



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2001

No. 154

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Rabbi Carole Meyers, Chaplain, Temple Sinai of Glendale, Glendale, California, offered the following prayer:

I am honored to be here this morning with you courageous leaders of our country to join together in prayer. It takes courage to pray meaningfully in the wake of events shaping our lives.

It is not that we do not turn to God, we do. We come with our praise and with our entreaties, but we strain to hear an answer, to sense God's presence radiating back to us, over the abyss that grief and fear have created.

Shall we this morning, just for a moment, stop speaking to God, asking God, about God, entreating God, and instead make an effort to find once again that experience of God's presence that grounds our faith.

Come with me to that place. Perhaps it was when you witnessed the birth of your child, new life so precious and pure, perhaps when you saw your soul reflected back at you in the eyes of someone whose love was infinite. Perhaps in the tangle of pain and darkness when somehow there was a presence to call, to let you know you would move forward. Perhaps when a piece of music shook you to your core, bringing an exquisite awareness of the depth of human experience.

Perhaps when you truly saw the miracle of nature surrounding us, the sun rising and setting, day after day of nature in its magnificent order, there was a moment when you knew that an Other exists before whom we stand in awe and whose greatness we strive to reflect in the actions of our lives.

Eternal God, be with us as we move through this time of uncertainty. Help us know that we can lend Your presence and use our lives to reflect it. Then we will have the faith to bring light and joy, peace and comfort, justice and goodness to this magnificent world God has created. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SAWYER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING RABBI CAROLE MEYERS

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in welcoming today's distinguished guest chaplain, Rabbi Carole Meyers, and thank her for leading

the House in prayer. As Rabbi Emerita of Temple Sinai in Glendale, California, Rabbi Meyers has distinguished herself as a community leader.

Over the past 15 years, Rabbi Meyers has served at Glendale's Temple Sinai, one of the most thriving synagogues in the area. During her tenure at Temple Sinai, the congregation nearly doubled in size, boosting its education programs for both children and adults.

Rabbi Meyers significantly raised the profile of the temple through her extensive community involvement. Over the past few years, Rabbi Meyers has been involved with Habitat for Humanity and the Glendale Community Foundation. She served on the Mayor's Task Force on Hate Crimes, helping to craft a citywide response plan to hate crimes. Rabbi Meyers also trained as a chaplain for the Glendale Police Department and helped to create an annual AIDS Awareness Prayer Service with other Glendale religious leaders.

Though Rabbi Meyers retired this past June in order to devote more time to her family, her influence on her community can still be felt. Today, especially in this time of national tragedy, the warmth of her words have indeed found a new meaning.

We are all proud to welcome Rabbi Meyers here today as a guest chaplain.

SUPPORTING THE WORDS CAN HEAL RESOLUTION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to join the "Words Can Heal" resolution that is being sponsored by the Jerusalem Fund.

The "Words Can Heal" campaign promotes the value and practice of ethical speech nationwide. The ability to voice

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7911

one's views freely without negative repercussions is inherent to our democracy. As we here in Congress surely understand firsthand, words have impact.

This campaign draws attention to the way we speak to our friends, to our family, neighbors and colleagues. Today, more than ever, it is essential that we come together as a Nation, open our arms with benevolence, and use our words to heal ourselves.

By participating in the Jerusalem Fund's "Words Can Heal" campaign, we can all benefit by using language to come together as a Nation and as a people.

Please join me and Rabbi Irwin Katsof from the Jerusalem Fund in co-sponsoring House Resolution 235, the "Words Can Heal" campaign, which will be on the floor this coming week.

□ 1015

VETERANS ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to follow the gentlewoman from Florida in her message. This weekend, all of us will head home and we will go out and we will speak to and about our veterans. It is a time to follow the leadership that the gentlewoman from Florida is advocating and it is a time to do something even more.

As we go and speak to our veterans, we have an opportunity to act on something that most of us supported in the 106th Congress, and that is the Veterans Oral History Project. It is a part of the American Folk Life Series of the Library of Congress and it is an opportunity for us to take part in the gathering of American history, in telling the stories of American veterans as all of us seek to honor those who have made sacrifices on behalf of this Nation.

It is a chance not for us to speak to them, rather, for them to speak to all Americans and tell the stories that are a part of our history. I would urge all of us to go home this weekend, and in addition to the speeches that we make, to take the opportunity, with a tape recorder, to listen to the words of those who have given so much to our Nation.

SUPPORT NATIONAL JUNIOR COLLEGE FOR DEAF AND BLIND

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

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated his goal: Leave no child behind. He did not say leave no child behind that can hear or see, he said leave no child behind, and that includes the thousands of students striving to earn a college degree who are deaf or blind or sensory impaired.

When we talk about improving education, we have got to improve it across the board. We have to give it to every student. We have to give them an opportunity to learn regardless of their disabilities. Students without these challenges have the option of attending a junior college to ease them into the college environment. No such option exists for these deaf and blind students.

Today, I am introducing legislation that supports these students with the establishment of the first National Junior College for the Deaf and Blind in conjunction with the Alabama Institute for the Deaf and Blind.

Mr. Speaker, let us level the playing field. Give these students trained professionals, a residential facility, and a means for modern-day distance learning. We can help to provide that all-important 2-year college stepping stone to the 4-year collegiate level and ensure valuable preparation for successful employment.

I ask all of my colleagues to support the first National Junior College for the Deaf and Blind.

THE DISAPPEARING \$20 BILLION

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is human nature: When tragedy strikes, most people want to help you right away. But you can tell your true friends by who still wants to help as time goes by. Will the real friends of New York please stand up.

The World Trade Center is still smoldering and the Federal Government is already wavering. On September 18, the administration authorized \$40 billion, \$20 billion to fight terrorism and \$20 billion for disaster relief, primarily for New York. But the budget office has allocated only \$9.8 billion for New York. They offer vague assurances that we will get the money eventually. Well, we cannot wait for eventually.

They say we cannot spend it anyway. Well, just ask New York's devastated businesses and unemployed workers. As September 11 recedes into the past, so is the administration's resolve to help New York, and that is unacceptable.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, workers and farmers in Pennsylvania sold products ranging from chemicals to foodstuffs to pharmaceuticals to over 200 countries last year. Those sales added up to over \$24 billion and supported well over a quarter-million jobs. I shudder to think that the absence of trade promotion authority, or TPA, could jeopardize these jobs and the families they support. Without TPA, American negotiators will not have the authority

they need to make sure our foreign markets will not be undercut or blocked by our competitors.

H.R. 3005 is a bipartisan compromise TPA bill. We need to pass this legislation to make sure that the U.S. negotiators are on equal footing with their foreign competitors. If we fail to renew trade promotion authority, we will be failing to fight for the American workers who depend on exports, and we will be failing to fight for the countless new opportunities that the global marketplace will provide for our workers in the future.

America's workers are the world's most productive. The only thing that can beat us is unfair foreign trade barriers designed to eliminate our competitive edge. So let us support the trade promotion authority bill.

FREEDOM AND OUR NATION'S VETERANS

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I speak today of our freedom. Our freedom has been girded and guarded by those who have served in the United States military. The ability for us to speak for or against has been protected by those in the United States military.

As we look toward honoring the veterans of our Nation, those who have served throughout the years, I rise to salute them and thank them for what they have done for us, giving us the privilege to travel about this country and to live in a wonderfully free and democratic nation. They have served us in times of war and in times of peace.

As a Representative of the veterans hospital in my own congressional district, when our city experienced the devastation of Tropical Storm Allison, we were very gratified that veterans gave up their beds in the hospitals to help those who were in need. We thank the veterans of America.

I support legislation that will allow us to listen to their oral history. This is a time that we honor them and applaud them and thank them for our freedom, which is tied directly to their existence. Thank you, veterans, and I thank those who serve in the United States military.

NATIONAL PARKS WEEKEND FOR UNITY, HOPE AND HEALING

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the upcoming Veterans holiday weekend, I wanted to remind all Americans of the wonderful and rare opportunity before them.

As my colleagues may recall, Mr. Speaker, following the tragic events of

September 11, Secretary of the Interior Gale Norton and National Park Service Director Fran Manella announced that all entrance fees to all of the 385 units of the National Park System would be waived over Veterans Day weekend.

The events of September 11 will never be erased from our memories. Each of us will remember where we were and what we were doing on that tragic day. They have taken their toll upon many of us in so many ways. Since these events, many have found solace in America's national parks for healing. All of our national parks serve as a tool to recapture the American spirit and provide much of the healing Americans are looking for.

I applaud the Secretary's announcement and encourage all Americans to take advantage of this weekend for unity, hope, and healing by visiting the diverse treasures of America's national park system.

VETERANS DAY

(Ms. SANCHEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of Veterans Day, I rise to thank the millions of men and women who have served in the United States military for their contributions to our Nation.

Many of our veterans first came to this country as immigrants in search of freedom and the opportunity to live in a country with liberty and justice. And they have demonstrated their belief in the principles of our great country with their willingness to put their lives on the line to defend the Nation which has given them so many new opportunities.

For example, after becoming American citizens in 1917, over 18,000 Puerto Rican citizens served America proudly in World War I. And during World War II, more than 300,000 Mexican-Americans served in the United States Armed Forces. Guy "Gabby" Gabaldon holds the distinction of capturing more enemy soldiers than anyone else in the history of United States military conflicts.

Over 81,400 Asian-Pacific Islanders served during the Vietnam War. These are but a few examples.

On Veterans Day, we all need to remember the sacrifices that veterans have made to protect our great Nation.

SALUTE TO RICHMOND AND WILL ROGERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL-CHILDREN

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

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the students of Richmond Elementary and Will Rogers Elementary School in my hometown of Stillwater, Oklahoma, for

their efforts and contributions to help the children of Afghanistan.

This past Monday, I met with my friend, Dr. Ann Dugger, and the school's principal, Dr. Gay Washington, of Richmond and also Mrs. Jerry Walstad of Will Rogers Elementary, and spoke to several hundred school students who gathered for an assembly. At this assembly it was announced that the children had raised more than \$500, and I was asked to deliver the check to the appropriate person from the White House for America's Fund for Afghan Children.

Yesterday I met with Governor Tom Ridge, Director of Homeland Security, and Bob Marsh, the White House liaison, about the contributions from the Stillwater schoolchildren. We can all be proud of the unselfish acts of kindness and generosity exhibited by these young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask the House to join me in thanking these schoolchildren from Stillwater, and encourage other schoolchildren around our Nation, for being shining examples of America's compassion. These children, like our children and grandchildren, have the right to live without fear. That is why we are fighting the war against terrorism.

BIOTERRORISM PROTECTION ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, this weekend we will commemorate veterans, honoring those who have served in America's armed services in times of peace and times of war. Tragically, this same weekend will mark the 2-month anniversary of September 11, 2 months since international terrorists declared war on the United States and the civilized world.

The veterans of America's war on terrorism are fighting today in Afghanistan. The veterans of America's war on terrorism are also our courageous first responders: our firefighters, our police, our emergency hospital personnel, our school administrators, even our school nurses. Our first responders are in the trenches, and it is our job in Congress to ensure they have all the resources they need to defend themselves and defend our people.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Bioterrorism Protection Act of 2001, providing both long-term and short-term strategies for fighting our new war, from laboratories to police stations, to firehouses and nursing tables.

We may not completely destroy the war on terrorism in 2 months or even 2 years. We may have to be on guard for 2 decades. But we shall prevail and American children will be secure because of our efforts.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE-PASSED ECONOMIC SECURITY PACKAGE

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

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the House-passed economic security package that will help American families and revive economic growth in our country.

I have always believed that the private sector is the true engine of opportunity in our country. Increased Federal spending will not improve the fundamentals of our economy. In these difficult economic times, the role of Congress should be to create an environment of opportunity for America's families.

It is the hard work and sheer determination of individuals, families, and small business entrepreneurs that make this country what it is today. It will be these same qualities that will revitalize the American economy after the September 11 attacks.

The House legislation offers tax cuts for middle class families and provides incentives for businesses to invest in capital and human resources, thereby creating jobs and opportunity.

Congress must act now. The House has acted by passing this strong package to ensure economic security. The President has called on Congress to send him a bill that he can sign into law this month, and I urge Congress to heed his call.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, we are told that silence is golden. However, what happens when the body being silenced is the House of Representatives? Most certainly my colleagues would object to the suppression of our voice and our role in the debate in consideration of legislative matters. Yet, without trade promotion authority, our voices are silenced regarding trade.

Trade promotion authority allows trade agreements to be considered as congressional executive agreements. These agreements represent procedural compromises. The President forgoes his ability to single-handedly negotiate treaties and, instead, agrees to consult closely with the Congress to ensure that congressional priorities are heard. Congress, in turn, commits to an up or down vote, but waives the right to offer amendments.

□ 1030

Some of my colleagues seem to think that our inability to offer amendments is too great a sacrifice. What then is the alternative? Without TPA, the President would unilaterally negotiate a treaty which would then be presented solely to the Senate for ratification. This obviously begs the question where

is the House. The answer, absent. Without TPA we have no role, no authority, and no voice in trade agreements. This is the people's House. Do not let our voice be silenced. Support TPA.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the growth of services in the U.S. economy has been a tremendous boon to our Nation's GDP and the rate of employment. The benefit of services trade are particularly evident in my home State of California, and at the local level. In California, for example, services account for more than 85 percent of the State economy and 77 percent of employment.

There are over 5,500 establishments exporting professional, scientific and technical services in California. Those establishments alone provide jobs for more than 130,000 people, according to the most recent U.S. Census Bureau data.

Software publishers, broadcasting and telecommunications services employ another 130,000 people in California, a number which would grow if new trade agreements that would reduce barriers to services and tariffs on industrial products and agriculture are signed.

The services sector needs successful trade negotiations that expand substantially opportunities for U.S. trade in services. Trade negotiating authority plays a crucial role in our country's ability to negotiate, and implement, these negotiations; and so we need to move these negotiations along.

NAMES FROM OFFICIAL LIST OF CASUALTIES FROM SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, TO BE READ ON HOUSE FLOOR

(Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to request the participation of Members in honoring those individuals who lost their lives or are still missing as a result of the September 11 terrorist attacks. We have all heard the numbers, the devastations, the pain of the families and our Nation's anguish. What we have not heard in Washington is the names of the individuals, and that is why I will begin today during Special Orders to read on the House floor from the list of the dead and missing.

I will begin to read from the official list of casualties, and I encourage my colleagues to join me until the roughly 4,000 missing or dead are named and entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have compiled this alphabetical list in a leather bound book that I would request all Members utilize for this effort.

Mr. Speaker, Members are requested to contact my office to coordinate dates and times so we can arrange for the book to be on the floor. I appreciate the assistance of Members in this important undertaking, and again encourage participation.

PROVIDE ENERGY, PROTECT THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, 3 months ago this House passed the Energy Security Act to increase and diversify our energy production. Only last month we passed an economic stimulus package to keep Americans working and our businesses open. Yet the Democratic leadership in the other body has refused to act on either of these two crucial measures which are so critically linked together.

It is time we ensure the economic prosperity of this Nation by ensuring our own domestic energy supply. Energy and other products produced from fossil fuels and minerals create the standard of living that every American enjoys and relies upon.

Obviously, an uninterrupted supply of energy, including crude oil and natural gas, are vital to the economy and security of the United States; and it is time for the Democratic leadership in the other body to meet the needs of the American people by securing our energy needs, thereby ensuring our economic prosperity. For the sake of this Nation and all Americans, I hope the Democratic leadership will act sooner rather than later.

