together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12170 of November 14, 1979.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 2001*.

WHAT ARE OUR REAL NATIONAL PRIORITIES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, it is good to be here today, though I am saddened by the fact that a budget has passed out of this House and I was unable to be on this budget resolution. That budget did not speak to the needs of my community. In fact, it did not speak to many communities, that of the environmental community as well as the education community.

It is amazing that the President said, when he was Candidate Bush, that he promised a new era of environmental protection, and that we should leave no child behind. Yet the impact of this budget today was simply that: We are leaving children behind, and the environment has not been given anything to enhance or direct some of the toxic wastes, the brownfields and all of those other environmental hazards that impact my district.

□ 1630

I can recall that last year in the budget when we talked about 100,000 new teachers. When I was a teacher, I really did gleam at the whole notion that we would for once pay attention to the importance of quality teachers, to bring those 100,000 new teachers into classrooms, whereby no child would be left behind in having a quality teacher.

When we talked about reducing class sizes, where class sizes would be no more than 20 students per class, again I was excited about the budget last year that brought forth those types of innovative provisions and initiatives that certainly did speak to leaving no child behind.

Today's budget resolution did not have either of those in there. In fact, the President has been very inconsistent with the application of his promise. If the President were true to his promise, he would not cut critical and necessary environmental and education programs.

It is so important for Watts in my community and other Members' urban communities to have gotten from this body a budget that would speak to the issues that are so important to them, and yet we rushed quickly to get out the $1.6 trillion tax cut, which invariably the Senate did reduce a bit to a $1.35 trillion tax cut overall.

I am for a tax cut, have always been for one, but we must have targeted tax cuts that will enable us to have those 100,000 new teachers, that will enable us to have those reduced class sizes, so that in my districts of Compton and Watts and the Los Angeles Unified School District, students really will get quality education that they sorely need.

It is important that the American people understand that the children that we speak about are poor children. Those 53 million children that we have to educate in this country are poor, they are disabled; they are, for the most part, limited English speaking. They are in need of a budget that speaks to them, a budget that does not leave them behind.

So the Republican proposal provided less than half the average funds Congress granted the Department of Education for the past 5 years, in speaking to education, the Department of Education that Congress granted over the past 5 years, speaking to education, speaking to the environment, speaking to those needs of the children, the majority of the children who make up the 53 million children who are in dire need of those qualified teachers.

This proposal that the majority put out fraudulently inflates their increase by taking credit for funding previously provided initiatives during the past administration for the 2002 appropriations. In reality, Madam Speaker, that is not the way you do business in terms of a budget.

Let us look at some of the things that happened in this budget proposal. It actually guts out school renovation, whereby States have to then divert $1.2 billion in their 2001 budget to fund other critical education programs, because they need more than $100 billion to bring classrooms up to adequate condition.

I certainly would like for Members who voted on this budget to come to my district and to look at the classrooms in my district, where the ceilings are falling, where the seats have splinters, where the students cannot move around in the seats because they will really be in danger of getting some type of sore, some kind of mark, or just simply cannot sit still in a seat because the seat is not adequate for them.

I would like for you to come to my district, where we do not have computers for every student, that once a semester they get a different teacher, and this teacher has an emergency credential.

I want those who really voted on this budget to come to my district to look at the school environment and recognize that this budget did not speak to those students. This budget also caps the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, funding at $1.25 billion. Disabled students, students we are trying to bring into the mainstream, should be in the mainstream of education, having now to deal with caps and funding that is below par in meeting their needs, the needs of these students who have special needs, but still are very sharp, very much wanting to be in the mainstream of education, and needing the funding to provide them the type of resources that are critically needed.

Madam Speaker, it also cuts educational technology funding by $55 million, less than the 2001 freeze level of $872 million. What a travesty. We have an H1–B bill that passed out of this House sending for folks from other countries over here to do high-tech jobs because we do not have trained personnel for these jobs, and yet we are not even in the process of trying to train the future leaders in high-tech when we cut educational technology by $55 million.

I have just mentioned to you that these schools do not have computers for every child or even a computer for every two or three children in a classroom; and if you look at the projections of the workforce in the next 5, 10, or 15 years, they will be the absolute children we are talking about today who are the poor children who will not have a chance to move into the world of work and high-tech jobs. They will simply be unable to meet the criteria for these jobs because of our not putting the money in a budget today that speaks to education for our children who will be the workforce of tomorrow.

So, I am simply concerned about this. It is a critical issue that really touches me deeply, because I was sent here by people who want to make their life better by education. They want to have a better quality of life by ensuring that their children have a qualified teacher and that the class sizes are conducive to learning. That means students who are in classes which have no more than 20 students.

So I say to you, those of you who voted on this bill, obviously you do not need the money for educational technology. Perhaps you do not need the money in your district for the individuals with disabilities. But I certainly do, and many of the Members here who represent urban and rural districts need this. So when we talk about ''leave no child behind,'' I am afraid this budget in terms of education has left many children behind, many of whom represent the 53 million children who I speak of today.

When we talk about the environment, we again recognize that Candidate Bush promised a new era of environmental protection. I have grandchildren who talk about the water, because they have heard by others and have seen on television that we have a problem with arsenic in our drinking water. Yet this budget rescinded an

order that limits arsenic in drinking water, rescinded that, that limits the arsenic in drinking water. It is asking for more studies.

How many more studies will we have to present to discern the notion that we must limit arsenic in our drinking water, that we must have that Clean Water Act, and cannot erode that by any means; and yet it is being looked at as a possibility of being eroded by this budget, this President's budget that passed out of this House today.

There has been a renouncement of the Kyoto Agreement on global warming and reversed a campaign promise to regulate carbon dioxide emission from power plants. Again, there was a promise that the Candidate Bush did, but now we see has totally dissipated. But the emissions in the air are not dissipating at all. We still have this problem of carbon dioxide and other toxics in the air.

