

and eroding the certainty and predictability that have been fundamental to the pre-eminence of the U.S. capital markets. Moreover, capital markets sanctions would seriously disrupt investor confidence—both domestic and foreign—in the U.S. markets, thereby jeopardizing their continued vibrancy. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said “the motive of the legislation, I think, obviously commendable, but I think it’s not been thoroughly thought through and I don’t think that the implications of this particular type of statute is useful to the United States and, indeed, I think it is downright harmful.”

Capital markets sanctions have never been imposed by the U.S. These types of sanctions would seriously disrupt investor confidence—both domestic and foreign—in the U.S. markets, thereby jeopardizing their continued vibrancy. The imposition of capital markets sanctions could also have the unintended effects of redirecting business out of the United States and eroding the certainty and predictability that have been fundamental to the pre-eminence of the U.S. capital markets. U.S. investors—pension funds, other institutional investors, and individuals—would see the liquidity, and the value, of substantial amounts of their holdings drop precipitately even at the suggestion that companies in which they are invested would be forced to delist from U.S. exchanges.

In sum Madam Speaker, I believe it is a mistake to unilaterally try to resolve complex foreign policy issues through an untested formula that would greatly impair the U.S. capital markets. The goals of the Sudan Peace Act are laudable, but I object to capital markets sanctions that are included in the bill. As the House prepares to consider the Sudan Peace Act, I urge my colleagues to continue pursuing open and fair financial markets and reject these types of sanctions.

Mr. NEY. Madam Speaker, due to the recent tragedies on U.S. soil we are in the position to find ways to stop terrorist attacks. As Congress works to develop these policies it is important that we be careful to not accidentally damage legitimate American jobs. We must act in ways that do not damage our economy, the free flow of capital, or create greater uncertainty in our capital markets.

I am extremely concerned over proposals that would deny legitimate investors and issuers access to the U.S. capital markets. As this body moves to go to conference with the Senate on the Sudan Peace Act (S. 180), I urge my colleagues to take a close look at the provisions of the bill that would impose such sanctions. The imposition of capital markets sanctions could have the unintended effects of redirecting business out of the United States and eroding the certainty and predictability that have been fundamental to the success of the U.S. Capital markets. Moreover, capital markets sanctions would seriously disrupt investor confidence—both domestic and foreign—in the U.S. Markets, thereby jeopardizing their continued vibrancy.

The safety and certainty of U.S. capital markets attracted record numbers of foreign issuers and investors in the 1990s. In the competitive, global environment, however, there are few products and services for which U.S. companies are the sole suppliers. If

issuers are denied access to the U.S. capital markets through unilaterally imposed sanctions, they will simply turn to other countries. Indeed, since the House of Representatives approved the Sudan Peace Act (H.R. 2052)—with a provision restricting capital market access—in June, at least one foreign company cited the uncertain environment created by the legislation in deciding to list on the London Stock Exchange over a U.S. exchange. H.R. 2052 would have little—if any—impact on the ability of sanctioned companies to raise financing, but it would strengthen the position of foreign competitors. U.S. investors—pension funds, other institutional investors, and individuals—would see the liquidity, and the value, of substantial amounts of their holdings drop precipitately even at the suggestion that companies in which they are invested would be forced to delist from U.S. exchanges.

Closing the U.S. capital markets in order to influence the behavior of foreign countries also sets a poor policy precedent that might easily provoke other countries to pursue their own foreign policy objectives through similar sanctions. The continued health of our capital markets is dependent on economic and political certainty and predictability. The historic U.S. commitment to open and fair markets has been fundamental to the U.S. financial service sector’s ability to nurture and establish a substantial foreign client base.

In sum, Madam Speaker, I believe it is a mistake to unilaterally try to resolve complex foreign policy issues through an untested formula that would greatly impair the U.S. capital markets. The goals of the Sudan Peace Act are laudable, however, I am deeply troubled by the capital markets sanctions that are included in the bill. As the House requests a conference on the Sudan Peace Act, I urge my colleagues to continue pursuing open and fair financial markets and reject these types of sanctions.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 180, SUDAN PEACE ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insist on the House amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

For modification of the Senate bill and the House amendment and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HYDE, GILMAN, and SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Messrs. ROYCE, TANCREDO, LANTOS, BERMAN, and PAYNE, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

For consideration of sections 8 and 9 of the House amendment and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. OXLEY, BAKER, BACHUS, LAFALCE, and FRANK.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 74, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 74) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, I do not intend to object since I support this continuing resolution; but I rise in order to do a couple of things: first of all, to try to ascertain exactly what the schedule is expected to be around here for the remainder of the week; and, second, to try to focus the attention of the House on the linkage that exists between our need to pass this continuing resolution and our inability to finish bills such as the Department of defense appropriations bill, which the committee has tried mightily to produce as a bipartisan product.

I am wondering if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), under my reservation, I am wondering if he can tell me if he has any idea what the schedule is going to be for the remainder of the week.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I wonder first if the gentleman would have any objection if I just make a brief explanation of what the CR does.

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman under my reservation for that purpose, Madam Speaker.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Madam Speaker, this is a simple CR. It extends the current continuing resolution until December 7. The terms and conditions of all the previous CRs remain in effect. All ongoing activities will be continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2001, with the exception

of the agencies covered by the FY 2002 appropriations bills that have already been enacted into law.

Additionally, the provision for mandatory payments has been extended for payments due on December 1, 2001.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has suggested, this is not a controversial resolution, and I urge that we move it quickly.

Then to the gentleman's question as to the schedule, I wish I could give him a very definitive answer; but as he knows, we have completed work on all of the House bills, and yesterday the Committee on Appropriations was able to finalize the markup of the Defense appropriations bill.

If I could just state for the record, the reason the Defense appropriations bill is late is two-fold:

One is we waited until early July to get the President's budget amendment for the pre-September 11 Defense requirements; and then the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations was actually here in the Capitol on September 11 when the tragic attacks on the World Trade Center took place, and at the Pentagon.