AIRPORT SECURITY IS TOO IMPORTANT AN ISSUE FOR CONGRESS TO JUST FIDDLE AROUND

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, what are we waiting for? The Senate, or the other body, I should say, passed an airport security bill. The House passed a transportation security bill. In these two bills there are differences, but we agree on a great deal. We agree that this security for transportation should be a Federal responsibility. We agree that the Feds should do the background checks. We agree that the Feds should screen the applicants. We agree that the Federal Government should do the training, and we agree that the Federal Government should do the supervision.

Mr. Speaker, we agree on all of these important issues. Then why do we not move? We disagree on whether screeners should be Federal employees or should be private employees. Well, in the scope of things, this is an insignificant disagreement. What we agree on is that we want the job done and we want

it much better than it is being done today.

We should charge the President with the responsibility to get this job done, and let him figure out what mix of Federal and civilian and private employees there should be. Let us get on with it. It is too important for us to fiddle around.

TRIBUTE TO BRAD COHEN, GEORGIA'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, as the House and Senate conferees work to complete the job of the President's number one domestic issue, No Child Left Behind and the reform of education, I think it is appropriate that we pay tribute to those that every day teach our children, America's teachers. In particular, to one particular teacher in Georgia, Mr. Brad Cohen, a man who suffers from what many call an affliction, Tourette's syndrome. People would never think Brad Cohen would be a teacher.

Instead, Brad Cohen calls Tourette's his friend, not his enemy. He has been recognized as Teacher of the Year, he teaches elementary at-risk children to read. He has changed their lives and taught them to appreciate that one's disability can be one's advantage with the right attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Brad Cohen and all of America's teachers.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE NEEDED

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, people across America, across Pennsylvania, across the Lehigh Valley and Upper Macungie, the valleys that I represent, are losing their jobs in very disturbing numbers.

In October, we had a record high numbers of Americans who lost their jobs. The actual loss of jobs or the threat of a loss of jobs is hitting all of us: our families, our neighbors, our friends. And it is about time that Congress responded.

We need an economic stimulus package that is going to lower the record-high tax burden that is impeding our economic growth and create the incentives to bring people back to work because the people who are losing their jobs across Pennsylvania, they do not want to know how long they can stay out of work; they want to know how quickly they can get back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility to help create an environment where that is possible. The President has called for an economic stimulus package. This Chamber has passed one, but the Democratic majority in the other

Chamber insists on bickering and wasting time when Americans need the opportunity to get back to work.

Some on the other side would like to load this up with government spending, which may be nice pork barrel politics in their district, but it will not get Americans back to work. I urge the other Chamber to adopt an economic stimulus package, and do it now.

EXPORTING OUR FUTURE

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

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, America is consistently the world's largest agricultural exporter. America generated \$50 billion in exports last year and is expected to generate another \$53 billion in exports this year. Passing Trade Promotion Authority will expand U.S. markets even further and provide a necessary step for America's continued economic growth.

Since TPA expired in 1994, U.S. agricultural exports have increasingly faced onerous trade barriers that threaten both the farm economy and our entire balance of trade.

American farmers depend on being able to export their products and crops to the rest of the world; and with 96 percent of the world's population living outside of the U.S. borders, there were billions of potential customers of our bounty. Additionally, soybean farmers in my home State of Missouri send more than 50 percent of their products overseas.

Passing H.R. 3005 will open the doors to increased exports and make it easier to forge market-opening agreements on agriculture with our trading partners. Let us pass Trade Promotion Authority and unleash the vast potential of America's agriculture sector.

PORTABLE SYSTEMS FOR DETECTION OF NUCLEAR, CHEMICAL, AND BIOLOGICAL AGENTS ON DISPLAY

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of concern all across the country and across the world about how we can detect the evidence of chemical or biological agents in our midst.

Today for 3 hours at this very moment in the Rayburn foyer, I have assembled 19 corporations who largely with defense dollars in the past have developed real systems. These are portable systems that can be used and are being used to detect the presence of chemical or biological agents or even small nuclear agents. These devices have been paid for with taxpayer dollars. It shows that Congress has been on the cutting edge of making sure that we have the proper means of pro-

tecting our people as these kinds of threats emerge.

I would encourage my colleagues to travel to the Rayburn foyer today, and I invite the press and public to see what the American people have done with their dollars to allow us to be able to respond to the kinds of threats that America is currently experiencing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the NBC Industry Group, the Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Industry Group, who has put together this assemblage of these 19 major corporations.

DEFERRED INSPECTION PROCESS IS FLAWED

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each year some 75 million individuals enter the United States and are inspected at our major airports. It is estimated that about 10,000 of these have inadequate documents to justify their existence in this country, but are allowed to enter anyway under a deferred system in which they are asked to report back.

Recently, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice issued a report from which I will quote the executive summary: "We found that nearly 11 percent of individuals paroled into the country under the deferred inspections process failed to appear for the completion of their inspection." That would mean some 979 individuals did not appear for their deferred inspections. It continues: "This is a conservative estimate, however, based upon the fact that we were unable to determine the outcome of 20 percent of the cases selected due to inadequate records."

They give the statistics, and they say the importance of follow-up action is evidenced by the results of our analysis which revealed that among those who failed to appear, INS inspectors identified over 50 percent as either having criminal records or immigration violations at the time of entry. They also point out that nine committed serious aggravated felonies after they were paroled into our country. They point out that the INS continues to use this faulty information.

Mr. President, you will be in my State tonight to reassure the Nation. To make us feel secure, do something about the fiasco that exists in the INS.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 47, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 433]

YEAS—363

Abercrombie	Doyle	Kerns
Ackerman	Dreier	Kildee
Akin	Duncan	Kind (WI)
Allen	Dunn	King (NY)
Andrews	Edwards	Kingston
Armey	Ehlers	Kirk
Baca	Ehrlich	Klecza
Bachus	Emerson	Knollenberg
Baker	Engel	Kolbe
Baldacci	Eshoo	LaFalce
Baldwin	Etheridge	LaHood
Ballenger	Evans	Lampson
Barcia	Everett	Langevin
Barr	Farr	Lantos
Barrett	Fattah	Largent
Bartlett	Ferguson	Larsen (WA)
Barton	Flake	Larson (CT)
Bass	Fletcher	LaTourette
Becerra	Foley	Leach
Bentsen	Forbes	Lee
Bereuter	Fossella	Levin
Berkley	Frank	Lewis (CA)
Berman	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)
Berry	Gallely	Lewis (KY)
Biggert	Gekas	Linder
Bilirakis	Gibbons	Lipinski
Bishop	Gilchrest	Lucas (KY)
Blagojevich	Gillmor	Lucas (OK)
Blumenauer	Gilman	Luther
Blunt	Gonzalez	Lynch
Boehler	Goode	Maloney (NY)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Bonilla	Gordon	Markey
Bono	Goss	Mascara
Boswell	Graham	Matheson
Boucher	Granger	Matsui
Boyd	Graves	McCarthy (MO)
Brady (TX)	Green (WI)	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (FL)	Greenwood	McCollum
Brown (OH)	Grucci	McCreery
Brown (SC)	Gutknecht	McHugh
Bryant	Hall (OH)	McInnis
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McIntyre
Callahan	Hansen	McKeon
Calvert	Harman	McKinney
Camp	Hart	Meehan
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Cantor	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Capito	Hayworth	Menendez
Capps	Herger	Mica
Cardin	Hill	Millender-
Carson (IN)	Hilleary	McDonald
Carson (OK)	Hinchey	Miller, Dan
Castle	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Chabot	Hobson	Miller, Jeff
Chambliss	Hoeffel	Mink
Clay	Holden	Mollohan
Clayton	Holt	Moran (VA)
Clement	Honda	Morella
Clyburn	Hoolley	Murtha
Coble	Horn	Myrick
Collins	Hostettler	Nadler
Combest	Houghton	Napolitano
Condit	Hoyer	Neal
Cox	Hunter	Nethercutt
Coyne	Hyde	Ney
Cramer	Inslee	Northup
Crenshaw	Isakson	Norwood
Crowley	Israel	Nussle
Culberson	Issa	Obey
Cummings	Istook	Ortiz
Cunningham	Jackson (IL)	Osborne
Davis (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Otter
Davis (FL)	(TX)	Owens
Davis (IL)	Jenkins	Oxley
Davis, Jo Ann	John	Pallone
Deal	Johnson (CT)	Pascarell
DeGette	Johnson (IL)	Pastor
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Paul
DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Deutsch	Jones (NC)	Pelosi
Diaz-Balart	Jones (OH)	Pence
Dicks	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)
Dingell	Kaptur	Petri
Doggett	Keller	Phelps
Dooley	Kelly	Pickering
Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Pitts

Platts	Schiff	Terry
Pombo	Schrock	Thomas
Pomeroy	Scott	Thornberry
Portman	Sensenbrenner	Thune
Price (NC)	Serrano	Thurman
Pryce (OH)	Sessions	Tiahrt
Putnam	Shadegg	Tiberi
Quinn	Shaw	Tierney
Rahall	Shays	Toomey
Rangel	Sherman	Towns
Regula	Sherwood	Turner
Rehberg	Shimkus	Udall (CO)
Reyes	Shows	Upton
Reynolds	Shuster	Velazquez
Rivers	Simmons	Vitter
Rodriguez	Simpson	Walden
Roemer	Skeen	Walsh
Rogers (KY)	Skelton	Wamp
Rogers (MI)	Slaughter	Watkins (OK)
Rohrabacher	Smith (MI)	Watson (CA)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Watt (NC)
Ross	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Rothman	Smith (WA)	Waxman
Roukema	Snyder	Weiner
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Weldon (FL)
Royce	Souder	Weldon (PA)
Rush	Spratt	Wexler
Ryan (WI)	Stark	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Wilson
Sanchez	Stump	Wolf
Sanders	Sununu	Woolsey
Sandlin	Tanner	Wu
Sawyer	Tauscher	Wynn
Saxton	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	

NAYS—47

Aderholt	Hoekstra	Riley
Baird	Hulshof	Sabo
Borski	Kennedy (MN)	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Stenholm
Capuano	Latham	Strickland
Costello	LoBiondo	Stupak
Crane	McDermott	Sweeney
DeFazio	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
English	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)
Ford	Moore	Udall (NM)
Green (TX)	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Gutierrez	Oberstar	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Weller
Hefley	Peterson (MN)	Whitfield
Hilliard	Ramstad	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—21

Bonior	Delahunt	Lofgren
Burr	DeLay	Lowey
Burton	Frost	Maloney (CT)
Conyers	Ganske	Ose
Cooksey	Gephardt	Radanovich
Cubin	Jefferson	Traficant
Davis, Tom	Kilpatrick	Young (AK)

□ 1106

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3061, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3061) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 3061, be instructed to insist on the House position to provide no less than a total of \$51,749,765,000 for the Department of Education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7, rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is very straightforward. It says the conferees should bring back a conference report for the Labor-HHS appropriations conference that includes House-passed levels for education.

As I think we all know, the President's budget provided for a 5.6 percent increase in education funding over the previous year. That contrasted to an average of a 13 percent increase in each of the previous 5 years. The bill that the House passed contained a 17 percent increase over last year, and that passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 373 to 43.

The bill passed by the other body, in contrast, does not provide the funding levels we need for education. It falls \$525 million short of the House level. The House bill provides \$7.7 billion for special education part b State grants, which is \$375 million more than the Senate. The House bill provides \$10.5 billion for title I grants, \$300 million more than the Senate. For teacher-quality activities, the House bill is \$135 million over the Senate. The House bill for bilingual education provides \$700 million, which is \$100 million more than the Senate. It has a variety of other programs in the education area but the House provides more adequate support than does the Senate bill, in my view.

Now, we all know that money alone does not produce quality education, but one cannot provide quality education without money. I think our bill, the bill that passed the House, is a very strong effort to do that.

Also we have to keep the door open for higher education to families from all across the country. The problem we face is that we provided a major increase for Pell Grants in the bill that passed the House; but we are now told that because of the deteriorating economy, with more students enrolled in college than expected and the like, that all of the increase that the House provided will be needed just to maintain the current maximum grant level of \$3,750 per student. In other words, we

will have to come up with even more money for Pell Grants, or college students will get no increase at all for their grant award for this year.

So this motion simply instructs the conferees on this bill to provide no less than the level of resources for education that the House has already agreed to. I would urge adoption of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has outlined a number of the good features of this bill. I totally agree with the motion to instruct. I think it reflects H.R. 1, which passed this body overwhelmingly. The numbers track.

It also reflects the President's priorities. The Office of Management and Budget is happy with the bill that we have. They feel that it is a very fiscally responsible bill.

It also has a number of features, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has touched on them, but a couple I might mention include the Reading First Program. It is a new program that the President has supported strongly with \$900-plus million. Reading is vital, as we all recognize; and also it has additional funding for the programs to improve and provide assistance and help teachers to enable them to better serve the students.

□ 1115

I think all of us agree that teacher quality is the heart and soul of a good school system. I am pleased that we do have language in here to support things like the Troops-to-Teachers, a relatively new program, but one that offers great promise in meeting the teacher shortage, and also great promise in attracting retirees from the military who have a lot to offer. They have the world travel, they have experience in managing people, and I think tracking these people at their retirement point to participate in our education program and to serve as teachers is a great concept.

I might say we added a number of millions of dollars to this program at the request of the military because what they are going to do is beef up their program in the military of talking to their retirees about participating in the Troops-to-Teachers, and also to providing some financial help to these individuals while they are finishing out their military career to go to a college or university, and get their necessary programs to qualify them under State requirements to serve in the classroom.

We also beef up the Teach for America program, again, one that attracts people, something similar to the programs that get young people to go into areas that are underprivileged and

teach for a couple of years in return for getting some assistance.

I have talked to some of these individuals and they are really excited about what they can do to help students, to be an inspiration, to provide role models for students in underprivileged areas. Again, a very successful program. We provide additional funding for that.

TRIO. TRIO is designed to go into the schools and have individuals from colleges, universities, talk to students and try to persuade them, inspire them, catch their interest in going on to higher education. It is a successful program, and we have added \$70 million to that. We have given more money for rural education and the mentoring programs.

One of the successes is where senior citizens or college students or just people in a community go into a school and mentor students, actually work with them on reading programs.

In my district, I have a hospital that brought a bus. They actually bused their employees out and gave them a break to do this. They would go to a school and work with students who are having difficulty with reading.

We hear a lot about the importance of science and math. We all agree that those are important, but before one can do science and math education, one has to be able to read. Reading is basic. Reading is fundamental. We, in this bill, have tried to identify programs that will help students to be successful in learning to read, and in turn, then they can more effectively participate in others.

Really, this is what is the heart and soul of "no child left behind." "No child left behind" means no child that cannot read, because if they cannot, they have a real problem.

There are a lot of other good features in the bill. That was evidenced by the strong vote we had in the House. It was a bipartisan bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I worked very closely together, and the members of our subcommittee likewise worked with us to get a bipartisan bill. It is strongly endorsed by the administration, the Office of Management and Budget.

What the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is saying is, education is number one. Polls tell us over and over again that education is number one with the people of this Nation. Therefore, the bill reflects that. I think this is a very proper motion because the bill in the other body has a smaller amount for education, and we feel it is important that we go to the conference with a vote of affirmation from the Members of this House saying, in effect, that they, too, agree that education is a number one priority in getting a conference report.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like our colleagues to know that the education number in this bill, which is a very substantial number, is a solid number. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and I had begun to work on this issue in the spring actually, and in working with our counterparts in the Senate, we came to this number.

So I think we have all made this commitment to the strong educational part of this bill, and I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that this motion certainly reflects the viewpoint that we had established early on.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in the minority on the full committee gave us a very good allocation. That is one of the things that made it possible to have such a quality bill and to meet the needs as we see them.

