

gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and whoever else is in there, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the whole crowd, and the gentleman allows us to offer a substitute.

We know that the majority is probably going to win this vote. We are not naive. The gentleman has the majority on his side of the aisle. But we want the American people to understand that there is another viewpoint here. And for the gentleman to shut us off and not allow us to debate for at least an hour our view on a very important issue that is going to affect us perhaps for not only years but decades to come, I think it is, if I may say so, the height of irresponsibility and not in keeping with the bipartisan tone in which the President of the United States has been so proudly displaying and advocating over the course of the last couple weeks.

Mr. ARMEY. If I may, Mr. Speaker, let me just say the gentleman from Michigan makes a good point. I understand that rumors can be upsetting and I regret that. But I still, nevertheless, in light of the rumor, the gentleman is, on behalf of his party, correct to come to the floor and make the points he has made, and I respect that. I can only tell the gentleman with respect to that question, which I think is a very important question for him to raise here today, that the gentleman's views have been expressed very clearly here. I see no way that the Republican leadership in the Committee on Rules when they meet on that can be unaware of how strongly they have been expressed. Let me thank the gentleman for that.

If I may have just one more moment on the matter of the points raised by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) with respect to scheduling consideration of the tax bill relative to the budget bill.

□ 1515

His position is well known to us, has been well known to us, and has been expressed by people on this side of the aisle. We have been and are cognizant of that position as we plan the legislative schedule for the next few weeks. It is not a position that has not been considered. It is a position that has been weighed well, as raised by people on both sides of the aisle. Still in light of those considerations, we have made these scheduling decisions. We are quite comfortable to proceed on that. We understand that they will be disconcerting and upsetting to Members, but we believe in the interest of managing the business of this House, that is the best way to proceed and I would hope that the gentleman could accept that.

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

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

Mr. BOYD. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, not to belabor the point, but I want to make a quick point that maybe has not been made. That is, that there are many on this side of the aisle that happen to agree with the President and many of the initiatives that he laid out in his speech on Tuesday evening and also in his budget he has presented, including strengthening our defense, including improving our educational system, including writing and implementing a prescription drug program, including helping assisting our veterans on their health care needs, including agricultural baseline needs that we know will exist, and also including his position on demeanor and the way he deals with people in a bipartisan way. It is refreshing. I know many of us on this side of the aisle have had many meetings with him since he has become President, including this Member, and with his staff to work on these issues.

I would simply say to the majority leader that I believe that most responsible people would think that it would be the proper thing to do to develop the budget, that is what the regular order of the rules of the House call for, prior to picking out a very small portion of that financial plan to pass which may seriously affect the way you do the other part. That is the only thing that I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas. There are a group of us that feel very strongly about that.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, again I appreciate that. I hope the gentlemen on his side of the aisle and my side of the aisle that feel so strongly in terms of this operational management model will abide with us in our interest of signaling to the American people on this tax reduction, this tax relief, that help is on the way. We want to get that signal out there early. We believe we can do that and be perfectly consistent with the requirement that in the end, as we work our way through this, it must all be reconciled to the budget that is passed by this body, the other body, and, of course, reconciled between the two bodies. There, of course, is no getting around that. So no matter how early we might act on any one part of it, in the end we will have that full reconciliation that I think would be a comfort to his concerns.

REPORT ON STATUS OF FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACTIVITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 1053 of the Defense Authorization Act of 2001 (Public Law 106-398), enclosed is a comprehensive report detailing the specific steps taken by the Federal Government to develop critical infrastructure assurance strategies as outlined by Presidential Decision Directive No. 63 (PDD-63).

This report was drafted by the previous Administration and is a summary of their efforts as of January 15. However, since this requirement conveys to my Administration, I am forwarding the report.

Critical infrastructure protection is an issue of importance to U.S. economic and national security, and it will be a priority in my Administration. We intend to examine the attached report and other relevant materials in our review of the Federal Government's critical infrastructure protection efforts.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 1, 2001.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 5, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,
MARCH 6, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 5, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 6, 2001, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING 40TH ANNIVERSARY
OF PEACE CORPS

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise also with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Peace Corps. It was founded on March 1, 1961 when President John F. Kennedy signed the legislation launching the Peace Corps.

Since then, more than 162,000 Americans have served and returned to this United States, having served in 134 different countries. Six now serve in the House of Representatives, three Republicans and three Democrats: the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), myself, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

More than 67,000 volunteers are in the field today teaching in elementary schools, high schools and technical schools, building water systems and agricultural co-ops, teaching health care, and treating people in need.

But, Mr. Speaker, we need to do more. The demand for the Peace Corps is at an all-time high. More host countries want volunteers. The interest in serving in this country is at an all-time high. In fact, only about one out of nine people that have shown interest have a space abroad, because Congress has not fully funded the Peace Corps. The goal was to have 10,000 volunteers in the field by 2000. We only have 7,000. We need to do a better job. Fully fund the Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 38 years since I joined the Peace Corps, and I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Peace Corps.