This is why the clean air and clean water bills cannot and should not be eliminated or diminished in their effectiveness, because of the critical need for the environment to again be conducive to children who play outside, who have no other recourse but to play outside, and they are playing in these areas where you have toxics, where you have carbon dioxide emissions in the air.

If that was not enough, we looked in this budget to see delayed new hard rock mining regulations that would require companies to protect water quality, pay for cleanup, and restore public lands ruined by mining activities.

These are provisions that were inside of this budget. A delay on this, rescinding on that, pushing back, suspending on others, clearly issues that do not and will not help this environment at all. We will not have a budget that speaks to clean air, clean water, clean up of toxic waste, clean up of brownfields.

Another provision in this budget that was proposed was a proposal to drill for oil and gas in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. We have heard a lot about ANWR. We have heard a lot about the need for that. And that is not a need. We should not disturb wildlife. We should try to find alternative means by which to deal with our environment, and it should not be that drilling for oil and gas at all in a place that will disturb the inhabitants.

The proposal was to suspend several of the past administration's environmental rules, including one that would protect the remaining roadless areas in the National Forest. What are we trying to do? What are we simply trying to do when we tend to erode those things that past administrations have done to speak to the needs of a cleaner, safer environment? Why are we trying to destroy those provisions, those initiatives, that will help the communities, the urban and rural communities, to reach levels where the air is cleaner, the water is safer, and, indeed, that there is no drilling in places that will create a climate that is not conducive to one who wants to go into National Forests and wants to not have roads and other areas that will, again, impede their solace of being there.

We have looked at EPA in the budget that is supposed to help us with the clean water, clean air, brownfield cleanups, and yet there has been a cut in the funding of EPA by $500 million, less than the 2001 freeze level.

Those of us who come out of local government, and once as a mayor of a city I recognized if you do not clean up the environment, you will not be able to induce or to even bring in businesses to provide the jobs for those who are the least of those who will get a tax cut or the results of a tax cut. You will simply not have those persons who will be able to make the charge of investing in this economy, investing in this country, if they do not have the jobs that accord them the salaries that will be conducive to the quality of life that we would want all Americans to have.

□ 1645

Yet we see these cuts in EPA of $500 million.

The budget also provides $850 million for the Clean Water State-Revolving Fund program, but it is less than two-thirds of last year's level. If, again, Madam Speaker, we are talking about clean water, we cannot make this budget and its resources less than two-thirds of last year's level. We have to bring this up to the level where those in this country will realize that we are trying to clean the water, we are trying to clean the air, we are trying to clean those brown fields, we are trying to stop the emissions in the air. We simply cannot state that charge if, in fact, the budget reflects something that is totally different, and which this budget did.

The budget also cut the EPA's science and technology program by $54 million, again, from the 2001 freeze level. This cut includes $4.5 million for safe drinking water research and a $6.3 million cut in research on key air pollutants. I simply cannot understand a person who said with the most oratorical stance that one could make that there will be a new era of environmental protection; and yet this budget does not reflect any of that, a person who spoke about this comprehensive education package that will leave no child behind; and yet we see that many children will be left behind.

I simply say as an educator, I cannot go back to my district and say, well done, we have done what you need, we have met those needs that you have. I cannot go back to my grandchildren and those children who think that the water is tainted, that there should be something done with the water and say, well, we do not know whether we can do that; we do not know whether we can fix that now. I cannot tell my asthmatic children and grandchildren who have asthma that you really cannot go outside because the emission in the air is so thick that you will not be able to breath. I simply cannot go home and say that ''well done'' on a great budget resolution. I cannot go home and say that this budget speaks to the needs of my community.

I simply will have to say that we do not have the right people making the right decisions for you; and, therefore, we need to look at the possibility of changing that in the near future. Because, Madam Speaker, if we are talking about the environmental and educational welfare of our children, then our Nation is at stake, our children, the environment really are at stake here. Because we have to speak to the children. We have to speak to the environment. We have to speak to the critical needs that will help us to address these needs, the critical needs of these areas that will not be advantaged by this tax cut. In fact, they do not even meet the levels of the tax cuts.

So if we are to live up to our promises, if we are to be the types of leaders that will be obligated to be responsible for those who are less fortunate, for those who are looking to us to provide those things that have not been provided for on the local and State level, then we must address why this budget resolution did not present itself in the fashion that would create the type of climate that would be conducive to the needs of those of whom I speak.

This is why I could not support the budget. I wanted to. I really wanted to help the President and help our country to have a budget that we could all rally behind and would appreciate. But that budget left behind our Nation's poorest and the most underserved children. And because of that, we simply cannot go out and rally that this budget was one for the urban or the rural communities. In fact, we cannot even say this budget presented itself for children so that we could bring them forward and not leave them behind.

It is a pretty sad day when we cut from educational technology and children are desperately trying to get on the Internet and trying to see just what that computer is all about. It is a sad day when the disabled student cannot get some of the resources that he or she needs because of this budget that did not speak to them. It is a very sad day when children cannot have adequate schools because of the renovation, the funding that has been cut from this budget.

I am pleased that we have one who has come to the floor who is a great leader, who is one of our budget persons, and who can speak to and articulate why the majority of this Democratic House did not vote on this budget. I present to my colleagues now this outstanding leader, the gentlewoman from the State of North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I appreciate her leadership in coming to

the floor and speaking about the seriousness of this budget and how it affects children, how it affects the environment. I heard the gentlewoman say what a marvelous thing he is doing for the country, to point out the seriousness of a budget document. The budget document is very important. It says, where are we going to put our resources. It says, indeed, where we place value. It says if we are talking from a political campaign or from a deep-seated commitment of American resources.