They have also been very helpful in giving strong support to this so that we have a bipartisan consensus within the Congress. I think it is a great team effort on the part of both sides of the aisle, and I would strongly urge Members to endorse this fact that education is number one, and that we go to conference with that concept.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very, very strong support of this motion. This bill, worked out in a bipartisan way by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), has about \$525 million more for education, educating our children in new and innovative ways.

I think this is a very strong instruction, a motion that we need to support on the House side.

At a time in the Midwest, Mr. Speaker, when our economies are not bringing in as much money, at a time when some of our State budgets are being cut by \$800 million, \$1 billion, and more, at a time in the Midwest when steel mills are being closed, when tax bases are shrinking, when we have lost 165,000 manufacturing jobs for many in the Midwest, we need this money for new ideas to educate our children in new ways.

In Title I we have a 20 percent increase for educating the poorest of the poor children in this bill; for reading and literacy programs, we have new ways of educating and teaching reading to our children.

We have, as the chairman mentioned, a new program that ramps up the Troops-to-Teachers program called Transition to Teaching, bringing people from the private sector in engineer-

ing, technology, math, and science, from Main Street into our classrooms. This is not throwing money at old ideas, this is new money attached to new ideas. At a bare minimum, this \$525 million over the Senate bill is what we should indeed support.

Mr. Speaker, I would also say that I hope that the other body would include in their stimulus package money for education, given what our States are going through in this tough time with the economy.

So again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage Republicans and Democrats to support this motion. I again applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) for their hard work.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for the outstanding legislative product they have put before this body, and to strongly endorse this motion to instruct.

One of the areas that I am most especially pleased to see is the substantial increase in special education funding under the Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act, the IDEA. In the fiscal year that ended September 30, we committed \$6.3 billion to help educate students with these needs. In the House bill, that number now exceeds \$7.7 billion, an increase of well over 20 percent.

This is a double victory. It provides much higher quality education for children with special needs, and it frees up resources in local school districts around the country to do many other things: to help reduce class sizes for children who are not in special education, to free up money for school construction, for teacher quality, or for tax relief.

We need to do more of this, and we need to do it for the reasons my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, just cited: State budgets around this Nation are feeling and will profoundly feel the effects of the economic slowdown. That will mean substantially lower State resources for education. Now more than ever it is important for us to step in and help fill that void. This legislation does so.

As we proceed with the House-Senate conference on the education reform bill, we strongly support making major quality upgrades and reforms in education, but we only want to do so if the resources are there to pay for the needs of children who are identified as having trouble.

This bill is an example of what we need to do on a permanent and ongoing basis to make sure that once we have identified children with problems, we give them the tools and the teachers with whom they can overcome those problems.

For the bipartisan leadership on this bill, I extend my thanks and appreciation, urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make one additional comment. That is that thanks to the leadership of the Speaker and the minority leader and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I think for the first time the Senate and the House subcommittee had an identical allocation. That is going to make it much easier in conference because we are working from the same total.

I commend them for giving us that kind of support, and also for increasing the allocation generally, because we will only in conference be dealing with priorities, but we will all be working from the same total number.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees to accept the higher funding levels for education that are included in the House bill. Chairman REGULA and Ranking Member OBEY have shown tremendous leadership on our Subcommittee, and they have negotiated a strong bill that reflects the value our country places on education.

We started this budget cycle in a much different place. In order to make room for his huge tax cut, President Bush's budget proposed the smallest increase for education in 5 years.

The \$2.4 billion increase in the Bush budget included substantial increases for reading programs and a modest increase for Pell grants, but left only \$400 million for all other education programs. This proposal left all other elementary, secondary, and higher education programs, special education, and vocational education programs with less than the level needed just to keep up with inflation.

Members of both sides of the aisle recognized that this was unacceptable, and the bill we negotiated included an increase of \$4.7 billion over the request and \$7 billion over last year. These increases include an additional \$1.7 billion for disadvantaged schools, the largest dollar increase for title 1 since its inception of the program, a \$154 million increase for after school child care, and a \$240 million increase for bilingual education.

We can never forget that our strength as a nation is measured both in our military might and in the well being of our people. There is no more important priority than educating our children and passing our knowledge and values to the next generation. I urge my colleagues to these funding increases and vote yes on the motion to instruct.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the pre-

vious question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2001, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2500, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that managers on the part of the House have until midnight, November 9, 2001, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2500) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a request to file the CJ by midnight tonight?

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman, it is tomorrow night.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2001, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2330, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002, AND TO CONSIDER CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that managers on the part of the House have until midnight Friday night, November 9, 2001, to file a conference report to accompany H.R. 2330; that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Tuesday, November 13, 2001, to consider

such conference report; that all points of order against such conference report and against its consideration be waived; and that such conference report be considered as read when called up.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1130

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2944, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2944) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. FATTAH

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FATTAH moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2944, be instructed to insist on the House position regarding assistance with Federal funds for education and training programs in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FATTAH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to, first of all, say to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and to the whole House, that I want to compliment him on his service and his leadership, leading us to this moment on this appropriation. It has been the smoothest I think of any of the D.C. appropriation bills since my time here in the Congress, and it is because of his leadership; and I would also like to thank the senior staff on both sides of the aisle that have worked on this.

I have a motion to instruct that simply would remind the conferees on behalf of the House of our deep concern about the young people in the D.C. area and to focus our energies to represent the House's position on a number of education matters, in particular, and by example, the appropriation for St. Coletta's.

Mr. Speaker, in that regard, I yield as much time as he may consume to my colleague from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) to say a few words about this important appropriations.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member for yielding the time.

We are all aware of the incidents of mistreatment and abuse of persons with mental retardation in the District of Columbia. There are horrible stories. We have read these in the Washington Post, describing an education system for those with special needs that is dominated by for-profit companies just going through the motions. These companies are in the business of covering up mistreatment rather than working to correct it.

Today, I stand before the House with a solution to this unspeakable problem, St. Coletta's School, a non-profit in Alexandria serving children and adults with cognitive and multiple disabilities from the D.C. metro area. St. Coletta currently serves 120 students between the ages of 4 and 22 years. These students are mentally retarded, autistic, suffer from multiple disabilities; and the majority have secondary disabling conditions such as blindness, deafness, social and emotional problems, cerebral palsy, and other physical impairments.

Mr. Speaker, 80 percent of those students are from Washington, D.C. Thirty-five percent of these D.C. students are in foster care or third-party placements due to abuse, neglect, abandonment or death of parents. An additional 30 percent of the D.C. students live with only 1 parent or extended family members.

Recognizing the desperate need in D.C. for these vocational, therapeutic, behavioral and family support and case management services, St. Coletta's of Greater Washington, Inc., is expanding its program to further serve the unmet needs of this D.C. community.

St. Coletta plans to purchase and renovate a facility to bring its already existing day program to more D.C. residents. The new facility will accommodate approximately 150 D.C. students and provide vocational and functional life-skills training, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and behavioral management services.

Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the chairman; and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member; for supporting St. Coletta's expansion project in the House D.C. bill and hope that more can be done for this project in

conference. This is an investment that we cannot afford not to make.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have no disagreement with the suggestion the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) is making. I think the whole idea of the gentleman's motion is to, in fact, do what it is we have already done in the bill. The administration, the OMB, have weighed in. They are, in fact, supportive of this move; and so I have no disagreement at all.

I would also like to comment briefly on the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who does bring up I think something that we should all look at very, very close, that is, St. Coletta's. He makes remarks that I think coincide with mine because I too have met with the folks from St. Coletta's, and so we join in addressing that issue and promoting it in the fashion that we think it should be, and I believe that from what I can sense here we should have a good conference.

We are close on a number of issues, but we are close enough I think on the money issue to redeem and bring this to resolution; and so with that, unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking member, wants to express an opinion.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan yield for just 1 second?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and thank him for his leadership and cooperation and, of course, the full committee chairman and ranking member, their guidance, as we have moved through this process. I am anxious to go to conference and finish our work for the year; and I believe that the motion to instruct and, moreover, the committee's work product is a great foundation from which the House could proceed in a conference; and I would be remiss not to also thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her leadership and urgings as we have walked down this road towards the D.C. appropriations.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am willing, of course, to accept what was mentioned. I want to also briefly say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), while thanking me, should also get thanked from me because he has done, I think, a great amount of work to bring this about. We use this word bipartisanship a little loosely; but frankly, we are on the same page in almost every respect; and when we have an occasional disagreement, it is not a disagreement. It is worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to applaud and salute the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and thank him for working as a team to bring this about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNOLLENBERG, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DOOLITTLE, SWEENEY, VITTER, YOUNG of Florida, FATTAH, MOLLOHAN, OLVER and OBEY.

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 279 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 279

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 279 is a standard rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 2620, the Fiscal Year 2002 Veterans Affairs, and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides yet another example of a carefully crafted, bipartisan product from our Committee on Appropriations that maintains fiscal discipline, while addressing some of our Nation's most pressing needs.

It takes care of our veterans; addresses the Nation's critical housing

needs; helps to protect and preserve our environment; invests in scientific research; and continues the exploration into space.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, and all the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work and dedication.

The conference report maintains our commitment to our Nation's veterans who selflessly placed themselves in harm's way so we may enjoy the very freedoms which we so cherish.

□ 1145

With November 11, being Veterans Day, fast approaching, our Nation's veterans deserve our thanks, but more importantly, they deserve and have earned the benefits provided in this conference report.

This year the VA-HUD appropriations bill provides an additional \$1 billion over last year's increase for Veterans Medical Health Care, bringing the total to \$21.3 billion. And I am proud to inform my colleagues, and more importantly our veterans, that we have increased Veterans Medical Health Care by \$4 billion over the course of the last 3 fiscal years.

The bill increases Veterans Medical and Prosthetic Research yet again by \$20 million and provides an extra \$128 million over last year's funding level for the Veterans Benefit Administration to expedite claims processing, which is a big problem.

Mr. Speaker, along with providing for the needs of our veterans, this legislation targets important resources towards the challenges faced by our urban communities and populations to provide adequate housing to help the most vulnerable folks in our society. Low-income families will benefit through this bill's investment in the Housing Certificate Program, which provides funding for Section 8 renewals and tenant protection.

A \$1.7 billion increase over last year's funding level will allow for the renewal of all expiring Section 8 contracts and provides needed relocation assistance. A total of \$15.6 billion is provided for this important program in fiscal year 2002. This includes \$140 million to fund some 26,000 new Section 8 vouchers. This housing assistance is critical in helping families who are trying to lift themselves up and improve their lives.

Other needed housing programs that help our elderly, people with AIDS, and the disabled also receive increases above last year's funding levels in this conference report.

The report also provides important resources to preserve and protect our environment for the next generation to enjoy. It targets funding with an emphasis on State grants to protect the water we drink and the air we breathe.

The State Revolving Fund for Safe Drinking Water is increased by more than \$25 million from last year's level,

the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is funded at \$1.35 billion, equal to last year's level, and, finally, State Air Grants are increased \$8 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report also maintains our commitment to the exploration of space and the improvement of science. I am pleased to say that the National Science Foundation is increased by some \$363 million above fiscal year 2001. This represents the largest NSF budget ever, and will go a long way to help foster scientific discovery, promote basic research, as well as increase scientific education.

NASA also receives an increase that will bring total funding to \$14.8 billion. It fully funds the Space Shuttle operations and maintains our commitment to the International Space Station. This will enable the United States of America to continue our superiority in space exploration and aeronautical research.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides the Federal Emergency Management Agency with \$2.2 billion for disaster relief to help some of our Nation's hardest-hit communities, much needed in this time of our Nation's crisis.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report and it deserves our support. It takes a responsible path towards addressing our Nation's most pressing needs and priorities. I urge all my colleagues to support this straightforward, noncontroversial rule, as well as this must-do piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the work performed on this bill by the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

This is a critical bill for many of our constituents. It directs funding for our Nation's veterans, addresses important housing concerns, protects the environment, and invests in science and technology research.

Specifically, the conference report increases Veterans Administration health care funding by over \$1 billion, money that will go towards eliminating much of the VA's backlog of veterans' claims.

Moreover, the measure furthers our commitment to doubling the National Science Foundation budget to invest in science and technology to secure American competitiveness into the future.

The bill authorizes \$700 million in HUD Community Development Block Grant funding to New York State to provide grants to the New York City

businesses damaged or affected by the attacks of September 11.

My colleagues will also be pleased to know that the bill establishes a new, higher standard for arsenic levels in public drinking water, raising the standards from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for the increase in funding in HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control. Fifty of my colleagues signed a letter to the committee requesting this increase, because many older houses and apartments still contain lead-based paint.

Research shows that children with elevated blood levels are seven times more likely to drop out of school and twice as likely to fall behind their peers in language acquisition. In my district of Rochester, New York, 37 percent of the children tested have more lead in their blood than the Center for Disease Control and Prevention considers safe.

Over the past decade, HUD has worked with local governments and agencies to increase the number of lead hazard control programs. However, millions of housing units remain contaminated with lead-based paint. To further reduce lead paint health hazards, the fiscal year 2002 HUD budget receives a \$9.8 million increase over fiscal year 2001, bringing the total to 109.8 million. These funds will be distributed through competitive grants to entities who agree to match the Federal grant. So, combined with the private-sector funding, it supports a 10-year strategy to eliminate paint hazards in 2.3 million private housing units occupied by low-income children.

Included in this request is a set-aside of \$10 million to continue the Healthy Homes Initiative, which helps to develop, to demonstrate, and promote cost-effective preventive measures to correct multiple safety and health hazards in the home that can cause serious disease and injuries to children.

There are lots of other programs in the bill that I could highlight for my colleagues, but I will save that for Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN, but let me say I support both the rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), my distinguished colleague and a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for the great work that they have done to produce this conference report and, in effect, to produce this bill.

I would also like to thank Frank Cushing, who works under a great deal

of stress, but does it very, very well, and all the staff that has done so remarkably well to produce this bill that we have, this conference report that we have in front of us today. None of it would be possible without their dedication, their expertise, and the long hours. I salute their work.

I just want to highlight a few of the provisions in the bill. The bill provides an extra \$128 million to help the Veterans Benefits Administration to expedite claims processing. The veterans of America do not deserve to suffer the lengthy waits they do now to receive the benefits that they deserve. The extra funding is an important step forward in cutting these wait times.

I would also like to thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for working with me to improve a pilot housing program in my district. This has amplification potential with districts around the country. The program is providing a viable and cost-effective housing alternative for the aging population, and I am pleased that it will continue.

I want to note also there is a \$363 million increase in funding for the National Science Foundation. The NIH and CDC get much of the publicity when we talk about medical and scientific advances. But few of those advances would be possible without the basic research that is conducted by NSF. I am pleased that these and other funding priorities in the bill will be signed into law when this conference report lands on the President's desk.

Chairman WALSH is to be saluted for crafting this piece of legislation under some very difficult circumstances. He and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) have worked tirelessly with our colleagues in the other body to forge a fiscally responsible bill in a bipartisan spirit.

So, Mr. Speaker, this conference report is the fruit of the effort, and I urge adoption of the rule and the conference.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their outstanding leadership and work on this bill.

I rise in support of the rule and in support of the conference report. I am particularly pleased that the report funds renewal of Section 8 contracts due to expire in 2002, and that it funds 25,900 new rental vouchers.

I am disappointed by the elimination of the Drug Elimination Grant Program, but understand that these programs will be funded from increases in public housing operating subsidies.

I am also pleased that programs for the elderly get a small increase, and that housing programs for the disabled are positively impacted. I had hoped not to see any decreases in funding for

distressed public housing and the empowerment zones.

