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.)