predict what the weather is going to be like 2 weeks from now. And if it is just 1 degree over 100 years, they are telling us that we are going to be so frightened out of our wits by that that we are going to submit to a global treaty that would give powers over our economy and bring down our standard of living, exempt Communist China and let them get all the development? No way. One degree over 100 years is this thing that they are fearful about. And at the same time, let us go back to that basic fact that we were just discussing. There have been changes in the earth’s temperature many, many times. Even if that 1 degree over 100 years was right and, by the way, we do not know how they took the temperatures 100 years ago. We do not know who was taking the temperature down in some Pacific Ocean place. Was it a sailor who was reading the thermometer right or what about the guys out west or in the jungles or something? Who was taking these temperatures 100 years ago? How do we know that it was 1 degree cooler 100 years ago? I would doubt that it is 1 degree
warmer, it might be, but if it was and even if we were in a period of our earth’s history in which, as I say, the glaciers came down and then the glaciers receded. Is it possible that we are in a period where the glaciers are receding a little bit and then they will come down? I am not sure, and I am not sure if we are about ready to happen. The Canadian government just put out a report about 3 months ago, I happened to see it, it did not have any ice caps are not melting. The ice caps are not melting. They are not receding. There is just as much ice cap as there was all balances called global balloon. Give up your freedom because we are going to try to scare you.

I do not think so. I do not think the American people will buy that. I think that George W. Bush on earth’s temperature. In fact, a renowned scientist just prior to me coming here and said, there is absolutely no evidence that there has been any temperature change, not even that I degree over 100 years, no temperature change above the change in temperature.

If there has been no change there and no change in the water, how are these people able to come forward and be so fanatical about what they are trying to railroad us into?

So, none of the readings include any deep water, and if there is any water temperatures, it is only very shallow water readings. So we have zero understanding of the deep waters that cover this planet, and no change, we see no change in the upper atmosphere. So how can we try to think that with that type of data, not knowing how the other data has been gotten, can we possibly make decisions like the ones for the Kyoto Treaty that will so dramatically affect the standing of living of our people?

Let me go on to say one other thing about global warming. About 7 or 8 years ago, during the height of the Clinton Administration, this Member of Congress was visited by a high ranking scientist in the U.S. Government, and he made me swear never to tell who he was, but he said, Dana, these readings that they are using to back up their theory that we are going through global warming, they do not take into consideration cloud cover.

Get that. Not only do they not take water temperature or the sun or any of these other things, but cloud cover. They have not taken into consideration even if the clouds were covering that day, much less do they take into consideration that at one time, maybe 100 years ago, there was a lot of open space where they were taking the readings, and now that space is covered with concrete because it might be a city.

Now, what does that have to do with that one degree of increase in temperature there has been? These things make a lot of difference, and yet these people who are trying to tell us that global warming is a problem have not taken any of these things into account.

So, anyway, what can we determine by all of this? That global temperature records are flawed. We know they did not take into account what was going on with the sun, whether or not the areas that were being recorded were urban or rural over these last 100 years. They have not even taken into consideration humidity factor in terms of the Earth’s temperature.

Finally, let us look at the Earth’s orbit itself. They do not take into account the Earth’s orbit. They do not
take into account the sun's situation. They do not take into account the cloud cover. They do not take into account their own role but their role. They do not take into account the humidity. What they do take into account is a theoretical calculation that man-made CO$_2$ has something to do with global warming, and they have lots of hypothetical data about how human beings are polluting the world.

Okay, human beings are polluting the world, and that is certainly a fact, and we have to work to make sure that we correct pollution by better technology all the time. It does not mean that we have a global warming problem. It does not mean that we have to make drastic changes in our life or increase taxes or centralize power.

Most of the sources of CO$_2$, and that is the main source, $5, $6 a gallon and $1.5 a gallon. These greenhouse gases, methane and CO$_2$, most of them are coming into the atmosphere naturally and are not made. Now, certainly we contribute a little bit. As I mentioned earlier, you have a lot of air that is CO$_2$. Three percent of all the CO$_2$ in the world every year comes from volcanic activity. If a huge volcano goes off, it goes much more.

But how about these other sources? That is about the same level as mankind. The volcanoes put out about the same thing mankind puts out every year, unless there is a big volcano that goes off.

What about some of the other sources? The other sources of methane and CO$_2$ are what? How about insects and termites, and how about rotting wood? Do you know that insects and termites and rotting wood contribute much more to CO$_2$ and methane than all the factories out there? How about that? Most of our human beings? All of our industrialization does not put into the environment as much CO$_2$ and methane that termites and insects and rotting wood do.

So if our main concern about pollutants is to bring those CO$_2$ levels of methane down because we are so afraid of global warming, what would we do? What would be consistent with that? Well, they say you want to limit human beings' right to have their own automobiles. Make it so expensive people cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. They cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. They cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. These greenhouse gases, methane and CO$_2$, most of them are coming into the atmosphere naturally and are not man-made. Now, certainly we contribute a little bit. As I mentioned earlier, you have a ton of air that is CO$_2$. Three percent of all the CO$_2$ in the world every year comes from volcanic activity. If a huge volcano goes off, it goes much more.

But how about these other sources? That is about the same level as mankind. The volcanoes put out about the same thing mankind puts out every year, unless there is a big volcano that goes off.

What about some of the other sources? The other sources of methane and CO$_2$ are what? How about insects and termites, and how about rotting wood? Do you know that insects and termites and rotting wood contribute much more to CO$_2$ and methane than all the factories out there? How about that? Most of our human beings? All of our industrialization does not put into the environment as much CO$_2$ and methane that termites and insects and rotting wood do.