I am gratified, Mr. Speaker, to know that we are increasing funding for Veterans Administration programs, and I trust that this means that our VA hospitals and services in the Chicago area will not have to experience drastic cuts in programs and services, and that we do not have to continue the talk of the possibility of closing the Lakeside Veterans Administration Hospital.

I commend the committee for increasing by 9.5 percent programs for the homeless and a 7.5 percent increase to help meet the housing needs of persons with AIDS and their families.

Mr. Speaker, these are indeed difficult times, and these are definitely times where there are going to be unmet needs. However, in spite of that, the committee has done a good and outstanding job and has a good product. I commend them for their efforts, for their astuteness, and for the balance which they have displayed.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), my distinguished colleague and the chairman of the VA-HUD Committee on Appropriations. We all take our hats off to him for his hard work, as well as to the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for yielding me this time. She has now helped us guide this bill through the House for the third time, and she does a marvelous job. I would also like to thank her opposite number, my neighbor, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for the courtesies extended to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), myself, and our subcommittee. Thanks also to Chairman DREIER, who quickly guided us through the Committee on Rules and turned us loose.

We think we have a very good bill. There are a number of compromises within the bill, but there are also, I think, some fairly important policy statements that we make. We allocated precious resources to the priorities that were expressed by the House and the Senate, and I will deal more with the details when the bill comes before us. But I would urge all Members to support the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I would like to point out that as this body is preparing to adjourn for Veterans Day, despite some of the comments we have heard, this budget is not a good budget for our veterans and we are not honoring them as we come up to Veterans Day.

I understand that the chairman of the committee and the ranking member have had a certain budget to deal with, and they have done the best they

can. But this Congress just passed a bill which gave \$25 billion in retroactive tax increases to the biggest corporations in this country. IBM will get a check for \$2 billion, GE and Ford will get checks for between \$1 billion and a \$1.5 billion. And what did we do for veterans in this budget? Barely keeping up with inflation. Barely keeping up with inflation.

At a time when the backlog of cases to be adjudicated accumulates at 10,000 a week, this budget will do nothing to clear up that backlog. This budget will not help us cure or find a treatment or a cause for Persian Gulf War illness. It does not take any of the 250,000 homeless off the streets.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, it does not shorten the waiting time of months and months that our veterans have to wait for doctor's appointments. This does not honor our veterans, at a time not only when we are approaching Veterans' Day but when our men and women are at war and we will have more veterans and more service-connected problems. We are not sending a signal in the men and women engaged in the war against terrorism when we treat our veterans in this way.

All of the veterans in this country came together to produce The Independent Budget, a budget by veterans for veterans. It outlined the needs that our veterans have. But what does this bill have, \$2 billion less than what this calls for. The final conference report that we are voting on provides less money than either House provided in their resolution. How can a conference report come back with less than each House recommended?

Mr. Speaker, those who are adept at these conference reports will have to explain that to me. We come back with \$2 billion less than our veterans need, less than what each House called for, and yet we are about to go out on November 11 and November 12 and say to our veterans, we support them. We love them.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report does not do the job that our veterans deserve and our new veterans are going to need. This budget again is a dishonor to our veterans as we approach Veterans' Day on November 11.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee. We realize the trying times that we are in, and I think many of us would have relished the opportunity for these very vital programs to have provided more resources. In fact, I would imagine if we could go back to the drawing boards, we would recognize the enormous needs that these services in this particular bill address.

But let me first of all as we talk about Veterans' Day acknowledge the extra \$128 million that the veterans will get to expedite claims processing. If there is anything in our congressional districts that causes us great concern, it is our veterans coming in attempting to process their claims for needs that are immediate. I believe it is important to overcome that particular need.

In addition, I think it is extremely important that there is an increase in this particular legislation for veterans. I would argue to say that we can always, as I work with homeless veterans, do more for them. I am hoping as we move towards the next session and the next fiscal year, we can reemphasize the needs of our homeless veterans with whom I have worked on a regular basis.

But we are addressing some needs, and whenever I go home and interact with my community, they are always speaking about another issue and that is dealing with housing. I would like to refer to the housing for the Nation's elderly, section 202 which has received an increase, the homeless program which has been fully funded at \$1.23 billion, the housing, the HOPWA program. I might say that we will be working with HUD to ensure that those dollars get to communities that are diverse, that we ensure that those programs are spread throughout, that we are reaching the communities that are impacted. We realize that in the African American community, HIV-AIDS is the one killer in ages 25 TO 44. We need those dollars to be spread in a diverse way. We have community development block grant money, and I am delighted that is there, as well as the Superfund monies which have been funded.

As a member of the Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, express my extreme disappointment that we have not seen fit to fully fund our Space Station and provide the extra safety and the extra crew module. We fought against this cut, and I am hoping that the administration will see the error of its ways with respect to the Space Station. We have fought long and hard, and in this time the Space Station may become even more valuable. We realize that we have to be fiscally responsible as relates to NASA, but we need to do more.

In Houston, in particular, we are very gratified that the conference has seen fit to focus on beautification. The Heights Association in Houston receiving \$100,000; to focus on recreation, \$25,000 for the Acres Home Citizen Council Recreational Complex that will enhance economic development in that area, create a whole buzz of activity, compete with of course our great sports arenas by going into a neighborhood and focusing, and recognizing that the whole Nation needs to be wired and to put in an intercity area, the home of Barbara Jordan and Nicky Leland, the Fifth Ward Technology Center in cooperation with the Hous-

ton Community College seed money of \$50,000 to help us recognize that economic development technology are interwoven. I look forward to these ideas and these monies moving forward to help build our country and as well build a better quality of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report for VA-HUD. The bill funds many important agencies, and much has been said about those agencies, particularly about Veterans' Affairs. But I would like to specifically recognize the hard work of the members of the conference committee for their work in approving funding increase for aeronautics research.

We know that dollar for dollar, investments in aeronautics research pays off. Every aircraft worldwide uses NASA technology, and the research center located in Hampton, Virginia, has been at the forefront of developing these cutting-edge technologies. Engineering principles developed from the past research at Langley have contributed to overall aircraft safety and efficiency, including things like wind design, noise abatement, structural integrity, and fuel efficiency. It is important to remember that these principles were developed 5, 10 and 20 years before they led to improvements in the aircraft we see today.

In recent years, NASA's research has been reduced by about one-third. Reversing that declining trend in aeronautics funding now will enable the aggressive research and technology programs that are needed to lead the United States into the 21st century, as the world's leader in aeronautics and space research, a key cornerstone of our future economic prosperity.

Again, I extend my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the other conferees for their strong support for the national investments in aeronautics research, and I urge Members to support the conference committee report.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. It balances a number of very important priorities. It protects our environment and keeps the United States at the forefront of space exploration. It provides needed funding to ensure new scientific discovery and addresses our Nation's critical housing needs.

Finally, it provides for the benefits and assistance of our Nation's veterans that they have earned and that they should enjoy. It is a fitting and timely

tribute as we prepare for Veterans' Day this November 11.

Mr. Speaker, once again our hats should be off to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the entire appropriations committee. I urge a yes vote on this rule and the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2620, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2620, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 279, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2620) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 6, 2001, at page H7787.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to present for consideration of the House the conference report on H.R. 2620, the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for 2002.

In the interest of time, I will try to be brief. I would like, however, to begin by saying that this is a good bill. I think the fact that we had a unanimous vote on the rule is symbolic of what is to come. Like those presented in each of the past few years, it is very much a solid, bipartisan effort of the

House and Senate. In this regard I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), as well as to our very able Senate colleagues, Senators MIKULSKI and BOND.

While we clearly had differences and many difficult decisions on several aspects of the bill as passed by each body, the conference report nevertheless represents a true collaboration of effort and an honest negotiated compromise. Again, I am grateful to my colleagues for their candor, perseverance, and friendship.

With the House's indulgence, I would like to take a few minutes to briefly outline the highlights of the proposal. First and foremost, the conference report is within the 302(b) allocation for budget authority and outlays. The bill's discretionary spending is \$85.4 billion in new budget authority, which is an increase of just over \$2 billion above the budget submission and some \$2.9 billion over last year's bill.

I would note for the House that this level of discretionary spending includes emergency spending for \$1.5 billion for FEMA for disaster relief requirements.

We have tried as best we can to spread the proposed increases throughout the bill: discretionary veterans programs overall are increased by over \$1.4 billion compared to 2001. This follows on some very substantial increases in the last 2 years, with \$1.05 billion of the increase going to medical care and the remainder spread to research, processing veterans' compensation, pension and education claims, operating our national cemeteries, and increasing necessary construction at VA facilities by over \$160 million over last year.

Housing programs have increased in HUD by over \$1.67 billion compared to 2001, with increases in the housing certificate program, public housing operating subsidies, the HOPWA program, HOME investment partnerships, the housing for the elderly and disabled programs, and the disabled program is a significant increase, and the lead hazard reduction program. It is important to note that this proposal also includes some very difficult but I believe extremely important and highly defensible changes in policy direction which are represented by reductions in the

Public Housing Capital Fund and the Drug Elimination Grant Program. Neither of these programs is serving the best interests of the people they were intended to serve, and it is our job to take whatever steps are necessary to remedy the situation.

In the case of capital funds, it meant getting tougher on public housing authorities to spend the dollars intended for the residents of public housing authority. There are literally hundreds of millions of dollars worth of code violations and hazards not getting fixed.

In the case of the Drug Elimination Grant Program, it meant taking an honest look at whether HUD is the best entity to run this type of program.

□ 1215

Based on HUD's track record, we did not believe that it was. Instead, this bill increases funding in the operating fund so that all PHAs will see an increase. They then have the discretion to use those funds as they see fit.

The Environmental Protection Agency's funding increases some \$586 million over the budget request, and \$74 million above last year. This proposal continues to provide a strong research program as well as increased resources for the many State categorical grants, including section 106 water pollution grants, section 103 and 105 air pollution grants, and the new BEACH grant program. The Clean Water SRF program has been funded at \$1.35 billion and the Safe Drinking Water SRF has received \$850 million. These are substantial commitments. However, they are dwarfed by the need that is out there in combined sewer overflow projects throughout the country.

FEMA's operating programs increase by nearly \$135 million over the 2001 funding level and we have provided \$2.1 billion in emergency and non-emergency dollars for disaster relief. I should also mention that \$150 million has been provided for the new firefighter grant program which, as my colleagues can imagine, is a very, very popular and competitive program.

NASA's programs will receive a net increase of \$508 million over last year, and we have proposed several structural changes in the agency's account structure to provide them greater programmatic flexibility and the committee, better oversight capability.

Finally, I am proud to say that we have raised the overall funding for the National Science Foundation by just over \$316 million to a total program of \$4.789 billion. That is an increase of 8.2 percent compared to last year. Doing a little research myself, 10 years ago that budget was half, so that the National Science Foundation budget has doubled in the past 10 years. The bulk of this increase will go to improve available resources for National Science Foundation's core research programs, bringing the total research program to nearly \$3.6 billion, while the remainder would be spread to major research, construction and equipment, education and human resource programs, and salaries and expenses for NSF's capable staff.

I would like to add that I personally would have liked to do more here, as I know my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), would. However, to do so only could have been done at the expense of other very important programs found in other agencies throughout the bill. Having said that, given the increase proposed by the administration of 1 percent, we have done a remarkable job.

All Members are, of course, aware of the difficulty in putting these bills together, especially with so many diverse and competing interests. Developing the perfect bill is probably impossible. Nevertheless, I believe we have done a tremendous job developing a bill that represents the interests of both the legislative and the executive branch.

By the way, I would like to thank the executive branch for allowing us to do our job without a great deal of interference. They have been very cooperative. Their priorities were made. We tried to honor those priorities; in many cases we did. But the relationship this year was excellent.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I want once again to thank all my colleagues for allowing us the privilege of presenting this conference report on the fiscal year 2002 appropriations for veterans, housing and independent agencies. I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions.....	23,355,689	24,944,288	24,944,288	24,944,288	24,944,288	+1,588,599
Readjustment benefits.....	1,981,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	+154,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	19,850	26,200	26,200	26,200	26,200	+6,350
Veterans housing benefit program fund program account (indefinite).....	165,740	203,278	203,278	203,278	203,278	+37,538
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	(300)	
Administrative expenses.....	162,000	164,497	164,497	164,497	164,497	+2,497
Administrative savings from prohibiting new Vendee Home Loans.....		-1,000				
Education loan fund program account.....	1	1	1	1	1	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	
Administrative expenses.....	220	64	64	64	64	-156
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	52	72	72	72	72	+20
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(2,726)	(3,301)	(3,301)	(3,301)	(3,301)	(+575)
Administrative expenses.....	432	274	274	274	274	-158
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account.....	532	544	544	544	544	+12
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration.....	25,685,516	27,473,218	27,474,218	27,474,218	27,474,218	+1,788,702
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care.....	19,381,587	20,304,742	20,382,587	20,704,742	20,656,164	+1,274,577
Delayed equipment obligation.....	900,000	675,000	900,000	675,000	675,000	-225,000
Total.....	20,281,587	20,979,742	21,282,587	21,379,742	21,331,164	+1,049,577
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-28,134)					(+28,134)
(Transfer to Parking revolving fund).....	(-2,000)					(+2,000)
Medical care cost recovery collections:						
Offsetting receipts.....	-639,000	-691,000	-812,000	-691,000	-691,000	-52,000
Appropriations (indefinite).....	639,000	691,000	812,000	691,000	691,000	+52,000
Total available (excludes offsetting receipts).....	20,920,587	21,670,742	22,094,587	22,070,742	22,022,164	+1,101,577
Medical and prosthetic research.....	351,000	360,237	371,000	390,000	371,000	+20,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	62,000	67,628	66,731	67,628	66,731	+4,731
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	20,694,587	21,407,607	21,720,318	21,837,370	21,768,895	+1,074,308
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses.....	1,050,000	1,194,831	1,195,728	1,194,831	1,195,728	+145,728
Offsetting receipts.....	(36,520)					(-36,520)
Total, Program Level.....	(1,086,520)	(1,194,831)	(1,195,728)	(1,194,831)	(1,195,728)	(+109,208)
(Transfer from medical care).....	(47,134)					(-47,134)
(Transfer from national cemetery).....	(125)					(-125)
(Transfer from inspector general).....	(28)					(-28)
National Cemetery Administration.....	109,889	121,169	121,169	121,169	121,169	+11,280
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-125)					(+125)
Office of Inspector General.....	46,464	48,308	52,308	48,308	52,308	+5,844
(Transfer to general operating expenses).....	(-28)					(+28)
Construction, major projects.....	66,040	183,180	183,180	155,180	183,180	+117,140
Facility rehabilitation fund.....			300,000			
Construction, minor projects.....	162,000	178,900	178,900	178,900	210,900	+48,900
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554).....	8,840					-8,840
(Transfer to Parking Revolving Fund).....	(-4,500)					(+4,500)
Total.....	170,840	178,900	178,900	178,900	210,900	+40,060
Grants for construction of State extended care facilities.....	100,000	50,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	
Grants for the construction of State veterans cemeteries.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
(Transfer from Parking Revolving Fund).....	(6,500)					(-6,500)
Parking Revolving Fund.....		4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	+4,000
Total, Departmental Administration.....	1,568,233	1,805,388	2,160,285	1,827,388	1,892,285	+324,052
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....	47,948,336	50,886,213	51,354,821	51,138,976	51,135,398	+3,187,062
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(3,029)	(3,604)	(3,604)	(3,604)	(3,604)	(+575)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory.....	(25,522,279)	(27,308,766)	(27,308,766)	(27,308,766)	(27,308,766)	(+1,788,487)
Discretionary.....	(22,426,057)	(23,377,447)	(24,046,055)	(23,830,210)	(23,826,632)	(+1,400,575)