As the gentleman knows, the Capitol was evacuated immediately, so that had to be postponed.

Since then, additional activities have taken place; the \$40 billion emergency supplemental was broken up into three separate tranches; and yesterday we finalized the Defense bill plus the last tranche of that emergency supplemental.

Now the issue, I believe, for the schedule is this: that if the requirement of a 3-day layover before filing the bill, if that were to be waived, then we could actually bring the Defense appropriations bill to this floor tomorrow.

If it is not waived, then the 3 days would have to ensue. Then we would file the bill, get a rule, and it would appear to me that that would either be early next week or following Thanksgiving.

I think the 3-day rule is affected by what type of rule would be presented by the Committee on Rules. I believe that is an issue that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is very much interested in.

That is about as much as I can say about the schedule. It is sort of iffy.

As far as the nonappropriations legislative schedule, of course the majority leader will speak to that probably sometime today.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would like to just make an observation.

I know that a number of Members of the House are being told that we may be in session Saturday because I and several others on this side of the aisle

are refusing to grant permission for the Defense appropriations bill to be moved.

In fact, I made an offer yesterday to the majority in which I indicated that we would be willing to not offer any amendments in the full committee when the Defense appropriations bill was before us, and that we would be willing to give unanimous consent for that bill to be considered today on the floor, or tomorrow, provided only that we be given the opportunity to offer the three amendments which were in fact offered in the committee yesterday: one by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), another by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and a third by myself.

Those amendments relate to guaranteeing that New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia would in fact get the amount that they were originally promised in the original budget supplemental.

The Murtha amendment referred to crucial upgrades that we felt were needed in the defense budget in light of the events of September 11, and the contents of my amendment would have been focused on the need to strengthen homeland security in a wide variety of areas.

We said that if those amendments would be made in order on the floor, that we would be willing to go directly to the floor. That suggestion was not responded to by the majority leadership.

I am willing to make an offer again right now, today. I would be willing to give my support to a unanimous consent request to bring that Defense bill up either today or tomorrow, provided only that those same three amendments be allowed to be debated and voted on on the House floor.

□ 1600

Those amendments were considered in committee yesterday. One was defeated on a vote of 31 to 34. Another was defeated on a vote of 31 to 33, and the third was dealt with on a voice vote. That is offer number one.

If that is not acceptable, I would be willing to waive the 3-day requirement to file views and to allow the bill to be called up immediately, provided that if the rule was defeated, the majority intends to offer that we would then be allowed to debate the bill under a rule which would allow those three amendments to proceed. So the majority leader, if he wished, or the majority leadership, if it wished, could get a vote on the kind of rule that they want. And if that rule goes down, the House would then be given the opportunity to vote on these three amendments.

I think we are trying to be infinitely flexible on this bill. But we do insist on the right to deal with three issues that are central to the defense bill which is

the defense of the homeland, added funding for defense for overseas activities, and meeting our commitments to New York that were made in the aftermath of September 11.

We pledged at the time that the money to New York would be allocated in one of the subsequent appropriations bills. Since this is the only one remaining, this is it.

So I want to repeat that and to suggest that I think the House would appreciate the opportunity to vote on whether or not we should upgrade State and local health departments to help meet any public health problems that could be associated with terrorism. I think we would agree that we ought to increase our capacity at biosafety laboratories. Right now, those laboratories are operating at full capacity. They have no real ability to expand in time of crisis.

We would like to put \$150 million more in here to help firefighters. We would like to put \$240 million more in the budget to provide for additional cockpit security. We would like to put an additional \$200 million into the bill to provide assistance to local airports whom we have mandated to increase law enforcement without being given the concurrent Federal resources to do that.

We would like to add \$440 million to State and local health departments to better prepare the country for health emergencies. We would like to provide \$107 million more to the FBI so that they can protect their records and make them less subject to problems in the event of attacks on the FBI itself.

We would like to provide \$500 million to the post office so that they can begin the process of figuring out how to sterilize the mail. And we would like to provide additional funding for the Coast Guard and Customs, among other items, all crucial to the security of the country. And all we are asking is that the Committee on Rules allow those three amendments to be debated.

I would ask the gentleman under my reservation if he would have any objection to the Committee on Rules allowing those three amendments to be considered by the House.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to say first that I appreciate the support that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has given us through the process; and yesterday when the Committee on Appropriations took up the basic Defense bill, the Defense Appropriations bill, and added to it the amendment that, the chairman's amendments that allocated the \$20 billion of that \$40 billion supplemental. He was very supportive in his comments of both the underlying bill and the amendments. His position

was, as he indicated, that there was much more that needed to be done.

I would say to the gentleman that I have analyzed those amendments closely and I have really found no objection to the amendments. The objection that I had to raise in the committee was only one of timing, whether we would do it today, now or whether we would wait for the President to request a supplemental.

But anyway then, directly to the question of the gentleman, I have no objection to the Committee on Rules providing a rule that would make any amendment in order to an appropriations bill that, in fact, is an appropriations issue. I do object to a rule or adding nonappropriations language to a bill.

In the case of the gentleman's specific question, I would tell him that I spoke to the chairman of the Committee on Rules earlier today and advised him that I would have no objection personally to a rule that would allow the consideration of those amendments. I believe that Members have a right to be involved in the debate on very serious issues; and, in fact, after the experience that we had yesterday, after about 7 hours, I almost wish that all of our Members could enjoy some of that fun that we had yesterday.

So the answer is I have already advised the chairman of the Committee on Rules that I would not object.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I understand that there are some other Members who have concerns.

Under my reservation, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support the continuing resolution and to speak about the supplemental appropriations bill.

Yesterday in the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered an amendment to increase funding for a number of critical security needs. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated. The September 11 tragedies happened because terrorists were able to take over the cockpit of four airplanes.