Now, the document should indeed be about where our priorities and our needs are; and the gentlewoman was correct, I think I heard her talk about recruiting teachers. I know the gentlewoman has taken a leadership role on that before she came to Congress on the whole issue, and she knows the critical shortage of teachers we have across America. She also knows that the future of our country is based on having good schools. So we have to have those who are able to lead the others. So it is so critical, and the number one priority in America happens to be education. Yet it was the most egregious omission in the budget.

Now, I come from agriculture; and I am very pleased that I saw there was some lifting up of the agriculture over what we had originally, so I want to applaud that. But I cannot accept that this budget was an important document; and you know that at the end of the day, that document will not be the guide that we just passed for several reasons. One, we cannot ignore the priorities of education and prescription drugs and the needs of America without the appropriators hearing from all of us and hearing from America who is saying, regardless of what we did with the budget, we have desperate needs. Regardless of what we have heard in terms of opportunities for us to get by with so little, we need more resources. So we know at the end of the day they are going to ignore those caps, and they are going to exceed those caps.

Also, we know that the budget is an important document because it should tell us where we are going to get our resources. We know that when we balance our budget at home, we cannot speculate that the job I do not have, I can just plug in a number. Well, the Federal Government, how we fund our resources is usually from taxes; and those are the actions we now have an obligation or that are legal on the books. So that is one.

The other one for resources happens to be trust funds, trust funds committed for the future. What are those trust funds? The trust fund for Social Security, the trust fund for Medicare. Or another way we can add resources, we can say well, if I need more money, I will just reduce spending over here in order to put money over there. So that is another way. So our budget should clearly indicate to the American people, how do we plan to pay for this and where do we get those monies? What tax reductions will do? So if we reduce the taxes, do we get more from the trust fund? Or do we cut programs? The money has to come from somewhere. So if we have an important document that should be telling the American people, this is a guide, well, the guide should clearly say, if I look at your budget, I know your resources and I know your revenue; and I know where these resources are from and how we gather the revenue, and that I am not either going into the Medicare Trust Fund, I am not going into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Why is that important? Well, in the tax budget we just passed, it says that we will have a $1.25 trillion tax reduction over the next 10 years. Now, that is just the beginning of the process. That is not the end. And we are paying down less of our debt. If we pay less of our debt, that means, guess what? Interest will go up. And as the interest goes up, so will that tax bill go up. We will find as we do that, the American people will say, well, I thought you said that the tax reduction was only about 1.3. How come at the end of the day, it is almost 1.6 or $2 trillion? Well, you have to add interest; and guess what, there are some other tax adjustments that we need to do, and a number for interest will be knocking on the door.

So again, I want to commend the gentlewoman for taking the time to explain to the American people and to our colleagues that the gentlewoman takes seriously the budget process, and I know I do. I am on the Committee on the Budget. I am offended not only by process, but also by substance. We have 435 of us, and the process allows that in a conference stage, the conferees, taken from both sides, should meet together. Now, we understand that the Democrats are in the minority and they will lose many of those battles supposedly, but we do not expect to be shut out completely.

So I am offended by process, but I am equally offended by substance, which is not there, the kinds of things that we will not be able to do. The kids will not be able to get educated, the environment will not be able to keep clean, and the commitment to the American people we cannot sustain if, indeed, we go with this budget resolution as it is. It means that we have to indeed get the money from somewhere. So it has to come from the trust funds, Social Security and Medicare. When we do that, we have violated the trust and our commitment to the American people. There is not enough money for prescription drugs, and the gentlewoman knows that as well.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for coming to the floor, because I tried to just take portions of this to speak on and next week we will speak on some of the others; and hopefully, this will send a signal to those conferees that we really are concerned about the impact this budget will have on our communities.

But when we look at the cuts in educational technology, the gentlewoman was one of the lead persons on the H1B bill, that really suggests to me and hopefully to some others of us that we are not trying to get the future ready for these high-tech jobs that surely should be the workforce from this country and not having to bring folks from across the waters to try to fill those types of high-tech jobs. So when we cut from educational technology, we are simply saying, that workforce that will mirror more of a minority, we do not worry about them anyway. We will just continue to bring people over. So the gentlewoman's take on that is really very valid.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Again, Madam Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman for taking the time and taking the leadership and for raising the consciousness and the understanding of the importance or the lack thereof, as we propose, of the budget process. Perhaps the American people will understand what happened today is of some significance, and they should wake up and be engaged in this process.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Well, again, we thank the gentlewoman so much and thank her for the work that she has done on the budget, irrespective of how it came out today.

We have again with us one of the great leaders of another State that has been front and center on education and on the environment, and I am sure she can pull from that budget any number of things that she feels was really egregious for the constituents whom she serves. Let me please recognize now the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. McKINNEY).

□ 1700

Ms. McKINNEY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I would like to applaud the fact that the gentlewoman had the initiative, the gentlewoman took the initiative to come down here to talk to the American people, to talk to our constituents about the issues that are very important to us and issues that are important to them, promises made and promises broken.

At the same time, we hear from the White House statements like, I am keeping the promises I campaigned on.

Let us just go and replay that campaign, because as far as I can remember, if I remember correctly, the current occupant of the White House lost the vote of the American people by 500,000.

Then on top of that, I had an election reform town hall meeting, and at the town hall meeting, we had the private company ChoicePoint come and testify about how the voter list was affected, so that those people who would go and present themselves in Florida and try to vote were denied the right to vote, because they started off the process with a list that was wrong.

What ChoicePoint testified at our hearing was that the State of Florida requested an inaccurate list. They requested a list of ineligible voters that was larger than the number of actual ineligible voters in Florida.

Where did they get those additional names of ineligible voters? They got those additional names from the State of Texas. Remind me. Who was running the State of Texas? Who is now running the State of Florida?