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002 — continued**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Public and Indian Housing						
Housing Certificate Fund:						
Direct appropriation	9,740,907	15,717,392	11,494,242	11,458,769	11,440,975	+1,700,068
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts	4,200,000		4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	
Subtotal, discretionary	13,940,907	15,717,392	15,694,242	15,658,769	15,640,975	+1,700,068
(Advance appropriation)	(4,200,000)		(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	
(Mandatory reclassification of prior year advance)		(4,200,000)				
Rescission of unobligated balances: Section 8 recaptures (rescission)	-1,947,300		-886,000	-615,000	-1,200,000	+747,300
Public housing capital fund	3,000,000	2,293,400	2,555,000	2,943,400	2,843,400	-156,600
Public housing operating fund	3,242,000	3,384,868	3,494,868	3,384,868	3,494,868	+252,868
Subtotal	6,242,000	5,678,268	6,049,868	6,328,268	6,338,268	+96,268
Operation Safe Home (rescission)					-11,000	-11,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	310,000			300,000		-310,000
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI)	575,000	573,735	573,735	573,735	573,735	-1,265
Native American housing block grants	650,000	648,570	648,570	648,570	648,570	-1,430
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	6,000	5,987	5,987	5,987	5,987	-13
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(71,956)	(234,283)	(234,283)	(234,283)	(234,283)	(+162,327)
Native Hawaiian housing loan guarantee fund				1,000	1,000	+1,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)				(40,000)	(40,000)	(+40,000)
Total, Public and Indian Housing	19,776,607	22,623,952	22,086,402	22,901,329	21,997,535	+2,220,928
Community Planning and Development						
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS	258,000	277,432	277,432	277,432	277,432	+19,432
Rural housing and economic development	25,000			25,000	25,000	
Empowerment zones / enterprise communities	75,000	150,000		75,000	45,000	-30,000
Rural empowerment zones	15,000					-15,000
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554)	110,000					-110,000
Total	200,000	150,000		75,000	45,000	-155,000
Community development block grants	5,057,550	4,801,993	4,811,993	5,012,993	5,000,000	-57,550
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554)	66,128					-66,128
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(1,261,000)	(608,696)	(608,696)	(608,696)	(608,696)	(-652,304)
Credit subsidy	29,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	-15,000
Administrative expenses	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Brownfields redevelopment	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
HOME investment partnerships program	1,800,000	1,796,040	1,996,040	1,796,040	1,846,040	+46,040
Homeless assistance grants	1,025,000	1,022,745	1,027,745	1,022,745	1,122,525	+97,525
Shelter Plus Care Renewals	100,000	99,780		99,780		-100,000
Total, Community planning and development	8,586,678	8,187,990	8,153,210	8,348,990	8,355,997	-230,681
Housing Programs						
Housing for special populations	996,000	1,001,009	1,024,151	1,001,009	1,024,151	+28,151
Housing for the elderly	(779,000)	(783,286)	(783,286)	(783,286)	(783,286)	(+4,286)
Housing for the disabled	(217,000)	(217,723)	(240,865)	(217,723)	(240,865)	(+23,865)
Manufactured housing fees trust fund		17,254	13,566	17,254	13,566	+13,566
Offsetting collections		-17,254	-13,566	-17,254	-13,566	-13,566
Savings from canceling S.1029			-8,000	-8,000	-8,000	-8,000
Federal Housing Administration						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	(160,000,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	
Administrative expenses	330,888	336,700	330,888	336,700	336,700	+5,812
Negative subsidy 1/	-2,246,000	-2,323,000	-2,323,000	-2,323,000	-2,323,000	-77,000
Administrative contract expenses	160,000	160,000	145,000	160,000	160,000	
Additional contract expenses	4,000	1,000		1,000	1,000	-3,000
Streamlined down payment requirements	7,000					-7,000

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002 — continued**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)	(21,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
Administrative expenses	211,455	216,100	211,455	216,100	216,100	+4,645
Negative subsidy	-100,000	-225,000	-225,000	-225,000	-225,000	-125,000
Subsidy	101,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	-86,000
Guaranteed loans credit subsidy (emergency funding) (P.L. 106-554)	40,000	-40,000
Non-overhead administrative expenses	144,000	144,000	139,000	144,000	144,000
Additional contract expenses	7,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	-3,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	-1,340,657	-1,671,200	-1,706,657	-1,671,200	-1,671,200	-330,543
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)
Administrative expenses	9,383	9,383	9,383	9,383	9,383
Offsetting receipts	-347,000	-382,000	-382,000	-382,000	-382,000	-35,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	53,500	43,404	46,900	53,404	50,250	-3,250
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities	46,000	45,899	45,899	45,899	45,899	-101
Office of Lead Hazard Control and Healthy Homes						
Lead hazard reduction	100,000	109,758	109,758	109,758	109,758	+9,758
Millennial Housing Commission						
Gifts and donations	1,500
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses	543,267	556,067	546,067	546,032	556,067	+12,800
Transfer from:						
Limitation on FHA corporate funds	(518,000)	(530,457)	(520,000)	(530,457)	(530,457)	(+12,457)
GNMA	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)	(9,383)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)
Native American Housing Block Grants	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)	(150)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)	(200)
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program	(35)	(35)	(+35)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,072,000)	(1,097,257)	(1,076,800)	(1,087,257)	(1,097,292)	(+25,292)
Office of Inspector General	52,657	61,555	61,555	66,555	66,555	+13,898
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)	(22,343)
(By transfer from Drug Elimination Grants)	(10,000)	(-10,000)
(By transfer from Public Housing Oper Subsidy)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(5,000)	(+5,000)
Total, Office of Inspector General	(85,000)	(93,898)	(93,898)	(88,898)	(93,898)	(+8,898)
Consolidated fee fund (rescission)	-6,700	-6,700	-6,700	-6,700	-6,700
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight	22,000	27,000	23,000	27,000	27,000	+5,000
Offsetting receipts	-22,000	-27,000	-23,000	-27,000	-27,000	-5,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net)	28,476,435	30,580,617	29,979,968	31,014,459	30,147,695	+1,671,260
Appropriations	(30,423,735)	(30,587,317)	(30,872,668)	(31,636,159)	(31,365,395)	(+941,660)
Rescissions	(-1,947,300)	(-6,700)	(-892,700)	(-621,700)	(-1,217,700)	(+729,600)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(382,332,956)	(381,842,979)	(381,842,979)	(381,882,979)	(381,882,979)	(-449,977)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(551,076)	(563,533)	(553,076)	(563,568)	(563,568)	(+12,492)
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses	28,000	28,466	35,466	28,466	35,466	+7,466
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses	7,500	7,621	8,000	7,621	7,850	+350
Department of the Treasury						
Community Development Financial Institutions						
Community development financial institutions fund program account	118,000	67,948	80,000	100,000	80,000	-38,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses	52,500	54,200	54,200	56,200	55,200	+2,700

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002 — continued**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Corporation for National and Community Service						
National and community service programs operating expenses	458,500	411,480		415,480	401,980	-56,520
Rescission	-30,000					+30,000
Office of Inspector General	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
Total	433,500	416,480	5,000	420,480	406,980	-26,520
Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims						
Salaries and expenses	12,445	13,221	13,221	13,221	13,221	+776
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses	17,949	18,437	22,537	18,437	22,537	+4,588
Department of Health and Human Services						
National Institute of Health						
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	63,000	70,228	70,228	70,228	70,228	+7,228
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention						
Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry	75,000	78,235	78,235	78,235	78,235	+3,235
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	138,000	148,463	148,463	148,463	148,463	+10,463
Environmental Protection Agency						
Science and Technology	696,000	640,538	680,410	665,672	698,089	+2,089
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554)	1,000					-1,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	36,500	36,891	36,891	36,891	36,891	+391
Subtotal, Science and Technology	733,500	677,429	717,301	702,563	734,980	+1,480
Environmental Programs and Management	2,087,990	1,972,960	2,004,599	2,061,996	2,054,511	-33,479
Office of Inspector General	34,094	34,019	34,019	34,019	34,019	-75
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	11,500	11,867	11,867	11,867	11,867	+367
Subtotal, OIG	45,594	45,886	45,886	45,886	45,886	+292
Buildings and facilities	23,931	25,318	25,318	25,318	25,318	+1,387
Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,170,000	1,268,135	1,170,000	1,274,646	1,170,000	
Delay of obligation	100,000		100,000		100,000	
Transfer to Office of Inspector General	-11,500	-11,867	-11,867	-11,867	-11,867	-367
Transfer to Science and Technology	-36,500	-36,891	-36,891	-36,891	-36,891	-391
Subtotal, Hazardous Substance Superfund	1,222,000	1,219,377	1,221,242	1,225,888	1,221,242	-758
Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program	72,096	71,937	79,200	71,947	73,000	+904
Oil spill response	15,000	14,967	15,000	14,986	15,000	
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,620,740	2,232,943	2,355,000	2,572,234	2,658,900	+38,160
Categorical grants	1,008,000	1,055,782	1,081,899	1,030,782	1,074,376	+66,376
Subtotal, STAG	3,628,740	3,288,725	3,436,899	3,603,016	3,733,276	+104,536
Total, EPA	7,828,851	7,316,599	7,545,445	7,751,600	7,903,213	+74,362
Executive Office of the President						
Office of Science and Technology Policy	5,201	5,267	5,267	5,267	5,267	+66
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	2,900	2,974	2,974	2,974	2,974	+74
Total	8,101	8,241	8,241	8,241	8,241	+140
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation						
Office of Inspector General (transfer)	(33,660)	(33,660)	(33,660)	(33,660)	(33,660)	
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief	300,000	1,369,399	1,369,399	359,399	664,000	+364,000
(Transfer out)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	(-2,900)	
Contingent emergency appropriations	1,300,000		1,300,000	2,000,000	1,500,000	+200,000
Subtotal	1,600,000	1,369,399	2,669,399	2,359,399	2,164,000	+564,000
Radiological emergency preparedness fund		-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000	-1,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan	1,678	405	405	405	405	-1,273
(Limitation on direct loans)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	
Administrative expenses	427	543	543	543	543	+116

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002 — continued**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Salaries and expenses	187,000	203,801	197,900	203,801	203,801	+ 16,801
Defense function	28,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	+ 2,000
Subtotal.....	215,000	233,801	227,900	233,801	233,801	+ 18,801
Office of Inspector General.....	10,000	10,303	10,303	10,303	10,303	+ 303
Emergency management planning and assistance.....	249,652	334,623	384,623	409,623	384,623	+ 134,971
Defense function	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Miscellaneous appropriations (P.L. 106-554).....	100,000	-100,000
Subtotal.....	369,652	354,623	404,623	429,623	404,623	+ 34,971
(By transfer)	(2,900)	(2,900)	(2,900)	(2,900)	(2,900)
Emergency food and shelter program.....	140,000	139,692	140,000	139,692	140,000
National Flood Insurance Fund:						
(Limitation on administrative expenses):						
Salaries and expenses 1/.....	25,736	28,798	28,798	28,798	28,798	+ 3,062
Flood mitigation 1/.....	77,307	76,381	76,381	76,381	76,381	-926
(Transfer out)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)
National Flood Migration Fund (by transfer).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)
Emergency Response Fund (P.L. 107-38).....	2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	4,439,800	2,212,945	3,557,352	3,277,945	3,057,854	-1,381,946
Appropriations	(1,139,800)	(2,212,945)	(2,257,352)	(1,277,945)	(1,557,854)	(+ 418,054)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(3,300,000)	(1,300,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(-1,800,000)
General Services Administration						
Federal Consumer Information Center Fund.....	7,122	7,276	7,276	7,276	7,276	+ 154
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Human space flight	5,462,900	7,296,000	7,047,400	6,868,000	6,912,400	+ 1,449,500
Crew return vehicle	275,000
Science, aeronautics and technology.....	6,190,700	7,191,700	7,605,300	7,669,700	7,857,100	+ 1,666,400
Mission support	2,608,700	-2,608,700
Office of Inspector General.....	23,000	23,700	23,700	23,700	23,700	+ 700
Total, NASA.....	14,285,300	14,511,400	14,951,400	14,561,400	14,793,200	+ 507,900
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds).....	(296)	(309)	(309)	(309)	(309)	(+ 13)
Revolving loan program	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities.....	3,287,000	3,263,981	3,579,340	3,451,481	3,530,270	+ 243,270
Defense function	63,000	63,000	63,000	63,000	68,070	+ 5,070
Subtotal.....	3,350,000	3,326,981	3,642,340	3,514,481	3,598,340	+ 248,340
Major research equipment	121,600	96,332	135,300	108,832	138,800	+ 17,200
Education and human resources.....	787,352	872,407	885,720	872,407	875,000	+ 87,648
Salaries and expenses	160,890	170,040	170,040	170,040	170,040	+ 9,150
Office of Inspector General.....	6,280	6,760	6,760	6,760	6,760	+ 480
Total, NSF	4,426,122	4,472,520	4,840,160	4,672,520	4,788,940	+ 362,818
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	90,000	95,000	105,000	100,000	105,000	+ 15,000
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	24,480	25,003	25,003	25,003	25,003	+ 523
Total, title III, Independent agencies	31,918,670	29,404,820	31,407,764	31,197,873	31,459,444	-459,226
Appropriations	(28,618,670)	(29,404,820)	(30,107,764)	(29,197,873)	(29,959,444)	(+ 1,340,774)
Rescissions	(-30,000)	(+ 30,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(3,300,000)	(1,300,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(-1,800,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)	(1,525,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(296)	(309)	(309)	(309)	(309)	(+ 13)

**H.R. 2620 - Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development,
and Independent Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2002 — continued**
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
OTHER PROVISIONS						
Filipino veterans provision.....	3,000					-3,000
Grand total (net).....	108,346,441	110,671,650	112,742,553	113,351,308	112,742,537	+4,396,096
Appropriations	(107,023,741)	(110,678,350)	(112,335,253)	(111,973,008)	(112,460,237)	(+5,436,496)
Rescissions	(-1,977,300)	(-6,700)	(-892,700)	(-621,700)	(-1,217,700)	(+759,600)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(3,300,000)		(1,300,000)	(2,000,000)	(1,500,000)	(-1,800,000)
(By transfer)	(85,560)	(66,560)	(66,560)	(56,560)	(61,560)	(-24,000)
(Transfer out)	(-22,900)	(-22,900)	(-22,900)	(-22,900)	(-22,900)	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,828,029)	(1,828,604)	(1,828,604)	(1,828,604)	(1,828,604)	(+575)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(382,332,956)	(381,842,979)	(381,842,979)	(381,882,979)	(381,882,979)	(-449,977)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(551,372)	(563,842)	(553,385)	(563,877)	(563,877)	(+12,505)
Total mandatory and discretionary	107,976,025	114,867,650	112,617,553	113,347,308	112,738,537	+4,762,512
Mandatory.....	25,518,279	31,504,766	27,183,766	27,304,766	27,304,766	+1,786,487
Discretionary.....	82,457,746	83,362,884	85,433,787	86,042,542	85,433,771	+2,976,025

NOTE: FY2001 includes FHA negative subsidy of -\$2,246,000,000 (BA & Outlays).

1/ Not included in FY2001 CSBA tables.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of the 2002 VA, HUD and independent agencies conference report and all of its fundings.

I want to begin by thanking Chairman WALSH who, as usual, has done an excellent job with this legislation. We appreciate his courtesies and the opportunity for input in the bill throughout the process. He has had an especially full plate this year, managing this bill with restricted allocations and at the same time providing leadership in the appropriations process to ensure that New York receives adequate funding to address its emergency needs arising out of the September 11 terrorist attacks.