The Obey amendment would have provided an additional \$250 million to prevent this from ever happening again. The President even requested this funding, but the majority bill, due to other priorities, included only \$50 million of the President's \$300 million request.

Today, the airlines have made some interim improvements so that cockpit doors cannot be as easily broken into, such as the strengthening of bolts. The

President's proposed \$300 million for permanent modifications to secure the cockpit doors to prevent an intruder from entering the cockpit, the funding request by the President and included in the Obey amendment, would help airlines ensure that all aircraft cockpit doors are secured as quickly as possible.

In addition, the Obey amendment would provide additional funding to our Nation's airports to meet additional security needs. They are doing increased patrols of ticket counters, baggage claim areas and screening checkpoints that have been mandated as have increased inspections, controlled access points in areas outside the terminal buildings.

Airports have also been required to reissue all airport identification and verify such identification at all access gates. To meet these requirements, the airports have incurred significant additional costs, primarily for law enforcement officers and overtime pay.

The American Association of Airport Executives estimates the cost of these new requirements to be about \$500 million this year. These increased costs come at a time when airports are losing money due to increased air travel and fewer sales in airport shops and eateries. The airports estimate total revenue lost to be \$2 billion in 2002, or 20 percent of estimated revenue.

The Obey amendment included \$200 million to assist airports in meeting the cost of increased security requirements mandated by the FAA. As the Defense bill now goes to the House Committee on Rules and then comes to the House floor, I urge the House to allow consideration of the Obey amendment.

Just to be clear, would the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) yield for a question?

Mr. OBEY. Surely.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, all the funds that I speak of and all the funds that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) speaks of in his amendment, as I understand, are declared to be emergency funds, so they could only be spent, even after they are appropriated, if the President agrees, says there is an emergency and then releases the funds.

Mr. OBEY. That is exactly correct. What we are saying is that we believe that the President needs the added flexibility to have these funds available because of the crisis that we are in; and if he deems any of the items to be nonessential, he simply does not have to designate them as an emergency and that money would not be spent.

Mr. SABO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his answer, and I might indicate also that the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) amendment includes some additional funding for the

important duty of the Coast Guard and for port security in this country, which is very crucial.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) very much. I think the gentleman's comments indicate why in the process of approving this continuing resolution we are concerned that the time that will be used by the Congress between now and the expiration of the new continuing resolution would be put to the best possible use.

Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, as well as the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my ranking member, for yielding and rise, obviously, in support of this continuing resolution.

This needs to be passed, but the issues that are being raised by Mr. OBEY and others who have spoken with reference to what we need to do in the short term, what we need to do before we leave and go home after the first session of the 107th Congress, I know the Coast Guard was just discussed, great concerns.

I represent obviously the State of Maryland. The State of Maryland is a coastal State, clearly concerns are raised. We have tankers going in and out. We do not know who gets off those tankers, gets in little rubber boats, brings items to this coast and to Maryland, to Delaware, in the Chesapeake Bay which may obviously pose dangers to many of the Federal facilities that are located therein.

We cannot wait. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made that point yesterday very eloquently. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is in a difficult position, the chairman of our committee.

We had three amendments in committee yesterday. The chairman of our committee wanted to back all three of the amendments and said so, that he was inclined to vote for the Obey amendment, inclined to vote for the Walsh amendment and inclined to vote for the Murtha amendment, but he did not because there is a constraint being imposed.

Very frankly, that constraint will perhaps lead us to additional continuing resolutions because we may not finish our business in a timely fashion if we continue to delay that which I think we know we need to do. The issues raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), Coast Guard being but one, the homeland security issues, that is critical, need to be addressed and they need to be addressed in the short term.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership on these issues. I thank him for raising these issues on an item that is not controversial, but gives us an opportunity to say that we need to move on these and we need to move in the short term on these, and I am certainly hopeful, and I say to my chairman for whom I have, as he knows, unreserved respect and great, great affection.

I think he is one of the finest Members of this body, and I would urge him to prevail upon those who will be making decisions to allow these amendments to be considered on the floor when we consider the Defense bill and its supplemental title, because I believe that considering these now is in the best interest of our country, the best interest of our security, the best interest of the safety of our people, the best interest of our confronting those who would terrorize this land and people around the world.

I, therefore, believe that as we did in responding immediately to the Terrorist Act, we need to respond with as much efficiency and speed as we possibly can to these identified.

I know the chairman and the ranking member agree on the objectives. That is the irony. It is not that we disagree with the objectives. We are just disagreeing on timing, and now is better than later. It is safer, more appropriate policy, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his comments.

Under my reservation, Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction.

Mr. OLVER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding, and I too rise in support of the continuing resolution which is indeed necessary, and I hope that this continuing resolution, which is dated for December 7, will in fact provide us with enough time to finish the work that needs to be done on the appropriations legislation; and I have every reason to believe that that will be the case.

I also want to speak to the question of what the rules for debate ought to be on the Defense and the supplementary codicils on the Defense Appropriations bill and to urge the Committee on Rules to make in order the three amendments that have been spoken of earlier that had been offered in the Committee on Appropriations yesterday and each one, debated at length and then disposed of.

□ 1615

I want to speak specifically to the portion that has to do with the mili-

tary construction budget, the area where I am the ranking member. One of the issues that is involved in the homeland security amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offered yesterday, has to do with our major, most important Department of Defense facility that deals with bioterrorism. That is right here close to the Capitol at Ft. Detrick, Maryland.

All of the samples for anthrax testing in the recent anthrax scares, went to Ft. Detrick. And the number of samples they would not have seen in a whole year were handled there within a 6-week period at a place which is aged and inadequate as a testing laboratory and very poorly equipped. But that is the place where we test the samples, where we develop the vaccines to try to meet those kinds of public health incidents.