So we have the Bush brothers getting together and deciding who is going to vote in Florida and who is not going to vote in Florida, and then we have Kathy Harris coming up here on Capitol Hill to the Congress, the most powerful legislative body on the planet of Earth, coming and saying that election reform is the most important agenda for me as Secretary of State.

If the State of Florida was important to the Bush brothers in the year 2000, just imagine after having lost the popular vote by 500,000-plus, how important is the State of Florida going to be in the year 2004?

Now we are asked to come here to talk about the environment and the budget, and I see that the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART), who is sitting in the chair, is watching the timer, because this is the kind of information that folks do not want to come out.

Forty-five percent of George W. Bush's tax cut is going to go to the wealthiest 1 percent of taxpayers. If you make a million dollars, you are going to get a lot back. But if you happen to be a regular, average American, you will not get very much back; but we want to make sure that regular, average Americans get the most that they can get back.

Is it not interesting, I just happened to compile a list, we got up to 80 important issues for the first 100 of the Bush days. I would like to remind the people that this is the wealthiest Cabinet in the history of the United States. So, of course, they are going to go all over the country talking about we have to support the President's tax proposal.

How much are they going to get back? Our Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, campaigned on a platform to abolish the Department of Energy; is that not interesting? Can you imagine? No wonder the White House is now going into apoplexy as they try and recover their position on the environment.

Americans, by a remarkable 7–1 margin, think that Bush is less concerned about protecting the environment than protecting the interests of the energy industry. Of course, we see that oil is thicker than blood, because now George W. is even going against his brother Jeb down in Florida, so that they can auction off offshore oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) gave the administration an ''incomplete'' with respect to dealing with the environment in their first 100 days. Now, we also would have to give the administration an incomplete, because even as we try and take care of business on behalf of our constituents, and, of course, we have to interact with the White House, I guess they are just yelling down the hall to empty offices, because 90 percent of the positions have not even been filled.

Madam Speaker, I have written letters to the White House on the Yucca Mountain project, the apparent appointment of Walter Kansteiner, which is an abomination, to be the assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. That appointment is an abomination.

I have written to the White House on the Kyoto Protocol, on behalf of the people of Vieques, on behalf of people who have hemophilia, about the issue of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, about the education rate or the E-rate program, about the National Science Foundation, about the need for the Center for Disease Control and Prevention in my district, which is responsible for doing the most incredible things around the world on behalf of our health security.

I have written about contract bundling and the negative impact that it has on minorities and women who want to do business with the Federal Government. I have written about the 2000 Census. I have also written about the 1946 murders of four black sharecroppers in Walton, Georgia, who were lynched.

What have I gotten in response? I got a letter that says, I have shared your letter with the President's advisers and the appropriate agencies who have been formulating policy recommendations in this area.

Hello.

You were elected how many months ago? You had your plan of operation how many months ago? You certainly had your plan of operation in effect in November of the year 2000, because you took the election. But what comes after the election is governing, and that unfortunately is not what is being done.

The American people are being shortchanged. The American people are being shortchanged by what is happening in this Congress, with this Republican majority, that since it was elected in 1994 has failed to produce a budget on time.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her leadership. I want to thank her for allowing us to have this opportunity to come here tonight and to let the American people know what is really happening with their government, our government.

We must have change. We must be able to deliver on behalf of our constituents.

Madam Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

1. Bush campaigned on a pledge to provide a $1.6 trillion tax cut to America's wealthiest families.

2. Bush named the wealthiest cabinet in the history of the United States.

3. Bush's Cabinet stumped for the President's tax cut proposal.

4. Bush's number one priority in his first 100 days has been promoting a tax plan that will cost $2.6 trillion over the next ten years. 45% of his cut will benefit the wealthiest one-percent of taxpayers, people with an average income of $915,000.

5. The Bush tax plan against women and lower income earners gives no tax relief at all to those families too poor to pay income taxes (12 million families with 24 million children), no tax deductions for 53% of Black and Hispanic families; and no tax cuts made for single persons earning between $6,001 to $27,050 nor for married persons earning $12,001 to $45,200.

6. The administration's proposal also fails to make adjustments that would make tax rates truly progressive. Completely untouched is the regressive payroll tax that places the heaviest burden on low to middle income workers, predominately female, while leaving in place a substantial break for high income earners who make no payroll tax contributions above the $80,400 level (most of whom are men, of course).

7. Bush's tax cut would wipe out the rest of any funds available, leaving nothing for future contingencies, including shoring up Social Security.

8. The richest cabinet in history will get a kickback of over $100 million through Bush's efforts to push the Estate Tax legislation through Congress.

9. The Republican party is so devoid of talent that Bush named a record number of George Herbert Walker retreads to his Administration. There's no question about one assignment that's going to get a big, fat ''Incomplete''—installing the 487 top officials who will run the executive branch the next four years. 90% of assigned positions are unfilled.

10. Our new Secretary of Energy, Spencer Abraham, recently campaigned on eliminating the Department of Energy, the very program he now runs, while also leading efforts to prevent increased fuel efficiency in vehicles.

11. Our Secretary of the Interior, Gale Norton, has led efforts to rollback endangered species protection and allowed mining company polluters to escape clean up requirements and liability.

12. Bush appointed Gale Norton as Secretary of Interior because she believes that corporations have a constitutional right to pollute.

13. Gale Norton's first concrete attempt at a regulatory rollback was a proposal to gut updated environmental mining regulations that went into effect at the end of the Clinton administration. Independent reports estimate that taxpayers could be on the hook for about $1 billion in environmental cleanup cost from today's mines.

14. President Bush's choice for the No. 3 spot at the Department of Energy is Robert G. Card, who until recently was CEO and president of a cleanup contractor that has been fined or penalized more than $725,000 for numerous worker safety, procurement and other violations since 1996.