It was started on March 1, 1961, when President Kennedy signed the legislation launching the Peace Corps—establishing a bold and hopeful experiment to allow Volunteers to bring practical grassroots assistance to the people of developing nations to help them build a better life for themselves and their children.

Forty years later, the Peace Corps has succeeded beyond everyone's expectations.

Today there are more than 162,000 returned volunteers in the United States, six of whom serve in the House of Representatives and two in the United States Senate. They have served in 134 different nations, making significant and lasting contributions from Armenia and Bangladesh to Uzbekistan and Zimbabwe.

There are more than 7,000 Volunteers that are now living and working overseas. They are addressing critical development needs on a person-to-person basis: working with teachers and parents to teach English, math and science; helping spread and gain access to clean water; to grow more food; to help prevent the spread of AIDS; to help entrepreneurs start new businesses; to train students to use computers; and to work with non-governmental organizations to protect our environment. Above all, Volunteers leave behind skills that allow individuals and communities to take charge of their own futures.

In our increasingly interconnected global community, Peace Corps Volunteers also pro-

mote greater cross-cultural awareness, both in the countries in which they serve and when they return home. As they work shoulder to shoulder with their host communities, Volunteers embody and share some of America's most enduring values: freedom, opportunity, hope, progress. It is these bonds of friendship and understanding that they create that can build the foundations for peace among nations.

And I can personally testify that the best service that is given to the Peace Corps is the continuation of service to our communities when we all come home. Today, because of the anniversary of the Peace Corps, thousands of returned Volunteers are visiting schools and local communities throughout the United States, sharing the knowledge and insights gained from their experiences abroad and passing along the value of services to others.

As we have learned around the world, the best way to support a democracy is to help development at the local level. Meanwhile, America's young and old, single and married, would like to serve their country, humanity and democracy. The Peace Corps is one of the most effective mechanisms for uniting these two ideals. This is an asset we should not let go to waste.

On this 40th anniversary of the Peace Corps, please join me in honoring all Volunteers, past, present, and future, and in celebrating their four decades of service to the world. The Peace Corps has served its country well, and we should all be proud.

CONGRATULATING MOST REVEREND EDWARD M. EGAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK, ON HIS ELEVATION TO THE DIGNITY OF CARDINAL

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate the Most Reverend Edward M. Egan, Archbishop of New York, upon his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal. It is most fitting that Cardinal Egan is the successor of the late John Cardinal O'Connor. New York's new Cardinal is well aware of the legacy left by his predecessor and he is well prepared to continue and strengthen that legacy. He too is dedicated to the dignity of all peoples and to caring for those who are most scorned or ignored by society.

Cardinal Egan has the wonderful ability to nurture and develop a sense of social justice among his fellow Catholics. As was the case with Cardinal O'Connor, he understands and deeply respects the values inherent in a multicultural and multireligious community. He has a deep and abiding respect for and dedication to education.

As he assumes his leadership role in the great Archdiocese of New York, it is right for us to wish him success in making this great community a more

human, more caring and more believing community of brothers and sisters.

I ask my colleagues to please join me and all the members of the Archdiocese of New York in congratulating the Most Reverend Edward M. Egan upon his elevation to the dignity of Cardinal.

REGARDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RETROCESSION ACT

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 810 to retrocede the District of Columbia to the State of Maryland, minus the Federal portion of the city. The city has the bumper slogan of "taxation without representation." This bill will provide taxation with representation for the residents of D.C. I think that this would be a great move forward for the people of this community. It would give them access to all the services of the State of Maryland and also an opportunity to elect a Congressman, to vote on two United States Senators and to vote on members of the State legislature in Maryland.

The retrocession would create the fourth largest regional market in the United States between Baltimore and Washington. Does it work? In Canada there is a prime example of how this proposal could and would work. Its capital, Ottawa, lies in the province of Ontario and sends representatives to the provincial parliament in Ontario as well as the federal parliament as part of the Ontario delegation. It works very well for our neighbor Canada and I think it would work very well for the United States. Most importantly, it would give the people of the District of Columbia the right to vote, to have taxation with representation.

Mr. Speaker, two hundred years have passed since District of Columbia residents lost their right to vote. Despite the ratification of the 23rd Amendment in 1961, which returned their right to vote for President, District residents still lack voting representation on the floor of Congress. To increase national awareness of this situation, the District recently changed the slogan on its automobile license plates to read "Taxation Without Representation."

Today, I am once again introducing a bill that I strongly believe is the best solution to this problem, especially given the failure of other alternatives. This legislation would return the District of Columbia, barring a small federal enclave, to the State of Maryland.

The District of Columbia was originally comprised of territory ceded by the states of Virginia and Maryland. The Virginia portion was retroceded back to that state in 1846. Under this bill, the remaining territory, excluding a small enclave encompassing the White House, Congress, the Supreme Court and most executive agencies, would be returned to Maryland.