If we had another agent, whether it be smallpox, or agent X, Y, or Z that was brought out and we were hit with that at the same time as we were trying to deal with the anthrax situation, that they struggled with so effectively during the past few weeks, that laboratory would be absolutely overwhelmed, far beyond its capacity to do the testing in defense of our public health. And part of the amendment which the gentleman from Wisconsin had offered yesterday having to do with homeland security began to correct that. It would put nearly \$5 billion into properly equipping and manning the office over there at Ft. Detrick so that they could do the necessary work.

The other thing that was in that, which is related to military construction, is actually \$400 million, or thereabout, close to it, and is actually much closer to the sort of thing that terrorists are directly involved with. We have seen the impact that dedicated terrorists can have on an open society such as ours. Well, we have also seen what happened in 1982, in Lebanon, when a dedicated terrorist was able to take a truck filled with explosives up to the very doors essentially of the dormitory where 200-plus of our Marines were being billeted and those Marines lost their lives. We are living under certainly very different circumstances from the circumstances before September 11; and we are an open society, we have acted like an open society, and many of our bases are very open kinds of bases.

Anyone can walk right into the Naval Academy or West Point. Anyone can drive a truck, a delivery truck in there. We have never had to bother taking the kinds of inspection precautions that we probably now almost certainly need to take much more seriously. That kind of site is very much at risk for a similar sort of a situation that happened to our Marines in Lebanon. We have circumstances where there are major highways that go directly through the middle of major bases.

I can name them in large number, but just a couple are in North Carolina, at Camp Lejeune, a major Marine base there, and at Fort Bragg, a major Army base in North Carolina. Those bases have major highways running right through. There are thousands of civilians, thousands of vehicles passing through those bases each day. There are places where they can turn off. We do not yet have in those places the fences, the gates, the barriers, the inspection places to deal with that. We are in danger at places like that, and dozens of others in this country.

The amendment the gentleman from Wisconsin had offered would provide us with the money to do, in the worst cases, in the most egregious cases, not by any means all, we cannot probably in a matter of several years deal with all of the force protection problems in those kinds of places, but it would give us a major start in dealing with the kinds of places where we need fencing, we need gating, barriers, and inspection stations at our military facilities in order to be able to be certain that we can avoid the sort of terroristic effects we have seen in other places.

All of this really should be pretty familiar to us, because all of these things have been done close to the Capitol, around our own buildings here on Capitol Hill, and our men and women in the armed services deserve at least the same kind of protections that we have been trying to provide for ourselves. In fact, right here, within a matter of blocks of the Capitol, there is one of those billeting locations used by Marines here in the capital city and close to us, which lies within feet, literally feet, of Interstate 295 and major highway intersections. And we need to do things to correct that kind of risk, to reduce that kind of risk for our military personnel.

So I would hope that the Committee on Rules would make these three amendments in order, in order that they can be debated, in order that they can be fully considered by the full House and not just by the Committee on Appropriations. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I do support the continuing resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding. The gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Florida are known for their fairness. I am here to appeal to both of them, through the Speaker.

We need to keep our government funded and running while we finish our legislative business. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the continuing resolution. One of the Federal agencies that I am particularly focused on, and I would ask the two gentlemen

to as well, is the Federal Emergency Management Agency. This agency administers the Firefighters Assistance Grant Program under the Fire Services Administration.

We all worked hard, in a bipartisan way, 285 co-sponsors, and finally brought it to reality, passed in both Houses. This month we passed the VA-HUD appropriations bill. It will provide funding for \$150 million for fiscal year 2002. But it is far from the amount that I think the members of our fire services deserve and need.

As part of the supplemental chapter of the Department of Defense appropriations bill, we are trying to secure \$150 million additional dollars for this necessary program. If September taught us anything, it is the importance of the firefighters and first responders to the public safety equation.

We had to scrape and beg to get \$100 million last year in the emergency spending bill. The leadership told us they did not believe us when we said the fire services needed this money desperately. So what happened? Thirty thousand applications came in to FEMA, over 19,000 fire departments throughout America, volunteer and career. And when we added up all those applications, it came to \$3 billion. We had \$100 million.

I believe we are sincere about responding to September 11, and yet we know that over 65 percent of our career departments are undermanned, that is, of the first 200 cities in America, 160 of them cannot pass muster right now, today. I am a bit chagrined that we are still scraping and begging, but this is needed.

And trust me, my colleagues, you will be hearing from all of these fire departments in your districts around the country. We are asking them to do a different job than 20 years ago, to be the first responders and, many times, the last to leave all of these emergencies. The odds are that all of us have a few fire departments at home that will not get a grant this year because there was not enough money to go around.

There are few heroes in our lives, but these people who put their necks on the line day in and day out to keep us safe certainly are, and that is what we are doing here today. I know our contribution to this worthy cause will continue to rise as each of my colleagues hears from their own constituents about the need for more fire personnel, safety equipment, and vehicles.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding. This is an important matter to Americans and our fire departments and our EMT squads throughout the United States. They have been there as first responders, and we cannot ignore them. So I appeal to both gentlemen to hear the fairness of my request from the depths of their commitment in their own hearts.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time under my reservation, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments, and I totally agree with them.

Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me and for his leadership, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the committee, as well for his honesty and forthrightness, for those of us who did not have 7 hours yesterday, were not in the Committee on Appropriations, to make mention of his support of these amendments.

I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for these amendments, and I would like to highlight and hope that the Committee on Rules will not only make them in order but I am hoping that they will prevail on the floor of the House.

I think the distinction that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) made is very important for us to reemphasize. This simply provides the appropriations that then can be designated by the White House as to whether an emergency exists and that these monies are then available to be utilized. I have no doubt that the President, once the facts are presented fairly and without obstruction, will understand what is going on in local communities.

The firefighter matter that my distinguished colleague from New Jersey just mentioned, I have had firsthand experience with. First of all, Houston went through Tropical Storm Allison. It does not compare to September 11 in the enormous loss of life, but we had our emergency responders on the front line there along with FEMA. Following back to back with Tropical Storm Allison in Houston came September 11, and the anthrax scare subsequent to that. My firefighters answered about 75 calls in a 3-day period, the HAZMAT team.