15. The New Attorney General has a history of blocking enforcement of environmental laws; and throughout his career, Ashcroft has worked tirelessly to restrict a woman's right to choose.

16. The new head of the EPA, Christine Whitman, who doubts that global warming is a serious problem, defended global warming and got kicked by Bush. In a memo from Whitman to Bush, the EPA Administrator stressed the need for Bush to ''appear'' to be engaged in addressing global warming, as if the environment responds to appearances.

17. Tommy Thompson, the new Secretary of the Department Of Health and Human Services was one of the country's most anti-choice governors and now heads up the department that wields the greatest influence over policies affecting women's reproductive health.

18. Bush named Don Eberly, a right wing activist who was an official with the National Fatherhood Institute, to head up a White House office for faith-based programs. Some women's rights advocates are concerned that Eberly will utilize the office to help funnel even more federal monies to misogynist groups who promote so-called fatherhood initiatives.

19. John Negroponte, Bush's appointee for UN Ambassador has a track record of disrespecting human rights. During his tour as ambassador to Honduras, Negorponte earned his reputation for being soft on human rights abuses. Under the helm of General Gustavo Alvarez Martinez, Honduras's military government was both a close ally of the Reagan administration and was disappearing dozens of political opponents in classic death squad fashion. Negroponte turned a blind eye to human rights abuses and even helped to cover up extrajudicial killings.

20. Bush's appointee for Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, John Bolton, does not belong in the arms control job because, as the director of the Carnegie Non-Proliferation Project, Joseph Cirincione, says: ''Bolton is philosophically opposed to most of the international treaties that comprise the nonproliferation regime.''

21. The nomination of Cuban-born Otto J. Reich as the State Department's top Latin American official is drawing Democratic criticism based on his role in the 1980s Central American wars. The Democrats' concerns over Reich focus on his leadership of the State Department's one-time Office of Public Diplomacy for Latin America and the Caribbean. The office—which Reich led from its inception in June 1983 until January 1986 was accused of running an illegal, covert domestic propaganda effort against Nicaragua's leftist Sandinista government and in favor of the Contra rebels.

22. Bush named Linda Fisher, an executive with Monsanto Co., a leading developer of the world's most dangerous chemicals and biotech foods, for the second-ranking job at the Environmental Protection Agency, the White House said yesterday.

23. Energy interests gave $2.9 million to Bush for his political campaign, and then kicked in an additional $2.2 million for his inauguration fund.

24. Bush plans to allow drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and to sell out our public lands to private interests.

25. He did a big favor for major electricity wholesalers by keeping the federal government largely out of the California energy crisis, which has produced major profits for energy companies including Dynegy Inc., Enron Corp. and Reliant Energy Inc., all of which are based in Bush's home state of Texas.

26. Bush showed his loyalty to the coal mining and electricity industries when he reversed a campaign pledge to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, which may have saved an estimated 30,000 lives a year of those who die due to respiratory illness.

27. Bush endangered the world's future and damaged our credibility in the International community when he announced the United States' withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol, an international treaty aimed at combating global warming. Seems that he's more interested in changing the global climate than the political climate.

28. Dick Cheney formulated crucial energy policy decisions behind closed doors.

29. Cheney's task force focused heavily on incentives for production; easing regulatory barriers for energy development; and opening more public lands to drilling including national monuments and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska.

30. Americans, by a remarkable 7-to-1 margin, think that Bush is less concerned about protecting the environment than about protecting the interests of the energy industry.

31. Despite objections from his brother, Florida Governor Jeb Bush, he plans on auctioning offshore oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico. Seems that natural gas is thicker than blood.

32. The Bush administration announced that it will block a rule from Clinton's administration requiring more energy efficient air conditioners.

33. Republican representative Sherwood Boehlert said that the Bush first 100 days deserve the grade of ''incomplete in dealing with the environment.''

34. Bush's budget proposes slashing more than $200 million from federal renewable energy and efficiency research programs, even as his administration declares the United States needs to find ways to cope with an ''energy crisis.''

35. The snows of Mount Kilimanjaro melt away as global temperatures and ocean levels rise, Bush plans nothing to address it.

36. The Environmental Protection Agency announced it would withdraw the pending decrease in allowable arsenic for drinking water, prepared during the final days of the Clinton administration.

37. Bush asked Congress to remove from the Endangered Species Act a provision that allows environmental groups and others to sue the Interior Department to get rare plants and animals listed as endangered.

38. The Bush Administration plans to suspend rules that require federal contractors to comply with environmental, civil rights and labor laws.

39. In Quebec, Bush announced his intention to promote a trade plan for the Americas based on the failed NAFTA model. This will lead to further erosion of labor rights, human rights, and environmental protections throughout the hemisphere.

40. And Bush is looking to kill the roadless policy rule that will protect millions of acres of public land from taxpayer subsidized logging.

41. A Bush White House aide confirms that Bush is taking a look at recommending easing clean air regulations without Congressional actions, thus saving utilities and coal-mining companies billions of dollars of violations of clean air regulations and at the same time mooting legal action against polluting companies.

42. Bush was the top recipient of contributions from tobacco companies. Through carefully orchestrated budget cuts, Bush has managed to kill the lawsuit that the Justice Department has against big tobacco for deliberately deceiving the American people on public health issues. This move could potentially save big tobacco billions.

43. Speaking of Bankrupt public policy. Legislation championed for years by the financial industry that would make it harder for consumers to wipe away their debts was passed by an overwhelming margin in both chambers of Congress. Though a similar measure had been approved last year, President Clinton vetoed it. Bush, however, has signaled he will sign the bill, a move that could generate an estimated tens of millions of dollars in additional revenue for major credit card companies.

44. Where did Bush's enthusiasm come from? Charles Cawley, President of MBNA America personally raised at least $100,000 for the Bush campaign, qualifying him for admission into the Pioneers, the campaign's roster of top supporters. Last January, Cawley broke out his checkbook again, writing a $100,000 check to the Bush-Cheney Inaugural Fund.

45. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce contributed more than $514,000 to candidates and parties, 94% of that money went to Republicans, and the National Association of Manufacturers spent $12.8 million lobbying Members of Congress from 1997 to 1999.

46. In a private meeting in late February, Bush and Republican congressional leaders decided to kill the ergonomics rule put forth by the Clinton Administration, which would protect workers from workplace related injuries.

47. Following his pledge to leave no [rich] child behind, President's Bush's budget reduces resources for the Child Care and Development Block Grant projects by $200 million. That means that many low-income children will no longer be eligible for childcare, making it more difficult for their parents to work.

48. Bush plans to eliminate all funding for the Early Learning Opportunities program, which would have supported parent education and family support services.

49. Bush's budget will shortchange vital education programs; including efforts to reduce class sizes, improve teacher training, repair crumbling schools, promote after-school programs, and increase the number of Pell Grants available to low income freshmen.

50. Bush plans to cut in half grants that help states investigate and prevent child abuse and neglect.

51. President Bush has proposed a regime of annual testing for all students between grades three and eight. Schools that demonstrated an improvement in performance would be granted increased federal funding. Students at schools designated as low-performing would, after three years, be able to use their share of federal funds to attend other public or private schools. The school would then be privatized with the assistance of the federal government.

52. Bush's budget does not even provide funds to keep up with inflation for the WIC program, which provides vital nutrition assistance to low-income women, infants, and children.

53. On the anniversary of Roe v. Wade, President Bush ordered the reinstatement of the global ''gag'' rule on international family planning programs, programs that strive to prevent unintended pregnancies, reduce abortion, and avert hundreds of thousands of infant and maternal deaths worldwide each year.

54. Bush is prepared to unilaterally abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

55. Bush strongly advocates the National Missile Defense System or ''Star Wars''. This program has cost taxpayers over $40 billion to date, and yet it has failed repeatedly in carefully orchestrated tests. The program is destabilizing and China has already indicated that it would initiate an arms race if the U.S. pursues the program.

56. The Bush administration has put its European allies on notice that it intends to move quickly to develop a missile defense and plans to abandon or fundamentally alter the treaty that has been the keystone of arms control for nearly 30 years.

57. Bush said he would suspend negotiations with North Korea, this strict stance on Korea has soured once-improving relations with North Korea.

58. The U.S. bombs 10 miles outside of Baghdad—a major metropolitan area—saying that the area was ''unpopulated.''

59. Plans by U.S. President George W. Bush to sell weapons including eight diesel-powered submarines to Taiwan have received an

embarrassing setback at the hands of European governments. Neither the Germans nor the Dutch, who have sown up the market in diesel submarines, are willing to allow the sale of the subs to Taiwan.

60. Under Bush, there has been a growing Anti-US feeling in the EU and around the world.

61. Bush's decision to proceed with arms sales to Taiwan—China has said that offensive weapons such as subs will only lead to greater tensions in Asia.

62. Bush's commitment to the Balkans. While trying to build peace he is reducing U.S. commitment to peacebuilding. Same with the Middle East where tensions are growing and he is seeking to be less involved.

63. Bush has continued use of drug certification and the nomination of another hard liner to lead the War on Drugs.

64. President Bush worked with the CIA and a Private Military Company to cover up their responsibility in the deaths of two American missionaries killed by a Peruvian fighter as part of U.S. drug war strategy.

65. For women who depend upon government to advance economic equity in an economically unjust society, there would be little or no money for improved child care/early childhood education programs, effective Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforcement against discrimination and harassment.

66. There will be little or no money for expansion of Violence Against Women programs, few options for expansion of health care coverage to the 43 million uncovered, no funds for a new prescription drug benefit for seniors.

67. A multi-trillion dollar tax cut may also jeopardize the future financial solvency of Social Security and Medicare—the majority of beneficiaries being women—and there will be few resources remaining for critically needed social investments.

68. Bush proposes to privatize Social Security, a move that jeopardizes the financial future of millions of Americans.

69. President Bush announced an expanded faith-based initiative and a vigorous, but misguided campaign to turn over social service programs to religious organizations. Faith-based initiatives, a more pernicious version of the old ''charitable choice,'' would permit direct federal funding of programs run by religious organizations, free to proselytize and discriminate, that would have little public accountability.

70. Bush's faith based initiative faces major setback: people of faith have little faith in it!

71. President Bush's budget will propose deep cuts in a variety of health programs for people without health insurance. Services providing ''health care access for the uninsured,'' would be reduced 86 percent, to $20 million, from $140 million in the current fiscal year.

72. Mr. Bush's budget request would also cut federal spending for the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, pharmacists and other health professionals.

73. Bush put a stop to giving unions preference on contracts for federal building projects.

74. Senator Pete Domenici disagrees vehemently with Bush's decision to hold all federal spending to no more than a 4% increase.

75. Kathy Harris, symbol of a purposely-failed election, travels to Washington to testify before Congress on the need to have elections that the people can believe in.

76. George W. Bush needs to win the Florida electoral college vote more in 2004 than in 2000. Therefore, don't look too soon for any election reform from this President.

77. According to David Broder, ''The Bush White House so far has not made changing the election system a priority. The President's proposed budget, along with the budget resolutions of the House and Senate, set aside no fund for federal aid for improving election equipment or administration.

78. Republican Jim Ramstad said that Bush White House interference in Minnesota politics could end up hurting the party. A phone call by Dick Cheney to dissuade a potential candidate from running has all the markings of Bush and Cheney trying to be a ''kingmaker'' thwarting the will of the people.

79. World reaction was tepid, critical or simply silent to President Bush's announcement that the United States would build a shield against ballistic missile attacks.