I want to begin by thanking the majority staff, Frank Cushing, Tim Peterson, Dena Baron, Jennifer Whitson, Jennifer Miller and Ron Anderson, for their hard work and openness during the development of this conference report. I must make particular note of their generosity in sharing their Capitol office space with the minority staff during the time that Members and staff were prohibited from occupying our office buildings. I also want to thank my excellent staff, Mike Stephens, Michelle Burkett, Angela June Ohm and Gavin Clingham, for their hard work during this process. All staff have really done an excellent job on a very difficult bill.

Given the resources, Mr. Speaker, that this subcommittee was allocated, we were forced to work together in a constructive manner to reach reasoned compromises. No Member got everything that they wanted, each sacrificed on issues of importance, to us and to our caucuses, but we have produced a conference report worthy of the body's support.

The bills passed by the House and the Senate were not significantly different in allocation but did contain significant substantive differences. In each case, a middle ground was sought and improvements have been made.

I want to take a minute to discuss a few of the programmatic numbers in this conference agreement.

Veterans remain a top priority of the members of this subcommittee. We have provided \$21.3 billion for the medical care account. This is \$350 million over the President's request, an increase of \$1.5 billion over the current year, and almost \$50 million over what was in the House bill when it left this body. We also increased the medical and prosthetic research account by \$20 million over 2001 funding.

Important to members of my caucus, we were able to improve the House-passed funding levels for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, and provide the Corporation for National and Community Service funding comparable to its fiscal year 2001 funding. The Public Housing Cap-

ital Fund was increased \$290 million from the House-passed funding level, and we maintained the \$250 million increase in the operating fund that was contained in the House bill. Funding to renew all existing Section 8 vouchers is included, as is funding to provide 18,000 new Fair Share vouchers and 7,000 new vouchers reserved for the disabled.

Within EPA, we restored the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to the funding levels of past years, \$1.35 billion, and provided an overall increase of \$75 million over this fiscal year, nearly \$600 million over the administration's request.

These improvements have not come at the expense of scientific research. The National Science Foundation will receive an increase of \$362 million, an 8.2 percent increase over 2001, an increase that is distributed broadly by research category and includes adequate funds for major new science initiatives.

For NASA, a 3.5 percent increase is provided. While I continue to have concerns that we are not providing NASA the resources needed to undertake the missions that have been identified for that agency, I would suggest that this minimal increase is a recognition of the budget constraints we face. I believe that we as a Congress should look closely at NASA in the next year and provide additional resources to that agency.

This conference report is the product of a balancing act, and I believe that we have done a good job ensuring that the needs of each agency are met. I ask for the body's support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise, number one, to congratulate Chairman WALSH for having done such a tremendous job in taking a 302(b) allocation that was not nearly as much as these agencies could have used but in providing a bill that really gets the job done. He has done an outstanding job. He could not have had a better partner than the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). They worked together in just a very strong, bipartisan fashion. Their staff support was equally bipartisan, and we produced a good bill. And so I would hope that we would get a very good vote for this conference report.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an announcement to the Members that we are nearing the end of the appropriations process for fiscal year 2002. I think everyone would breathe a deep sigh of relief over that, especially the chairman of the committee.

Briefly, we have produced two major supplemental bills since we received the details of the President's budget on May 9, which was about 2 months later than we normally get it, but I think we

all understand the lateness of the new administration being put in place. But we were 2 months late in actually getting the detailed numbers that we need as appropriators to work these bills. But since that time on May 9, we have produced the two supplementals that were major supplementals through the entire process and to the President.

We have also concluded all of our work on the Interior appropriations bill, the Military Construction appropriations bill, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, the Legislative Branch appropriations bill, the Treasury-Postal appropriations bill, and today we will conclude our business on the VA-HUD bill that is before us.

Also today we received unanimous consent to take up the appropriations bill for Agriculture, to file it by midnight tomorrow night; we will complete the conference on Commerce, Justice and State later today; we appointed the conferees for the District of Columbia appropriations bill; and we appointed the conferees for the Labor, HHS and Education appropriations bill. We hope to conclude those conferences by the middle of next week and hopefully will be on the floor before or by Friday of next week.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that part of the slowdown here also has been that the other body, while its appropriations committee had reported out most of its bills, the other body held appropriations bills for a long time and did not pass them. And so we cannot go to conference on an appropriations bill until the other body passes it as well. But while the committee did pass out its bills, the full Senate did not take them up.

We still have to do the Transportation conference, and there is one issue that is delaying us there, and that has to do with a difference of opinion between several Members of the other body and the President of the United States on the issue of trucks entering the United States from a foreign land. That has to be resolved yet, but we think that will happen also by the end of next week.

The major outstanding issue, having said all of this is the Defense bill. It has yet to be done in the Committee and in the House, but I believe we will also have it through the House by Friday of next week. I do not think we will be able to have it conferenced by Friday of next week. The Defense bill itself has been completed for over a week, but we are using it as a vehicle to deal with last \$20 billion of the second supplemental we did.

This gets a little confusing and complicated, but on the \$40 billion supplemental that we passed in the days after the terrorist attacks, if Members recall, we required that the last \$20 billion of that Act actually go through the appropriations process once the President decided how he would like to use that \$20 billion to respond to the terrorist attack of September 11. So while the Defense bill has been completed for about 10 days, we have been

holding it as the vehicle for that \$20 billion. We will mark up that \$20 billion part of that Defense bill on Tuesday of next week and hopefully will have it on the floor Wednesday or Thursday. That is our plan.

Again, Mr. Speaker, because of the good work of members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle and the support that we received by both sides of the aisle on our appropriations bills this year, again I say, we can breathe a sigh of relief. We are reaching the end of that process for fiscal year 2002.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, congratulations to my colleague from West Virginia and my colleague from New York for the job that they did on the bill. Today is a historic day for public health and safety and it is a great day for the environment. Today, after a decade-long battle, we are finally lowering the level of arsenic in our drinking water. The United States will finally join the rest of the developed world in cleaning up its drinking water.

□ 1230

Arsenic is a toxic poison that can cause lung cancer, bladder cancer, skin cancer; and according to the National Academy of Sciences, the threat to our children and pregnant women and anyone who drinks this carcinogen is even greater than we had originally thought. Arsenic simply has no place in our drinking water.

I am very pleased that the VA-HUD conference report includes language that I offered on this floor to cut the level of arsenic by 80 percent without any further delay. EPA now cannot drag its feet any longer. We need to get to 10 parts per billion immediately. Not next year, not next month, but now. EPA should never have blocked this ruling in the first place. In fact, based on the science, we should actually go lower than 10 parts per billion to adequately protect the public health.

Because of the actions we are taking here today, millions of Americans will be drinking cleaner water. This is a serious problem in my home State of Michigan. There are only four other States that have a higher exposure to arsenic in the entire Nation. According to the EPA, we have 367,000 Michigan residents in 176 communities who may be drinking water containing arsenic in amounts higher than 10 parts per billion. We are finally taking action to protect those people.

I want to thank those who helped bring this victory about, including those cosponsors of my original amendment in the House: the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY),

and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE). Senator BOXER in the other body led the fight. My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), was a steadfast supporter to get the strongest possible language that we could get in conference.

I also want to thank again my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the appropriations staff for all the assistance and help that they put in. This was a bipartisan victory. We had many supporters on the other side of the aisle as well.

The report language accompanying the arsenic standard raises a concern that we all share, and that is what that impact will be on small communities. The science is clear. No community would want to expose their citizens to higher levels of arsenic. But these communities need financial help to meet the new standard, not exemptions and waivers from the law. That is why authorizing legislation that the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and I and others introduced would double the amount of funds available to help meet this new standard.

When it comes to getting poison out of our drinking water, no community should be left behind. Next year, we need to step up to the plate and help these small water systems with additional resources.

This is one of the most important environmental and public health victories to come out of this Congress. It is a tremendous step forward in making sure that our drinking water is as clean and safe as it can be. I applaud and thank my colleagues for their support on this important measure.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished dean of the New York Republican delegation.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

As my colleague is aware, the New York State Department of Health recently released its findings from its Cancer Surveillance Improvement Initiative. That report showed that Rockland County and the East Side of Manhattan have among the highest breast cancer incidents in our State.

Specifically, the report shows that a majority of these two areas are characterized by elevated incidence and are 15 to 50 percent higher than the State average for breast cancer incidence.

In response to that alarming finding, I have been working with my colleague from Manhattan, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), to secure funding from the EPA for the NYU School of Medicine to conduct an assessment to determine if the observed excess incidence of breast cancer in my area of Rockland County and in the East Side of Manhattan, the area of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), are associated with air pollution and electromagnetic

radiation generated from the local power plants.

I am gratified the VA-HUD appropriations conference report contains \$500,000 for Rockland County, New York, for an assessment of environmental hazards in Rockland County and the East Side of Manhattan. It is my intention and that of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that this money be allocated to the NYU School of Medicine for this important study.

Therefore, I am asking our good chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), to clarify this is the intent of this proposal.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for bringing this issue to my attention. I share his concern for the findings in the New York Department of Health's report which show the high incidence of breast cancer in Rockland County and the East Side of Manhattan.

I want to assure my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), that it is the intent of the language included in the conference report for this study to be directed to the New York School of Medicine.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to thank our good friend, the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH), for his support.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his strong efforts in working with me to secure funding for this very, very important project. One in seven women die of breast cancer, and we have a huge incidence in our two respective districts.

I also especially thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH), who worked very hard with us in the VA-HUD bill, along with the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN); and we appreciate very, very much their support. I believe we will save lives eventually.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to serve on the subcommittee on VA, HUD and independent agencies.

The gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), have done the work of a dynamic duo. First of all,

they were able to bridge the gap of bipartisanship that is so sorely needed in this Congress, and they did it, and they got a good job done because of that.

I have been in the majority, and I have been in the minority. I have seen many talented and skilled leaders in this body on both sides of the aisle, and I always praise them. But I have rarely seen the kind of effective bipartisan leadership that these two Members had. They are serious about their responsibilities. They want to make government work, and they want to make it work well. They could not please all of us. I am never always fully pleased. But they are serious about it, and we do have a very good committee, and they are always willing to listen and they want to help. They are problem solvers, and we are fortunate to have them. We had many constraints on this subcommittee, but they were able to overcome most of them.

I would like to thank on the majority side Frank Cushing, Tim Peterson, Dena Baron, Jennifer Miller and Jennifer Whitson; and on the Democratic side, Mike Stephens and Michelle Burkett. They showed confidence, they showed experience; and the help and good cheer is greatly appreciated.

This does a lot of good, Mr. Speaker, because sometimes as Members we want things, and sometimes our reach exceeds our grasp. But, as Tennyson said, after all, what is heaven for?

It funds the Federal urban empowerment zones, which assist our oldest, poorest neighborhoods. It increases veterans health care, environmental protection, our space program and FEMA.

This conference report should be fully endorsed by the Congress. I fully support it. All Members should. It increases the funding for the National Science Foundation's Historically Black Colleges Undergraduate Program from \$17 million in the House-passed bill to \$28 million in the conference report. It will have a lot to do with science education in historically black colleges and universities.

This conference report funds for the first time a program to help historically black colleges and universities with doctoral programs in science and engineering. This will improve their competitiveness and their capabilities in getting Federal research dollars. This has always been a problem among historically black colleges and universities, and this conference report saw that as a need, and they funded it. The doctoral candidates and the doctoral persons who are pursuing it in these universities will certainly be helped.

This conference report also includes \$27 million, an increase over the House level, for the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation Program to help increase the number of minority students in basic science, math and engineering. This subcommittee saw the need for this kind of improvement with historically black colleges and also all minority institutions.

I support this conference report, not because it is the best we can do, but I support it in spite of that. This committee did very well with what it had. With a final allocation that is \$200 million below our House-passed bill, there was not much they could do to make this bill as good as it should be, but they did the very best they could do. We should have done better, but my mother used to say, you cannot get blood out of a turnip when it is not there.

True, our bill is a marked improvement over what we initially passed in the House. Initially the House zeroed out HUD's Shelter Plus program, which provides rental assistance for homeless people and their families. This conference report fully funds that program.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that these major programs that were so strongly needed, even though this particular committee did not have the funding it needed to fund these, it did its very best to serve these programs, and not just stop them after some success with them.

Initially, the House zeroed out the Corporation for National and Community Service programs, which is a program that many of the Members are so proud of and help out in their communities, and that is the AmeriCorps program. It is like a domestic Peace Corps. This conference report funds AmeriCorps, but reduces it by 6 percent.

Far more serious, the House vetoed out the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program which was designed to help stamp out drug dealing in public housing because local police were not doing enough policing in these areas. Many of us would like to see that program reinstated, but the wisdom of the committee, following the administration's advice, were not able to keep this program in. That is something that I wish very much had been in the conference report.

It also zeroes out Public Housing Drug Elimination Grants. The \$110 million that we added to the public housing operating subsidies would not begin to make up for the loss of this \$300 million program. What I am saying is the PHOs would not be able to take the money they are receiving to make up for the drug elimination grants.

Still, this conference report is the best we could do with the resources we had to work with. So many programs in our VA-HUD bill are designed to assist the poorest people in our society with basic needs. Much of the country takes this for granted. They take for granted a decent place to live, decent jobs. Many of our Congresspeople feel that way, access to credit that they can borrow.

Mr. Speaker, these programs are needed to help poor people. I wish this Congress would remember, these are not just add-ons and they are not superfluous bureaucracies. These things are needed.

I want to thank this committee, and I hope we will adopt this conference report and laud our two wonderful chairpeople and our staff.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), a very hard-working and distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I rise in support of the VA-HUD conference report and want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for their leadership and the good work of their staff.

I support this conference report for any number of reasons, but particularly because it contains a \$1 billion increase for veterans medical care over last year's level. This is critically needed funding, especially for my home State of New Jersey, but for the rest of the Nation; and it will help provide men and women who served in the military with better access to the medical care that they have so richly earned and deserve. Over the past 3 years under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH), the committee has provided \$4 billion in increase for medical care.

The conference report also takes an important first step towards providing veterans with schizophrenia medicines that are far more valuable and very important to their lives. It encourages the VA to inform its doctors, pharmacy managers and, hopefully, its VISN directors as well, not to use the cost of atypical antipsychotics as a measurement of job performance, and instead, to reinforce VA policy that physicians use their best judgment when prescribing medicines for mentally ill veterans. If anyone deserves access to all the latest, most advanced medicines available, it is our veterans. They deserve the best possible treatments we can provide them.

□ 1245

I also support this conference report because it provides a much-needed funding increase for the Section 811 program, housing for disabilities. I am pleased that the House provided \$29 million more for this program than the Senate, and in the end, the conferees agreed to provide the higher level. There is a great need in our Nation for housing of all types, but particularly housing dollars for nonelderly individuals with disabilities.

I support this conference report because it also contains an important set-aside: \$40 million within the Section 8 voucher program to further increase housing options for individuals with disabilities.

Combined with the increase in the Section 811 program, these two provisions will continue our efforts to provide housing for some of those who are in greatest need, who wish to live with independence and dignity.

I also support this conference report because it increases funding for the National Science Foundation by \$363 million over last year's level. Basic scientific research is critical, and this funding will help continue the NSF's work, including a number of projects in my home State, a State with a long history of scientific research and development.

This conference report also deserves support because it continues to provide funding for critical environmental programs, including \$1.27 billion for the Superfund program to expedite clean-up of hazardous waste sites. My State has the dubious distinction of having more of these sites than any other State in the Nation.