So the \$150 million to local communities, spread across the communities, is crucial to be able to respond to what the firefighters, the first responders, and the emergency teams are going through at this time. And so I hope that we will be able to not only pass this through the Committee on Rules but deliberate on the floor and ultimately pass it.

Just this morning, I believe we reached some sort of compromise on the airline security bill. I am hoping that the compromise, when it ultimately reaches the floor, will be satisfactory as it relates to federalizing all of the security for the airlines. I understand it is gradual; that it will have a pilot program of five that will be able to experiment with a private company, but, more importantly, it will have a 3-

year window of federalizing all of the security at our airports.

□ 1630

In the meantime, I believe it is crucial that we reimburse our local municipalities and our airports for the work that they have had to do, and the resources that they have used in light of September 11 and in light of the burden we put on them to say, we want to get our citizens back flying, get Americans back on planes. And from my traveling through airports, I can assure Members that local municipalities are bearing the brunt of extra security in the airport. We have to reimburse them. The director of the airport system in Houston indicated the necessity of getting these dollars to them.

In addition, the strengthening of the cockpit doors, even though we have heard that our airlines are gradually strengthening the cockpit doors, I do not think that we can assuredly say that every single cockpit door that departs from our soil is truly reinforced.

On the state of local hospitals, public hospitals, in the Homeland Security Task Force, we are well informed that the brunt of any kind of bioterrorism or chemical warfare in local areas obviously will fall to our public hospital systems. It is crucial that we reinforce them. Most of them are teetering because of the Medicaid and Medicare formulas, and so the \$440 million is crucial.

Madam Speaker, I have heard that the overtime is killing doctors and nurses. We need to make sure that the public hospital system is strong.

Lastly, the wisdom on the Postal Service is very important. Again, viewing those centers, one of the major mail centers in my community, watching the mail come through, this was before the stoppages because of anthrax, the ability to have equipment to sanitize that mail, both for the in-house postal workers and the letter carriers is crucial. It is important that our mail continue and that the American people know that we are taking charge and helping to assist them in the security of this Nation.

Madam Speaker, as I rise to support the continuing resolution, I hope these amendments will be made in order, and that we do this before we leave for any permanent holiday through the holiday season. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for listening to the needs of the Nation, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) who is very concerned about the security gaps at our ports.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) for the

time and attention they have given to some of our greatest needs.

I regret that we were not able to get these things passed in our subcommittee. Everybody is concerned about these important issues, and both the chairman and the subcommittee chairman have worked hard, and the ranking member as well.

I am from Florida, and I have a sincere appreciation for the safety features that we must have at our seaports. Port security is an issue which the Obey amendment addresses to show exactly why it is so important. I think if Congress understands this, we can better interpret this to the administration. Each of us has constituents back home that we must face. The President is in a larger milieu. Americans want to know, are we safe and are our ports safe. We must carry that message. If we take a strong enough leadership position on this, I think the President will acquiesce, because he, too, understands the power of a constituency that is determined to get some kind of consideration for their needs.

Port security is an issue that neither party can take a stand against. Number one, we have 361 deep-water ports in this Nation. We have 14 deep-water ports in Florida. My own port in Miami is the largest cruise port in the world; 3.4 million people go through our port annually. Ports in the United States handle about 7.8 million tons of cargo each year.

At the same time, the State of Florida is heavily port dependent. Florida has the longest coastline of any state in the lower 48 States. International trade through Florida seaports reached 150 million tons in 2000, valued at \$73.8 billion.

Our State laws in Florida require that our ports have vulnerability assessments. They have been reviewed by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. We already have security plans in place to ensure the safety of our citizens at Florida seaports. Not only is this important in Florida, it is important throughout the Nation. Most of the ports in this country do not have those security assessments made. We need to do these assessments, and we need to do them now and we need to address our vulnerabilities. Many of our seaports are located in extremely close proximity to United States military bases, population centers, and even the NASA operations at Cape Canaveral.

As the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) knows, the port of Tampa alone handles over 10 million tons of hazardous cargo each year, including petroleum products. I cannot stress too strongly the importance of port security. There is a clear funding shortfall at this time for these ready-to-go projects. They do not have to wait. We must impose upon our administration to bring these points to light.

I am 100 percent behind the continuing resolution, but I would be less than a good Representative if I did not come before Congress and ask for many of the things that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has asked be considered in his amendment.

On the basis of Florida studies, Florida's deep-water ports require \$80 million more. The chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government has done the best the gentleman can do. We have a huge security risk. Congress needs to understand that, and the administration also. It is clear that port safety and security nationwide is very costly.

The President recommends no funds whatsoever for port security. It is difficult for me to see the rationale for that. The Obey amendment includes \$200 million for port security assessments and enhancements. The Obey amendment is a prudent amendment. It looks at the security of our Nation. I say to Members that port security is a tremendously important security problem.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the CR, and I also urge the leaders to get these things done, to take the message to the President that we must take a stand on this. It is important.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) who wanted to make one additional point.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I had spoken generally about the amendments that we considered yesterday. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, I wanted to speak particularly about one item, and then mention three others quickly.

First, New York, Pennsylvania and the Pentagon, Virginia and the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area, sustained a direct attack; but there is another institution in our country which has sustained a direct impact, and that is the Postal Service of our Nation. We have lost two postal workers to anthrax. They died as a result of anthrax inhalation. I attended a memorial service for those two gentlemen, Mr. Curseen and Mr. Morris, 2 days ago.

In the Obey amendment, there is an item of \$500 million to allow the postal department to respond: one, to make sure that we do not lose any more lives of those who serve us in the postal department; and secondly, to make sure that we have the resources necessary to make sure that the mail that goes through the Postal Service, before it is delivered to individuals, is in fact free of biological or chemical agents which would cause them harm.