80. President Bush throws a bash featuring 535 Members of Congress to celebrate his first 100 days and schedules it on a Monday when few Members of Congress are in town: fewer than 200 Members of Congress bothered to show up.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. McKINNEY) for her extraordinary leadership, for bringing the really poignant issues to the American people. The American people need to hear what passed out of this House or, more importantly, what did not pass out of this House in terms of a budget for them.

If we are indeed to have a value system that speaks to those who are less fortunate, then a budget should reflect that.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) here, who is an outstanding Member, an outstanding woman who had served with me in the State legislature of California, who was also a mayor of a city at the time that I, too, was one in another city in California.

The gentlewoman has been extremely strong in her leadership on the issues of education, the environment, on our children who are limited English-speaking.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) to discuss this budget.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) for the opportunity to speak on our President's budget and the environment; that topic is very near and dear to many of us from the West Coast.

President Bush certainly has not received any honeymoon from the Nation's environmentalists: global warming, oil drilling in Alaska, arsenic levels in drinking water, all of the issues that have garnered headlines as environmentalists and others have argued with the President's position.

President Bush also stated last week in a Los Angeles Times article that he is committed to clean air and clean water. We hear him. We honor him. I have the perfect opportunity for him to demonstrate that commitment and achieve an early, bipartisan environmental safety victory.

There is a 10½ million ton mountain of radioactive uranium scrap in a city called Moab in the State of Utah. That particular site is leaking 57,000 gallons a day of poison into the Colorado River, which is one of the main sources of tap water for over 20 million Americans, some 18 out of California, and then others from Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona. And it is the main source of tap water for all of these individuals.

Even though Moab is several hundred miles upstream from where we are, from the point of where southern California draws its water, and no unsafe level of radioactivity or toxic substances to date have been detected in our area, it is a matter that requires our immediate attention.

Let me tell my colleagues a little bit about this. This is a very dangerous situation that scientists and environmental groups and many public officials from those areas have referred to as a radioactive time bomb.

Picture a truncated mountain or an ancient ruin that is covering 130 acres and in circumference rising 11 stories high. This is the ominous legacy of a nearby uranium ore mill, which for 28 years processed uranium ore for our national defense during the Cold War.

These mill tailings, or scrap, were dumped into an unlined pond that eventually grew into this huge mountain. Because of the mountain's concave top, rainwater funnels through the tailings, out the bottom, as a brew 650 feet away that includes arsenic, lead and ammonia. That is just to name a few of those contaminants.

Pressed to clean up this toxic site, the Atlas Corporation that ran it filed bankruptcy in 1998. Now, who can predict when this mountain's poisons will endanger our health and that of our children, of our grandchildren and their grandchildren? As a grandmother of 14, there is a question I sure do not wish to contemplate. We must act now. We cannot wait.

Last year, Congress passed and former President Clinton signed a bipartisan legislation for the Department of Energy to take control of this site of Moab, to clean it up, take it over from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

This would not have been possible without the support of Members of Congress on both sides, the generosity of the Ute Indian Tribe who had agreed to sign a memorandum of understanding with the Department of Energy to allow them to acquire the Department's naval oil shale reserve.

This Federal land, rich in gas reserve, was taken away from the Ute Tribe by the Federal Government in 1915. In return, the pledge made by the Ute Tribe dedicates a portion of the gas royalties towards the cleanup and removal, not capping, removal of the uranium tailings pile.

Our legislative goal this year will be to get this $10 million for cleanup in the Department of Energy's nondefense environmental programs.

I remind my colleagues, this is not a line item in the budget. It was not included in our President's budget. It is

such an important issue, and yet it was not even considered for entry into our budget for this coming year.

The cleanup is not just a priority to the residents of the 34th Congressional District, my district; it is an issue for agencies like the Metropolitan Water District and others who import the drinking water from Colorado for over 17 million urban Southland residents. Efforts to clean up these uranium wastes are being championed by all of them throughout the western States of Utah, Nevada Arizona, California and other States.

□ 1715

The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) are all moving in a broad bipartisan coalition to press for the removal of this radioactive uranium waste and the cleanup of this site that affects millions of Americans.

My colleagues and I will work diligently to educate our new Secretary of Energy and Members in the House and Senate about this looming catastrophe. In these exciting days of this new Congress, and with our new administration, we all look forward to joining with our president, with Secretary Abraham, and with colleagues on both sides to serve the best interest of our western States to ensure that clean water from the Colorado is available for future generations and will protect not only the environment but the precious sites that exist in that area.

I do not know how much time the gentlewoman has left; but if I have another few minutes, I have another issue of environment that I would like to mention.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. That would be fine.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. There is another issue that deals with environmental issues, and that is the tertiary treatment of water now being effectuated in some areas, including in California water that is treated before it is released into the ocean. EPA is now mandating that treatment plants be set up, costing taxpayers billions of dollars, in order to do a fourth treatment before that water is released into the ocean, or at least a third of it is treated. This water, which is used for irrigation in green spaces, in government areas for commercial and industrial use, is to be given a fourth treatment.

Now, imagine that we have an agency, EPA, that is saying that we will now have to consider doing a fourth treatment to water that is already given the highest treatment before release for any other use. I think that we need to be very careful. Although we want to protect the health concerns of our citizens, and we are certainly concerned about the after-effects of anything that we release for consumption, although we do not drink tertiary-treated water, it is used for commercial and industrial and irrigation purposes, we are also aware that the costs that are going to be borne to do a treatment for which there has not been any validity given to it, that fourth treatment.

We must find ways of being able to work with the environmental community to give that fourth treatment, whether it is through settling ponds, so that it can filter through nature's way, or be able to utilize it in melding through the rivers and aquifers, so that we do not saddle the taxpayers with additional burdens of paying for additional costs to set up agencies to do a fourth treatment on water. That is a very important issue for anybody who is concerned about their aquifer refurbishment so that we have enough water in times of drought.