So if our main concern about pollutants is to bring those CO$_2$ levels of methane down because we are so afraid of global warming, what would we do? What would be consistent with that? Well, they say you want to limit human beings' right to have their own automobiles. Make it so expensive people cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. These greenhouse gases, methane and CO$_2$, most of them are coming into the atmosphere naturally and are not man-made. Now, certainly we contribute a little bit. As I mentioned earlier, you have a ton of air that is CO$_2$. Three percent of all the CO$_2$ in the world every year comes from volcanic activity. If a huge volcano goes off, it goes much more.

But how about these other sources? That is about the same level as mankind. The volcanoes put out about the same thing mankind puts out every year, unless there is a big volcano that goes off.

What about some of the other sources? The other sources of methane and CO$_2$ are what? How about insects and termites, and how about rotting wood? Do you know that insects and termites and rotting wood contribute much more to CO$_2$ and methane than all the factories out there? How about that? Most of our human beings? All of our industrialization does not put into the environment as much CO$_2$ and methane that termites and insects and rotting wood do.

So if our main concern about pollutants is to bring those CO$_2$ levels of methane down because we are so afraid of global warming, what would we do? What would be consistent with that? Well, they say you want to limit human beings' right to have their own automobiles. Make it so expensive people cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. These greenhouse gases, methane and CO$_2$, most of them are coming into the atmosphere naturally and are not man-made. Now, certainly we contribute a little bit. As I mentioned earlier, you have a ton of air that is CO$_2$. Three percent of all the CO$_2$ in the world every year comes from volcanic activity. If a huge volcano goes off, it goes much more.

But how about these other sources? That is about the same level as mankind. The volcanoes put out about the same thing mankind puts out every year, unless there is a big volcano that goes off.

What about some of the other sources? The other sources of methane and CO$_2$ are what? How about insects and termites, and how about rotting wood? Do you know that insects and termites and rotting wood contribute much more to CO$_2$ and methane than all the factories out there? How about that? Most of our human beings? All of our industrialization does not put into the environment as much CO$_2$ and methane that termites and insects and rotting wood do.

So if our main concern about pollutants is to bring those CO$_2$ levels of methane down because we are so afraid of global warming, what would we do? What would be consistent with that? Well, they say you want to limit human beings' right to have their own automobiles. Make it so expensive people cannot own a car, $5, $6 a gallon. These greenhouse gases, methane and CO$_2$, most of them are coming into the atmosphere naturally and are not man-made. Now, certainly we contribute a little bit. As I mentioned earlier, you have a ton of air that is CO$_2$. Three percent of all the CO$_2$ in the world every year comes from volcanic activity. If a huge volcano goes off, it goes much more.
Now, with the cranberries and the cyclamates and the alar, it just hurt various farmers. But if we buy on the global warming theory, it is going to hurt all of us. It is going to bring down our standard of living.

Thank God we have a President of the United States that is willing to say this does not hold water; we need a lot more scientific research before we make such decisions; I am not going to go along with this global warming Kyoto Protocol. I commend him for that, and I would hope that the American people understand his wisdom and his courage and that he is standing there to protect us and to protect our standard of living.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing that George W. Bush is doing this kind of job and that he is a good man, and wish him well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). The Chair will remind all Members that in order to preserve comity between the two chambers, Members that in order to preserve comity and his courage and that he is standing there to protect us and to protect our standard of living.

With that, I would ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing that George W. Bush is doing this kind of job and that he is a good man, and wish him well.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FROST (at the request of Mr. GEHRARDT) for after 12:30 p.m. today on account of official business.

Mr. HANSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMET) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. KELLER (at the request of Mr. ARMET) for after 1:00 p.m. today on account of family reasons.

Mr. MCINNIS (at the request of Mr. ARMET) for today on account of family reasons.

Mr. MCNUIT (at the request of Mr. GEHRARDT) for Thursday, July 26, before 3:00 p.m. on account of attending a family funeral.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEHRARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. GEHRARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SUNUNU (at the request of Mr. ARMET) for today on account of attending a memorial service for his uncle.

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

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DAVES of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. INSLEE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CUMMINS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PAYNE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 30, 2001, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3134. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Karnal Bunt; Regulated Areas (Docket No. 01-168) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3135. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Importation and Interstate Movement of Certain Land Tortoises (Docket No. 00-016-3) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3136. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Export Certification; Canadian Solid Wood Packaging Materials Exported From the United States to China (Docket No. 99-100-3) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3137. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Phytosanitary Inspection 

3138. A letter from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:


3141. A letter from the Federal Register Officer, Department of Energy and Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Economic Regulatory Agreement; Interstate Transmission Agreements; Intrastate Transmission Agreements; Transmission of Electric Power; Rate Regulation; Energy Policy and Market Reform (Docket No. 12-00-001) (RIN: 1540-AD11) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3142. A letter from the Federal Register Officer, Department of Energy and Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Export Certification; Canada’s Final Rule—Authority To Control Imports of Petroleum Coke and Coke (Docket No. 8-99E94) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3143. A letter from the Federal Register Officer, Department of Energy and Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Authority To Control Imports of Petroleum Coke and Coke (Docket No. 8-99E94) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3144. A letter from the Federal Register Officer, Department of Energy and Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Authority To Control Imports of Petroleum Coke and Coke (Docket No. 8-99E94) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3145. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allocations, FM Broadcast Stations (Wallace, Idaho and Bigfork, Montana) (MM Docket No. 98-101; RM-9290) received July 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3146. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Authority To Control Imports of Petroleum Coke and Coke (Docket No. 8-99E94) received July 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3147. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report