This is a critical component of the Obey amendment that, hopefully, will be made in order and we can offer. We cannot wait. From my standpoint, this

is not enough money for the Postal Service. This is not, and I would stress, all of the money that they will need. The Postmaster General said they will need between \$3 and \$5 billion to respond to the events of September 11 and the anthrax scourge that has confronted the Postal Service and others. I would urge us to focus on this Postal Service money.

Quickly, I would remark on the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been a leader on behalf of the fire service. The Obey amendment provides an additional \$150 million for the firefighters and emergency response personnel.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) mentioned the shortages around this country in the fire service in our major cities. I will tell my friends in this House, the fire service of the District of Columbia does not now have the capacity to respond to a major catastrophe in this city. We all hope and pray that does not occur, but we are not ready for it if it does.

Two other items in the Treasury-Postal bill, we know that the northern border has been a relatively porous border. Canada is no threat to us, but terrorists have utilized Canada as an entry point into the United States. The Customs Department has told us that they need substantial additional funds. Unfortunately, they were not included in the President's budget, as submitted to us.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) did in fact add some money, but not enough to accomplish the objective. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) adds to the sum that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) added, so we can accomplish a more secure northern border across which we know when the millennium occurred on January 1, 2000, shortly before that, one of the terrorists came across trying to cause an explosion to occur in the Los Angeles airport. Coming south, they were caught. That border is such that we were lucky; and we need to beef it up substantially, and the Obey amendment does that.

Lastly, we have talked about security at the Capitol. It is important and I support it. This is the center of democracy, but we need additional funds to secure our Federal facilities in which Federal workers labor daily on behalf of the American people. It is not that the terrorists seek to get to those individuals. They do not care who they are. What they want to get to is the Federal Government, and if we do not secure those buildings, we place our people at risk. The Obey amendment speaks to that objective, and I would hope that we can consider it as soon as possible.

Madam Speaker, again I thank the ranking member for his leadership, for his efforts on behalf of these objectives. I know the chairman of our committee supports these objectives. He

articulated that yesterday. He is dealing with constraints, and we understand that.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the second ranking Democratic member on the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

Mr. EDWARDS. Madam Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) on his efforts of moving the government forward during this time of national crisis. He has worked on a bipartisan basis, and for that, I have the greatest respect.

Madam Speaker, God forbid, had the terrorists of September 11 chosen as their weapon a nuclear bomb with just enough uranium to fill a soda can, placed it in a car in New York City, 2 million people, men, women and children, would have been killed that day.

□ 1645

To put that in perspective, one nuclear bomb parked in one car in a major American city would kill 400 times the number of people that the terrible terrorist attacks of September 11 killed.

I know we would all agree in this Chamber, Democrats and Republicans alike, that there is no greater responsibility of the Federal Government than to protect the lives of American citizens and families. In so many ways since September 11, this body has acted responsibly. Chairman YOUNG especially has led the fight to address vital national needs when it comes to homeland protection.

But, Madam Speaker, I come today to point out one area where I think this Congress has failed the American family. It is the area of protecting American citizens from the real and devastating threat of nuclear terrorism. I think most Americans would be shocked to find out that even despite all we have learned since September 11 that this Congress this year will actually reduce funding for the programs designed to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorists. Let me repeat that because I think many Americans will not believe it. Despite the occurrences of the tragedy of September 11, this year this Congress has voted to actually reduce funding for programs intended and designed to protect the American homeland and families from terrorists making nuclear bombs as weapons against our country. I find that incredible.

Intentions have been good. No one has intended to make America more vulnerable to nuclear terrorists. But in government good intentions do not protect anyone. It is our priorities and our funding decisions that really count.

I find it somewhat amazing that last night in the defense appropriations bill we were able to find \$256 million to pro-

tect this Capitol and me, Members of Congress and congressional employees from possible terrorist attack; yet we could not find one dime in that \$20 billion budget to fund defense of 281 million Americans against the real threat of nuclear terrorism.

I am not here to criticize anyone who helped put together necessary funding to protect this Capitol, its Members of Congress, 535 of them, and staff. This is the center and the symbol of our democracy, and it is right that we should protect it. But I would suggest if we can find \$256 million in this bill coming up this week to protect a couple of thousand people here in our Nation's Capitol, then we surely should be able to find \$100 million to protect 281 million Americans from nuclear terrorism.

It is fair for anyone to ask just how serious or how real is the possibility of terrorists getting their hands on nuclear materials, making a bomb, putting it in a car and exploding it here in the United States. Let me give you the answer that the U.S. Department of Energy would give us to that question. They say, and these are their words, we are in urgent need, urgent need, to immediately upgrade the protection of nuclear materials, 600 metric tons of which exist in Russia that are not presently adequately protected. That is enough nuclear material to potentially build 41,000 nuclear bombs, any one of which could kill 2 million to 3 million American citizens.

How real is the threat possibility of nuclear terrorism against our families? In Russia, it has been documented since 1992, we have had 14 instances of bomb-grade nuclear material being stolen from Russian facilities; and in eight of those cases, the stolen nuclear bomb-grade material was not found until it had actually left the country of Russia. I find that frightening. Even more recently, today's press reports are suggesting that materials have been found from the facilities left behind by fleeing al Qaeda and Taliban leaders that actually had materials that instructed those terrorists on the means by which to take nuclear material and build a nuclear bomb. I find that frightening.

But let us not just take the Department of Energy's word for it. Let us not take today's press reports for it to answer the question of how serious is the nuclear threat against American families. Let us look at what President Bush said yesterday in the Washington Post from actually a press conference of 2 days ago with Mr. Putin, and I quote our own President, Mr. Bush:

"Our highest priority is to keep terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction." Our highest priority, the President said. "We agree that it is urgent that we improve the physical protection and accounting of nuclear materials and prevent illicit nuclear trafficking."