That is very important and a very safe way of being able to deal with water shortages and other issues that are now facing us in many areas of our country.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague, one of the great women out of the State of California, for coming today to lend the support of why we did not vote on this budget and why this budget is not good for American people who have been left short of the American Dream.

I now have another outstanding leader of this House who has demonstrated over and over and other again her leadership on a myriad of issues, but critically on the environment and education. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to speak about the impact of this budget on her constituents and on some of our American people.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me and for her leadership in gathering us today to talk about the budget that just passed the House of Representatives. And I am sorry to say it passed without my vote, because I would have liked to have voted for a budget that would have done what is right for the American people. That was not this budget.

We are at a remarkable point in our history right now. For the first time in memory, really, we have a surplus of money in the budget. We have an opportunity as Americans now, as a family might do, to say, okay, now we have some extra money available, why do we not look around and see if it is not time to fix the roof, to send our kids to a really good university, to provide ourselves with the health care that we need, to clean up our community, to make things better, to pay down our debts. How about that? We could pay off our debts, if as a family we had extra money.

But instead of doing that, we are about to squander the money that we have by giving most of it to the wealthiest of Americans, at the expense of what? Well, as a mother and as a grandmother, I am very concerned about education. As a Congresswoman, I have been going around my district, and not just to poor communities but to my suburban communities, and what do I find? I find schools that are overcrowded, where kids are bundled up in a couple of classes in one room, where ceiling paint is falling down, where there is not enough computers to teach the new technologies. We cannot even plug in computers in some schools because the wiring is faulty.

We have the money now to do school construction, to provide after-school programs, and early childhood education. Things that would benefit all of our children are within our reach right now because we have a surplus of dollars. What instead are we doing? We look at the education budget that came out of this House today, and it does not even include what the President of the United States asked for in increasing the budget. It barely increases education funding by the rate of inflation, one of the poorest increases in education funding that we have ever seen, or at least in recent years. And yet this President says he is an education President. We are doing so little for what needs so much right now. And knowing what we could do, it just makes me want to weep.

I live in Chicago; I represent a district in Chicago where there is a crisis in affordable housing. We are short about 155,000 affordable housing units in the Chicago area. This budget that came out of this House today cuts $2 billion from housing and urban development, money that could go to provide housing. Not more housing. As a consequence, we could get less housing. We are meeting less of the need than we should have.

If we look at the programs that have formed the basis of our security net in this country, Social Security and Medicare, programs that have worked to lift seniors out of poverty, have provided health care for our elders, people with disabilities, widows and orphans, things that all Americans can be proud of, all Americans rely on, this threatens the integrity of the Social Security Trust Fund. It threatens Medicare. It raids the Medicare Trust Fund to pay for an inadequate prescription drug benefit.

So senior citizens who thought, my goodness, both candidates for President, including George Bush, campaigned he wanted a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. But do not look in this budget that just came out of the House. I am afraid to say it is not there. There is a measly program that will go to seniors, some of whom earn $11,500 or less. But we know even middle-income seniors are going broke because they cannot buy their prescription drugs. Where is the prescription drug benefit under Medicare? It is not there.

This is the first budget in a long time that does not give more funding for the Ryan White Care Act for the AIDS pandemic that continues to rage in the United States, even as AIDS cases, particularly among women, particularly

among women of color, continues to accelerate. There is no money for that.

Child abuse prevention is cut. Child care is cut. Graduate medical education training for doctors to work in children's hospitals is cut. Veterans benefits are inadequate. Medicaid is being cut. We are supposed to be trying to pay down our debt, which would help us bolster the Social Security Trust Fund.

All of this is being crowded out by a tax cut almost half of which is going to go to the wealthiest Americans. Does it make any sense that we help the million millionaires at the expense of 39 million senior citizens and persons with disabilities who want a prescription drug benefit or want to know that their Medicare is safe? And it is all based on projections of a surplus for the next 10 years that is using a flawed crystal ball.

What makes us think that our projections are going to work when they never have in the past? We have always been way off; yet we are going to commit this money. No family would do that. We are going to commit this money now and hope that it will be there. This budget is fuzzy math, big time; and it jeopardizes all of the programs that have helped Americans to improve their quality of life.

I thank the gentlewoman for letting me say that.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so much. I really do thank her, and I appreciate her leadership on the issues.

Mr. Speaker, as we close, we want to remind all of us that the number one priority for this country must be our children, the future of tomorrow. And if education is going to be anything, it should be to not leave any child behind. Hopefully, the conferees will look at that; and we will have a budget coming out of the Senate side, I should say, that will help us in bridging the ones who are underrepresented along with those who are represented in terms of the American Dream.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of South Carolina). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1825

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1646, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–62) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. INSLEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for May 8 on account of flight delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LANGEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, May 16.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, May 10, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1796. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FSA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Wool and Mohair Market Loss Assistance Program and Apple Market Loss Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AG35) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1797. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Oklahoma [Docket No. 01–016–1] received April 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1798. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Plant Protection Act; Revisions to Authority Citations [Docket No. 00–063–2] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1799. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products; Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps Energy Conservation Standards [Docket No. EE–RM–98–440] (RIN: 1904–AA77) received April 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1800. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to Requirements for Licensed Anti-Human Globulin and Blood Grouping Reagents; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket No. 00N–1586] received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1801. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL197–1a; FRL–6970–6] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1802. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Rhode Island; Plan for Controlling Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [Docket No. RI040–7167a; FRL–6971–1] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1803. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New York; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program [Region II Docket No. 45–216; FRL–6924–3] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1804. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District [CA 153–0195a; FRL–6958–1] received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1805. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Pinal-Gila Counties Air Quality Control District and Pinal County