Further, this proposal provides nearly \$95 billion for the brownfields program, which will help clean up contaminated sites to allow them to be used and returned to productive use in many of our cities and urban centers.

This conference report builds upon what we have done in the past while staying within the confines of our allocation and within the overall level agreed upon last month by the Congress and the President.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity, and I am sure all committee Members do, to commend FEMA Director Alpaugh, VA Secretary Principi, and EPA Administrator Whitman and their respective agencies and personnel for all of their collective efforts addressing so many tragic, tragic events related to September 11. All of these agencies sprang into action to offer the resources and their dedicated personnel in the wake of these attacks.

For these and many reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report and I urge everybody to vote for it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this subcommittee was ably led for many years by Chairman Boland, who recently passed away. I would like to acknowledge what a pleasure it was for me to serve under Eddie Boland, and what an outstanding job he did leading this subcommittee, as well as his leadership in Congress.

He served for many years, and he was an outstanding member of the body. As we consider this bill, which would have been his bill, we would like to note his passing with great sadness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), a distinguished member of the Massachusetts delegation, and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, who served many years with Mr. Boland.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the subcommittee for yielding time to me, and I join him in expressing our sorrow at the death of Ed Boland. He was for many years one of the voices of housing in this body.

He served, along with his roommate, close friend, and legislative classmate, Tip O'Neill, for more than 30 years and made an enormous contribution in the areas of housing, intelligence, and science; and we mourn his passing. He was one of the people who made democracy work in a very positive way.

As I think back to those days, I think back also with regret. We have not only lost Ed Boland, we have lost as a nation the commitment to using the resources of the wealthiest country in the world to help people who are in distressed circumstances, and to meet common problems.

I want to be very clear: I congratulate the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the others. Given the constraints within which they had to work, they did an excellent job.

I am particularly gratified that they took care to provide adequate resources to public housing. The people who live in public housing are among the most needy and abused in our society. We are the ones who created public housing. We, the society, are the ones who created what many of us now understand, almost all of us now understand, were not very good places to live in the first place, and put the poor in there because they could not afford anything else. We are trying to change that.

But those who would cut back on funding for public housing are blaming the victims for penalties imposed upon them, and so in this particular appropriation public housing does well, and I thank the gentleman for doing that. This is not a politically popular goal, but it is an important one.

Mr. Speaker, in general, as I said, given the inadequate resources which they were given, they have done a very good job of putting them where they are needed. I appreciate their doing that. They have taken care of new Section 8s, they have taken care of public housing, they have tried to protect some of the other important activities. I am grateful to them for doing it.

But having said that, I must return to the other point; namely, that we as a Congress, we as a society, are erring gravely in withholding the resources we need for so many important problems.

The very prosperity that gave us such wealth, and it is temporarily on the other side of the ledger, but it is going to come back because this remains a very strong economy, the very prosperity that generated such revenues for the government caused housing problems for some people, because for many of those in this country, prosperity was a wonderful thing and it added to their incomes. But for some, when it did not add to their incomes, they were not only not better off, they were worse off because they lived in communities where housing prices were suddenly driven beyond what they could reasonably afford.

We have not, and it is not the subcommittee's doing, and it is not even the Committee on Appropriations' doing, but we as a Congress have not given the resources necessary that we could use to alleviate that.

In the environmental area, I represent some working-class communities, communities not terribly wealthy. They are the ones who now have to correct years of national neglect of clean water. They are facing very significant economic problems. We do not do enough to provide Federal funding to help them meet the Federal mandate of cleaning up the water and cleaning up international waters.

So just in summary, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia and the members of the subcommittee. I appreciate the hard work they put into trying to meet our needs, but I have to close by lamenting the unwillingness of this society and this Congress to do the appropriate thing with our wealth.

Yes, we will have many needs that can best be satisfied by individual spending, by money in our own pockets. But a civilized society that cares about the quality of its environment, has some compassion for the poor, for homeless children, that cares about adequate medical care for those who served our country, we have to understand that these needs cannot be fully met individually, that these needs require a Federal Government that is well funded.

We have to get over this kind of contradiction where everybody hates government spending, but then laments the fact that we do not have enough government spending for housing, for Community Development Block Grants, for veterans medical care, for cleaning up Superfund sites, for clean water, and for other important programs.

I hope as members contemplate this piece of legislation they will express their appreciation for the work that was done, but also their understanding of the inadequacy of the resources with which it was done, and help us change national policy in that regard.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge support of the conference report that contains within it the increased development of affordable housing.

I would like to congratulate the Chair, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and I would also congratulate the ranking member, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

The FHA loan limits have not been raised since 1992 despite dramatic increases in construction cost and critical demand for affordable rental housing. In a number of cities nationwide,

and those in West Virginia as well, there has been no new construction under the FHA program in 4 years.

The need for affordable housing is well documented, and today 13.7 million households face a critical housing need. The availability of decent housing has been deeply harmed by the lack of financing to produce these units. By increasing the multifamily loan limits, FHA will stimulate not only new construction, but rehabilitation of existing infrastructure in many cities across the country.

I look forward to giving my wholehearted support to this conference report. I thank the Chair and the ranking member.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for the work they have done. I recognize that it was a very difficult job to try and live within the framework that was foisted upon them.

Mr. Speaker, this VA-HUD conference report is certainly an improvement over the House version. However, the funds are still terribly inadequate to fulfill HUD's mission to support the most needy people in this country.

This report cuts funding for public housing, terminating \$310 million for the successful drug elimination program, and \$157 million for the capital fund that provides for the rehabilitation of housing units to bring them up to today's standards.

This bill will also cut all of the jobs of public housing residents that are associated with the rehabilitation.

In addition, this conference report cuts funding for proven economic development programs that are sorely needed to stimulate the economy. For example, the Community Development Block Grant has been cut by \$58 million; Empowerment Zones funding has been cut by \$45 million; the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund has been cut by \$38 million.

Funding for these programs should be increased, rather than decreased. These programs inject capital into communities that need it the most, creating jobs and stimulating the economy. Cutting these programs at a time like this is simply inexplicable.

This conference report, while certainly, again, an improvement over the House, is still troubling. It is troubling because of our need to support poor people, rather than abandon them at this time. We have to remember that at the same time that we are doing this, there are some Members in this House who are proposing obscene tax cuts for the richest corporations in America.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a vote on this bill, because this is the best that

we can do. But we must have a better vision for the future. We must work harder to change our priorities for the future and empower and support the most needy citizens in this Nation.

Let me just close by saying I worked very hard for about 10 or 15 years with all of the public housing programs in my district. I knew and I know today that there are still drug problems and that drug traffickers find their way to poor people, encouraging them to get involved in this underground of drug selling.

It is unconscionable that we would cut drug elimination in these public housing projects at the same time that we want to strengthen them, we want to clean them up, we want to encourage people to go to work and get in job training programs. They cannot do it without the kind of support that is offered through the drug elimination program and other like programs.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts on this issue.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I appreciate the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), for the fine job he has done, and also the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and also the subcommittee staff for their tremendous help on this legislation, and for assisting with the legislative language to provide \$490,000 to construct the Harold Chitwood multipurpose cafeterium facility to match approximately \$1 million, to be provided locally, to build the additional facilities of the complex.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman, is it his understanding that this multipurpose facility would be owned and operated by the Bennington school district and constructed on land of the district for educational, community, and Native American activities?

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

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. That is exactly what my understanding is of this expenditure.

Mr. WATKINS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the chairman engaging in this colloquy.

□ 1300

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for yielding the time, and I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their commitment to our Nation's veterans. They have had significant increases in this budget in the last 2 years and they

have worked very hard. Given the constraints, they have had to do the best in this year.

Let us put this in context as we are about to adjourn for our Veterans' Day. This budget appropriates barely sufficient funds for the VA to keep up with inflation, barely sufficient funds. At a time when we are all going to go out on next Sunday and Monday to say how much we support our veterans, we are falling behind in our commitment.

This budget is \$2 billion below what the veterans groups have come together to try to argue for in their independent budget. This budget is below what both the House and the Senate have in their resolutions, this at a time when we are producing more veterans as they defend our country in this war against terrorism, and this comes at a time when the VA has already informed its field people that they are going to fall \$800 million behind in this budget and they better prepare for that.

The VA is being called to help with emergency efforts at a time of potential casualties in this Nation. Not only do they not have sufficient resources, not only are they falling behind, but they are called upon to do new things in this war against terrorism.

So what occurs is backlogs for disability adjudications are building at the rate of 10,000 a week, 10,000 a week. Appointments have to be made 6, 8, 9, 10 months in advance that our veterans have to wait for. This is not a way to give a signal to those who are fighting in Afghanistan that we are going to treat them right when they come home.

This budget is disappointing. We should not vote for it, and we should put this in context. When people tell me we do not have the resources, this House just passed a \$25 billion subsidy for retroactive tax increases for the biggest corporations in America, \$25 billion dollar. A check for \$2 billion was given to IBM, and we do not have money for our Nation's veterans.

We cannot do anything about Persian Gulf War illness and our veterans are homeless on the street. I am going to vote no on this budget because on November 11 this is not a way to honor our veterans.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER) one of our newer Members. We are delighted to have him with us today.

Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding the time, and I rise today in support of this conference report because it does work to take care of our Nation's veterans, and it does work to protect our environment.

For our Nation's veterans, this bill provides for over a billion dollars in increases over last year's bill for veterans health care. The bill also provides additional funding for the veterans benefits administration to expedite claims processing.

Also, important to my home district, this bill provides \$850,000 for the University of West Florida through EPA to conduct an environmental health study in Escambia County. In 1998, EPA wrote Escambia County ranked 22nd out of more than 3,300 counties nationwide in the amount of toxic releases reported by the agency.

Over the last couple of years, there has been mounting anecdotal evidence suggesting that these toxic levels have attributed to an increase in illnesses in northwest Florida. It is time to find some real answers. The study will compile environmental information, coordinate research, evaluate risks to the health of our citizens, and provide the information necessary to remedy the situation.

I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the members of the committee and the staff for their work on this important legislation and for recognizing the need for a science-based evaluation of toxic levels and illnesses in northwest Florida.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for yielding me the time.

I rise in strong support of the bill. Let me start out by saying that I appreciate the fact that the chairman and the ranking member increased the amount of funding for NASA than what was in the President's request. We did not get everything we wanted for NASA, but we got more than what was originally proposed.

I also think that the committee was very wise in increasing the funding for basic science funding research through the National Science Foundation, which we now know that basic science research has been critical to the economic expansion that we enjoyed in the prior 8, almost 9, years.

Most importantly, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for accepting the higher level of funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency and for natural disasters. As Members know, earlier this year before the events of September 11, which this Congress has very wisely and very strongly dealt with, we in Texas, and particularly in the greater Houston area, suffered a tremendous natural disaster as a result of Tropical Storm Allison. There were a number of Members including myself who were down here on the floor arguing for sufficient funding just as the effects of this storm were unraveling.

As we now know, nearly 80,000 people in the greater Houston area were affected by the storm; 50,000 homes took on water. The major hospitals were closed down, and the total cost was probably around \$5 billion. The Federal share will be close to \$2 billion as part of this storm; and I just want to com-

mend the chairman and the ranking member for the work that they did, that they have stepped up to the plate and provided what is a basic function of the Federal Government in stepping to aid its people in times of crisis.

Just as we have done rightly so in New York and with the Pentagon, we have also done in this bill as it relates to the people of Texas and of the greater Houston area as a result of Tropical Storm Allison, and I appreciate the work that both sides did on this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for yielding me the time, and I certainly thank the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts in this bill.

I rise reluctantly to say that I intend to vote no on this bill. I recognize that the chairman made a very strong effort to stick to the original House mark on NASA, but without the support of the administration or the other body, it was very difficult for him to hold on that issue, and certainly I thank him for his efforts.

My greater concern is just that we are continuing the general trend that we have been on for the last 8 years when it comes to our investment in aerospace. At the conclusion of the first Bush administration, aerospace investment for the United States of America, 15 percent of the total Federal R&D went to aerospace.

At the conclusion of 8 years of the Clinton administration, it was down to a figure of only 7 percent, only 7 percent of our Federal investment goes into aerospace. Now today that figure is treading down even further. Indeed, this is a critical issue not only for our competitiveness, manufactured products that we make in the United States lead the way in our import/export balance sheet in the area of aerospace; but we are losing that competitive edge. Also, I think this is a critical issue for national security and national defense.

Specifically, if you look at this bill, NASA's budget barely keeps pace with inflation. This is a budget that has essentially been flat for 10 years. A budget that, when you adjust for inflation has an agency that has seen its purchasing power decline by close to 30 percent, barely gets an inflationary adjustment here.

Let us look at the some of the comparisons in this bill. EPA gets a 10 percent increase over last year; housing an increase of 6 percent over last year. Despite the fact that some people have come to this floor saying they want even more for housing, housing actually gets an increase that is double the inflation rate. The Science Foundation, certainly something I support, a 10 percent increase over the last year, but yet the NASA account barely keeps pace with inflation.

Let me just say there are some good things in this for NASA. There is a 25

percent increase to cover some expenses at the vehicle assembly building, a building that was built to support the Apollo program that is deteriorating. Fortunately, there is some money for new doors in that building. It needs a lot more: a new roof, a new facade. Certainly, I am very pleased that the chairman was able to hold the mark on the shuttle upgrades account which was very, very good news; but overall in the area of human space flight, it actually transfers money out of human space flight to cover NASA accounts elsewhere.

Overall, I cannot support this bill. I do not think the people in my district support this bill, and I intend to vote no.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, would the Chair advise us as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the conferees for the great job they have done on this VA-HUD conference bill. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, I am particularly pleased with the commitment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) to make sure that the NASA budget continues to make sure that America provides a leadership in space and keeps America number one in space endeavors.

The conferees showed good judgment in producing a bill that requires NASA to conduct many of the recommendations captured within the International Space Station Management Cost and Evaluation Report. I believe that this is the right course in establishing a credible Space Station program.

It is with this achievement that we should continue to press NASA to stay on course concerning the other aerospace projects that are of critical importance to the American taxpayer. That is why I have requested from NASA a letter delivered to me tomorrow that specifically outlines a program within the space launch initiative that ensures an orbital flight demonstration experiment involving the X-37 vehicle, so we can verify this cutting-edge technology and its benefit as a space transportation system.

In the past, NASA has been disappointing in producing space hardware and flight hardware that satisfied our launch needs. This time it is now time to move forward aggressively developing the means to access space affordably and effectively. The X-37

project represents a major milestone in moving us closer to this goal. Let us hope that this week marks a sea change in attitude at NASA to start thinking boldly and creatively as we enter the 21st century and beyond.

We need to have space launch, and we need to make sure we have the technology developed that will keep America the number one space power. We also must be concerned about the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the conferees on their commitment to both of these goals.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would take a few seconds to close and, merely, I would like to thank our staffs, both minority and majority staff, for the remarkable amount of effort they put into this. We had six pre-conferences prior to conference. They worked very, very hard as did all of the members of the subcommittee. I would especially like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who was very supportive all the way along. There was no partisanship at all in this bill.

I submit the bill to the consideration of the House. I urge its adoption.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of increasing the FHA Multifamily loan limits. The FHA multifamily loan programs support the new construction and substantial rehabilitation of much needed affordable rental housing.

Our Nation faces a growing affordable housing crisis for low- and moderate-income families. Yet the FHA multifamily loan limits have not been raised in 9 years. How can we expect the private sector to produce affordable rental housing, when they cannot receive affordable financing?