What did President Putin say on November 7, just over a week ago? Referring to nuclear proliferation, he called it one of the most foremost threats of contemporary times. How important did President Bush think it was that we act immediately in regard to protecting Americans against the threat of nuclear proliferation? On November 6, just a few days ago, he said, "We will not wait until the authors of mass murder can gain the weapons of mass destruction. We act now because we must lift this dark threat from our age and save generations to come."

I support President Bush's effort to say we must act now. It is our responsibility to act now to protect Americans from the threat, the real threat, of nuclear terrorism. But this Congress has taken no action. In fact, if anything, we have rolled back the clock and reduced funding for those important programs.

Madam Speaker, I think it is absolutely essential for the protection of our homeland that the Congress, the Committee on Rules in the days ahead allow the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment to be voted on on the House floor, because it would put into action what President Bush has said in his words, that we must act now.

Finally, some said last night in the Appropriations Committee hearing that we just wait till next year. Sometimes waiting is the responsible thing to do. I would argue that when it comes to protecting Americans from the threat of nuclear holocaust, waiting is a dangerous mistake. I am not willing to ask other families to pay the price of playing that waiting game. Let us follow the lead of President Bush in this time of national crisis. Let us act now by voting for the Obey amendment and adequately funding the programs to keep terrorists' hands off nuclear materials.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think they are most important and ought to be heard by everyone.

Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding to me for an opportunity to make some comments about the present situation. I also want to express my appreciation and high regard for the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for the way in which he has led the committee this year and the fairness with which he has conducted its operations. But there are several important issues that are before the Congress now that many of us are fearful are not going to be dealt with appropriately, much less thoroughly. Therefore, I want to say,

also, how much I support the amendment that was put forth by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to provide for the kind of domestic security which we now know we so desperately need as a result of the attacks that occurred on September 11 in New York, in Virginia, and the plane crash that occurred in Pennsylvania.

Speakers before me have stipulated, I think, in precise and clear detail why this amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin has put forward is so important to secure the safety of Americans all over our country. And so the rule that comes forward should make in order that amendment. The Members of the House ought to have an opportunity to express themselves on the issue of the funding of domestic security. And that opportunity will not be afforded to them unless the rule makes in order the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment.

The same can be said about the amendment that is being offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA). That amendment would add additional needs, or make them clearer in the appropriations bill with regard to our national defense; and that amendment ought to be made in order as well. Both of these amendments are based upon contingent emergency. In other words, the money would not be spent unless the President thought that it was necessary to do so.

We are offering these amendments because we know that the House is going to be in recess for some period of time, and it may be necessary for the President to respond, both in terms of national defense abroad and in terms of domestic security here at home. And so the Murtha and Obey amendments are very important and ought to be made in order and ought to be debated on the floor of the House, and we need to have the rule that governs this issue when it is brought to the floor make these amendments in order.

Also, very importantly, is an amendment that was offered on a bipartisan basis by the five members of the Committee on Appropriations who represent various congressional districts in the State and City of New York. As is true with the other two amendments, I think it is true of this one as well, that the chairman of our committee along with the ranking member support the ideas behind these amendments and the provisions within them. It is unfortunate that the chairman of our committee is working under very difficult and dire circumstances. Otherwise, we know that it would be routine for these amendments to be brought forward. But routine or no, these amendments should find their way to the floor. The amendment that we introduced as representatives of the State of New York also should have an opportunity to be heard on the floor and for the Members of this House of

Representatives to express their will with regard to the disaster that struck New York City when the Twin Towers were attacked on September 11.

I do not know of another time, at least in the modern history of our country, when the Committee on Appropriations has not responded to the request of Members for aid at a time of disaster. In almost every instance when we speak of disaster, we speak of natural disaster. We speak of the results of flood or hurricane or earthquake or fire or some other natural disaster. The Committee on Appropriations always responds. This House of Representatives always responds when disaster strikes anywhere in the country. The disaster that struck New York is the worst disaster in the history of the Nation. No, it is not natural, it is man-made. It was inflicted upon us by enemies from outside of the country. Nevertheless, we need to respond to the financial needs that are associated with the occurrence of that strike, that disaster.

We thought that this had been done. Under the leadership of the chairman of our committee, our ranking member, the Speaker of this House and others, an agreement was made shortly following the attack of September 11 which would provide \$40 billion; \$20 billion of that \$40 billion would go for national defense and home security, and the other \$20 billion, it was made clear, would be made available to the City and State of New York as a result of the consequences of this incredible disaster that fell upon New York City.

We thought that that deal was signed and secure. It was made, again, by the leadership in this House, the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations on a bipartisan basis with the President of the United States. And the President said, You shall have that money, State of New York, because we know you need it. But now we are told that it is not necessary to provide that money at this time. Only half of it has been made available to the City and State of New York because of that terrible strike.

□ 1700

We plead with you to provide us with the remainder, with the remaining \$10 billion, and we plead with you specifically for the individual people who were afflicted as a result of that disaster. Five thousand people almost were killed as a result of that strike. They left behind husbands, wives, children. Many people are without health insurance; many others have lost their jobs.

We need to take care of the widows and orphans that have resulted as a consequence of that strike, and we need to make available to the people who have been placed out of work, tens of thousands of people have lost their jobs as a result of that strike, we need to make available to them health in-

urance through COBRA, Medicaid for those who were not eligible for COBRA, unemployment insurance and Workers' Compensation for those people who have been injured as a result of this strike.

So these things, all of them, are necessary. These amendments are appropriate. They ought to be considered in the context of the bill. I hope and trust that when the Committee on Rules considers this issue, they will in fact make these amendments in order.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Madam Speaker, before I withdraw my reservation, I would like to bring to the attention of the House two additional matters with respect to this matter.

I note and I am now reading from a story in the New York Times today which reads as follows:

"Osama bin Laden's al Qaeda network held detailed plans for nuclear devices and other terrorist bombs in one of its Kabul headquarters. The Times discovered the partly burned documents in a hastily abandoned safe house in the Karte Parwan quarter of the city, written in Arabic, German, Urdu and English. The notes give detailed designs for missiles, bombs and nuclear weapons. There are descriptions of how the detonation of TNT compressed plutonium into a critical mass, sparking a chain reaction and ultimately a thermonuclear reaction.

"Both President Bush and the British Prime Minister are convinced that bin Laden has access to nuclear material, and Mr. Bush said earlier this morning that al Qaeda was seeking chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.

"The discovery of the detailed bomb-making instructions, along with studies into chemical and nuclear devices, confirms the West's worse fears and raises the specter of plans for an attack that would far exceed the September 11 atrocities in scale and gravity. Nuclear experts say the design suggested bin Laden may be working on a fission device similar to Fat Man, the bomb dropped on Nagasaki. However, they emphasize it was extremely difficult to build a viable warhead."

The story goes on.

That is just one explanation of why the amendment that we seek to bring to the floor after this continuing resolution is approved, why that amendment contains \$1 billion aimed at keeping weapons of mass destruction away from terrorists, including the items discussed most eloquently by the gentleman from Texas.

I would simply say, Madam Speaker, there has been considerable misunderstanding about what the genesis of this amendment is.

Let me simply say, Madam Speaker, that immediately after the need became apparent, the gentleman from

Florida and I both instructed our staffs to review all of the agency requests for additional funds that might legitimately be considered by this body in order to strengthen homeland security; and we produced for discussion purposes a document which listed items Tier One, Tier Two, Tier Three, in the order of what people considered to be their importance. Some of them are funded, some of them are not, under the base bill.

We feel that if there had not been intervention at a higher level in this institution, I feel strongly that we would have had a bipartisan amendment presented to the committee yesterday and to this House, whenever the bill is considered, which would have had us stand as one, just as we did a few weeks earlier when we passed with no dissenting votes the first down payment of \$40 billion that the Speaker played a very constructive role in helping to negotiate.

Let me simply say that I understand why our friend on the majority side of the aisle and the committee yesterday could not vote with us on the amendments that we were proposing. I also understand that, in their hearts, many of them would have liked to.

I have an observation to make about that which has been, in my view, willfully misunderstood by one person in OMB who attended a meeting in the White House last week and willfully misdescribed to the press since.

When I was at the White House, I simply made this observation about Congress as an institution. It had nothing whatsoever to do with the operation of the White House or any other branch of government. What I simply observed was this: When each of us is elected, we come to this body as politicians. All we prove when we win our first election is that we know how to win an election. We then come to this body and seek to become legislators as well as politicians, and that process is furthered by each of us being given a committee assignment. After we are given that committee assignment, we learn the business over which that committee has jurisdiction. Some Members of this House learn it awfully well on both sides of the aisle.

The point I was trying to make is that for any legislative body to be a self-respecting legislative institution, there has to be a fair balance between the political requirements that sometimes drive the party leadership of both parties and the substantive legislative requirements that should drive the committees of this institution.

In my view, when the leadership of the other party seeks to intervene and shut off the judgment of the committee that has responsibility for the subject matter at hand, there is nothing wrong with that happening occasionally. That is the job of the leadership in both parties. But when it happens routinely, es-

pecially on matters this sensitive, then what happens is that this body becomes more and more strictly a political rather than a legislative institution. That is not good for us, that is not good for the country, and that is the point I am trying to make.

It seems to me that if the committee had been left to its own devices, we would have had a significantly uncontroversial proposal to make to the House, which would have increased funding for military expenditures associated with the war. It would have added these additional items which I believe are not at all controversial and are badly needed to plug some of the security holes, and we would have also assured that the original commitment made to New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia would have been maintained. That is the purpose of what we were trying to do yesterday.

I urge the White House and I urge every Member of this House to, please, before they make up their mind about how they are going to vote on whatever rule is attached to the Defense Appropriations bill, I urge every Member to simply review line-by-line what it is that is being proposed. If they do, I think that you will find that the vast majority of members of both parties would recognize the substantive value of what it is we are trying to do. It just seems to me that that is our job.

I also want to point out again, lest anyone think we are trying to "bust the budget," each and every add-on to the homeland security package, each and every item in that bill contains as part of that item the following language: "Provided further that such amounts shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement, as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress."

What that language means, Madam Speaker, is that if this money were to be provided, not a dime could be spent unless the President later agreed that each and every one of those items represented an emergency that needed to be funded. If, in the judgment of the President after reviewing our arguments, he decided that spending could wait for another day, that is the way it would be. He would maintain total control over the expenditures.

But we believe it is crucial to provide this, because we have talked to the FBI, the CIA, the National Security Agency, to many other agencies of government, and we are convinced that this is necessary for the good of the country.

We have stimulus packages floating around here being promoted by both parties. I will not comment on what I think of them. But the fact is that if we want to stimulate the economy, the

number one requirement is to restore public confidence in our ability to travel and people's ability to go into public places without fear, and that is what we attempt to do. That could do more to restore economic confidence than virtually anything else this body will do.

So I urge each and every Member to review this. And I repeat, we are perfectly willing at any time to grant unanimous consent for that Defense bill to come up today or tomorrow, provided only that we have an opportunity to vote on these three amendments. Surely that is not too much to ask.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 74

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "December 7, 2001"; and by striking the date specified in section 123 and inserting in lieu thereof "December 1, 2001".*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI) laid before the House the following communication from Ronald J. Norra, Pharmacist/Security Officer of the Office of Attending Physician:

OFFICE OF ATTENDING PHYSICIAN,  
U.S. CAPITOL,

Washington, DC, November 15, 2001.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for production of documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

RONALD J. NORRA,  
Pharmacist/Security Officer.

UNITED STATES ARCTIC RESEARCH PLAN BIENNIAL REVISION: 2002-2006—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United