Construction costs have risen more than 25 percent since the last increase. One simple way to stimulate the development of affordable housing in our communities is to increase the multifamily loan limits. In my home State of New York, the current limit is \$87,226 per two-bedroom unit. In the last 4 years not one unit has been produced under the FHA multifamily loan program, due to that low number. The 25-percent increase established in this conference agreement would raise the limit in New York to \$106,952.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this necessary and important increase that will benefit so many working families throughout our Nation.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2620, the Fiscal Year 2002 Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. This bill provides \$112.7 billion for these agencies, 7 percent more than current funding.

I support the bill because it provides \$2.2 billion in disaster relief for FY 2002, which will be needed in part to recover from Tropical Storm Allison, one of the worst disasters to ever hit Houston and the State of Texas. The

total is \$800 million more than the President's budget request, and these additional funds will help the Houston area's continuing recovery from Tropical Storm Allison. While FEMA has spent almost \$900 million in Texas as a result of Allison, they expect to spend an additional \$800 million in the State before recovery is complete.

Most future FEMA disaster relief funds for Allison recovery will be for Public Assistance (PA), much of which will reach the nonprofit hospitals and institutions of the Texas Medical Center, which conduct millions of patient visits per year. When the House originally considered the VA-HUD, it contained only \$1.4 billion in disaster relief. I greatly appreciate the willingness of the chairman and ranking member to provide the funds necessary to address our needs in Texas.

It is very important for Congress to maintain a healthy disaster relief capability at all times. I am proud that Congress has already made a major commitment to the recovery process for New York City. I am also proud that the war on terrorism has not caused us to forget the disaster relief needs of the rest of the country. I am confident that Congress can simultaneously help rebuild after the worst disaster in our Nation's history and the most expensive natural disaster in Houston's history.

Besides including additional disaster relief funding, I commend the chairman and the entire Appropriations Committee for going part way toward correcting a major flaw in the President's budget regarding funding for the International Space Station. The bill provides \$14.8 billion in total for NASA, 3.5 percent more or \$508 million more than current funding. Importantly, this legislation fully funds the space station at the \$1.9 billion budget request. While the President's budget did not reduce NASA funding, it kept the increase below inflation, reducing purchasing power, and zeroed out the Crew Return Vehicle (CRV) and Habitation Module. These two integral parts of the space station are necessary to have a research presence on the station, which is why we have constructed this orbiting microgravity laboratory. While I am disappointed that the bill does not contain the \$275 million for CRV form the House bill, I am pleased that at least \$40 million will be spent on CRV in 2002.

I am relieved that the conference committee approved a major increase over the President's request for scientific research. This bill includes \$4.8 billion federal funding for research through the National Science Foundation. The performance of the economy is largely the result of technological advances stemming from basic science research throughout our Nation. This fact underscores the necessity of increasing Federal basic scientific investments.

Although the conferees are to be commended for wrapping up their work on veterans' spending before Veterans' Day weekend, I am concerned that this measure does not provide enough funding for veterans programs. I will continue to consistently support health benefit expansion for our Nation's veterans, many who have made incredible sacrifices in order to preserve our freedom. Although the war on terrorism is unlike any other war, there will still be thousands of new veterans of this war who will be as equally deserving as those who served in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the gulf. My home State of Texas has a growing veterans population

who will not be fully served until we find additional resources.

Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has produced a good bill under the difficult circumstances. In Particular the FEMA disaster relief funding is important to my constituents and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of housing funding in this VA-HUD conference report.

The good news is that this bill restores a significant portion of the very deep and unwise cuts made to housing and community development programs that were proposed in the administration budget and were adopted in the House-passed bill. The bad news is that this bill is still disappointing from a housing standpoint.

The last few years, we worked together in a bipartisan basis to restore funding for housing programs that were cut in 1995, and to provide new vouchers for almost 200,000 low-income families.

The conference report being considered today reverses this progress, by making modest funding cuts in some important programs, and by dramatically reducing the level of incremental section 8 vouchers for low-income families and seniors. Moreover, this is taking place just at the time when we appear to be entering into a recession, which will make it harder for low- and moderate-income families and seniors to keep a roof over their head.

It is true that on a purely technical basis, budget authority for HUD will increase under this bill. However, when you factor out the increase just to renew expiring section 8 contracts, and factor out the offsetting increased receipts from FHA and Ginnie Mae, this bill actually cuts housing and community development programs by over \$250 million.

Specifically, the bill makes \$215 million in net cuts in public housing programs, including termination of the Drug Elimination Program. It cuts funding for CDBG and Empowerment Zones, just as virtually everyone agrees we need to do more to stimulate economic development in the face of a recession. And, it cuts the number of new Fair Share Section 8 vouchers from 79,000 last year to only 18,000 this year—a 77 percent cut.

The simple truth is that the housing cuts in this bill are unnecessary. Earlier this year, Congress diverted \$114 million in unused section 8 funds to nonhousing purposes. A portion of the \$300 million in savings we will generate from the mark-to-market extension will be diverted to nonhousing purposes. And FHA and Ginnie Mae continue to produce billions of dollars in profits to the taxpayer—profits which could be reinvested in housing, but are instead used to increase the Federal budget surplus.

On various policy issues, the bill is also disappointing. I am pleased that the conference report in effect adopts the amendment offered by myself and Congresswoman LEE during House consideration which restores the \$100 million cut in homeless funding for Shelter Plus Care renewals, funding this through a reduction in the as-yet unauthorized administration down payment initiative. However, we failed to do what we should have done, which is to renew expiring Shelter Plus Care grants through the section 8 certificate fund, as we do all other expiring rental assistance.

On the \$640 million reduction in funded section 8 reserves, I am pleased that the conferees included report language dealing with the issue of providing additional funds beyond the remaining 1 month of funded reserves. I urge HUD to implement this provision in a way that maximally increases section 8 utilization, that is, by promptly providing additional funds to section 8 administrators who exhaust their reserve funds and need additional funds to serve their authorized number of families.

So, in conclusion, we have averted the devastating impact of earlier versions of the HUD budget, but in so many ways we can and should do better.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the conference report directs the EPA administrator to put into effect without delay the 10 parts per billion standard for arsenic that was promulgated in the Clinton administration. The Bush administration has, without justification, delayed the effective date of the January 22d rule and has been in clear violation of Federal law. Congress had set a deadline to have a new final standard for arsenic in effect no later than June 22 of this year. The House of Representatives, in July, sent the administration a clear message when it voted to have an arsenic standard no higher than 10ppb so the United States could be in line with the World Health Organization and the European Union.

Despite extensive scientific proof that the current standard for arsenic in tap water of 50 ppb is unsafe, it remained unchanged from 1942 until the Clinton administration reduced it to 10ppb in January 2001. In 1942, the U.S. Public Health Service (USPHS) established a standard for arsenic in tap water of 50 ppb, which remained in effect for over half a century even though it did not consider evidence accumulated over the past 50 years that arsenic causes cancer.

In 1962, the USPHS recommended that potable water supplies not exceed 10ppb arsenic. Nearly 39 years later, EPA finally adopted that recommendation in January 2001.

The National Academy of Sciences issued a report in 1999 finding that "it is the subcommittee's consensus that the current EPA standard for arsenic in drinking water of 50ppb does not achieve EPA's goal for public health protection and, therefore, requires downward revision as promptly as possible."

The NAS, EPA, International Agency of Research on Cancer, and many other scientific international bodies have declared arsenic in drinking water a known human carcinogen, based on numerous studies from around the world showing that people get bladder, kidney, lung, skin, and other cancers from arsenic in their tap water.

Despite all of that information, tens of million of Americans drink arsenic in their tap water supplied by public water systems, at levels that present unacceptable cancer and non-cancer risks. According to EPA, about 12 million Americans drink tap water containing over 10ppb arsenic, about 22.5 million drink tap water containing over 5ppb, and about 35.7 million drink water containing in excess of 3ppb. Thus, according to EPA's occurrence estimates and NAS' most recent cancer risk estimates, about 36 million Americans drink water every day that contains arsenic at a level presenting over 10 times EPA's maximum acceptable cancer risk.

It is for that reason I was pleased that the Bush administration finally—at a bare min-

imum—accepted the 10ppb rule after months of unnecessary delay. However, in reviewing the language in this conference report, I would say to my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee that it is a mistake to encourage small communities to seek lengthy compliance time extensions so they continue to drink unhealthy water. We should work together to develop additional cost-effective technologies and provide targeted financial assistance where necessary to bring small water systems into compliance with the new protective standard for arsenic. No person no matter where they live in our country should have arsenic in their drinking water which presents an unreasonable risk to health.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to thank Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for taking a reasonable first step in responding to the escalating concerns parents have voiced over the effects of arsenic-treated wood playground equipment on their children.

Included in the VA-HUD conference report is a provision requested by myself and Senator BEN NELSON of Florida.

The provision directs the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency to report to the committee within 3 months on their most up-to-date understanding of the potential health and safety risks to children playing on and around arsenic-treated wood playground equipment.

The report will also include the steps the EPA and the Consumer Product Safety Commission are taking to keep state and local governments, and the public, informed about the risks associated with arsenic-treated wood.

It responds to a study released today by the Environmental Working Group and the Healthy Building Network, which estimates that one out of every 500 children who regularly play on swing sets and decks made from arsenic-treated wood will develop lung or bladder cancer later in life as a result of these exposures.

It is important in these times of changing priorities that the health and well-being of children remain foremost in our minds.

The parents of Indianapolis and communities all over the Nation are looking forward to the findings of this report.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee under difficult circumstances. As most Members know, the allocation of the subcommittee was insufficient to adequately fund the Department of Veterans Affairs, and particularly veterans medical care. While I am disappointed about the appropriations provided in the conference agreement for veterans, I realize the extraordinary conditions under which we have had to work this session. I hope that we can redress some of the shortcomings in this year's budget in the next fiscal year.

As a nation, we are now engaged in the first war of the 21st century. We must be prepared to provide the benefits and services of our future veterans as well as meet the needs of those men and women who have honorably served our Nation in uniform in years past. This is a moral obligation of our Nation.

Undoubtedly, major additional funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs and particularly veterans medical care and services can be fully justified. As the need for additional funding becomes more obvious in the weeks and months ahead, I look forward to

the administration submitting a request for the additional funding which is clearly needed.

Until that time, VA will continue to do its best to meet its missions. But VA can only do more with insufficient resources for so long. A day of reckoning is fast approaching. We must do better by our Nation's veterans. While we have improved upon the President's request, the Department of Veterans Affairs still estimates shortfalls for delivering current services in FY 2002. This year we will continue to pass legislation encouraging VA to do more, including managing its role as a backup provider to the Department of Defense in times of war or national emergency and combating bioterrorism. I want VA to fulfill these roles, but I also want to ensure that they have adequate resources to take on these challenges.

This Sunday, November the 11th, when Members of this body are praising our veterans' past deeds and stressing the importance of a strong national defense, I ask all Members of this House to make a commitment to our deeds and our actions reflect our words. We must provide adequate resources to our past and present servicemembers. We can do less.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report accompanying H.R. 2620 and to thank Chairman WALSH and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their hard work on this bill. The chairman and ranking member have worked on a wide range of issues within this bill and I believe my colleagues in this body owe them a debt of gratitude for the dedication and spirit of bipartisanship they demonstrated while reaching compromise on their differences.

There is, however, language in this report which concerns me greatly. The language pertains to the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs and the treatment of veterans with mental illness.

Mr. Speaker, there is still enormous concern among veterans' organizations, Members of this body and mental health advocates about the VA's desire to implement treatment guidelines for veterans who suffer from schizophrenia. The language included in the House version of the conference report accompanying the VA-HUD appropriations bill would have held the VA accountable by requiring them to wait until a scientific review of newer atypical antipsychotic medications was completed by the National Institute of Mental Health—the premiere Federal scientific research agency. By contrast, the Senate conference report language for the VA-HUD bill would have left the VA free to implement their new treatment guidelines with little congressional oversight.

The compromise contained in this conference report is not what many of us in this body had hoped for. Specifically, the compromise does not go far enough to ensure the guidelines the VA seeks to promulgate will follow the most up-to-date science regarding the treatment of schizophrenia. In fact, it is precisely because there is a dearth of scientific research on the use of different antipsychotic medications that I fought for inclusion for the House-passed language in the conference report. Without sound scientific research, I am concerned the VA will institute treatment protocols which could jeopardize the health of veterans with schizophrenia.

As many Members know, mental illness is no small thing, and it's certainly not something

we can describe in terms of dollars and cents. Unless you meet some suffering from an illness like schizophrenia, it's hard to imagine how it can impact a person's life as well as those who love them. Without proper treatment, victims are often completely unable to function in society, accounting for 1 out of 5 hospital admissions and 4 of 10 beds in long-term care facilities—not to mention countless encounters with the corrections system. This is why I was disappointed stronger language did not make its way into the conference report.

I am heartened, however, to see we are sending a clear message to the VA that it is not to use the total sum cost of drugs which are prescribed at VA facilities as a measure of a pharmacy manager's or physician's performance. Rest assured I will continue working with veterans' organizations and advocates for veterans with mental illness to ensure the VA and individual VISN's closely follow the guidance the conference report provides for respect to the freedom that doctors in the VA system should have to prescribe clinically appropriate medications for their patients without fear of reprisal.

Let me be clear on this. Diagnosis and treatment of mental illness should be based on medical judgment and need, not price. Restrictive formulary policies jeopardize patient care by taking treatment decisions out of the hands of doctors. Because patients differ in their clinical responses to different drugs, in their sensitivity to specific side effects, and in their tolerance for these side effects when they occur—and because the atypical antipsychotic agents are different from one another in their clinical effects for a particular patient and in their side effects—I have a difficult time believing that any treatment protocol or formulary can embody the best clinical care. Veterans with schizophrenia—60 percent of whom have a service-connected disability—should never be subject to 2nd-rate treatment.

Those who wore the uniform and served to protect our freedom should have access to the newest and most effective treatment available. While this conference report still leaves us with work to do in overseeing the VA's schizophrenia treatment guidelines, I am pleased to see that we have made some progress. Rest assured I will continue to work, along with Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TAUSCHER and many others, to ensure veterans with mental health receive the best treatment possible.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, nearly 83 years ago, our Nation signed an armistice agreement that ended the First World War. Though many bright-eyed optimists heralded this as "the war to end all wars," just two decades later the world was plunged into another war more brutal and bloody than the first. In both world wars, as in the Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf, millions of men and women answered their country's call to defend liberty at home and abroad.

And now America finds itself embroiled in yet another war, a new conflict in which we stand together against the enemies of freedom and order. Just as we have so many times before, we send soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines forth in the cause of liberty for which so many have given the last full measure of devotion. For their service and sacrifice our Nation's soldiers and veterans deserve our eternal gratitude. But they deserve more than

gratitude, for our government has promised veterans that it will provide them health care both during and after their service.

Yet we are constantly confronted with our failure to honor these promises. Our failure to meet our obligations to our veterans can be seen in the decision by the Portland Veterans Administration Medical Center (VAMC) to cut hundreds of staff and reduce services to thousands of veterans because of a multi-million dollar budget shortfall. Anyone who has used the VAMC in recent years knows that the center is already understaffed; hundreds of veterans contact me each year complaining about their inability to get in to see a doctor at the Portland VA. These cutbacks will affect the VAMC's new outpatient clinic in Salem, for which the community, veterans groups, and I have labored so hard to secure funds. Though the clinic was designed to save veterans from having to travel to Portland for care, the clinic will now take only a fraction of the patients it was meant to serve.

Mr. Speaker, although many pay lip service to helping veterans, too few put the money where their mouth is. For example, President Bush campaigned extensively on veterans issues, but essentially requested the same amount of funding for the VA (when adjusted for inflation) as appropriated last year under President Clinton. Likewise, in this Conference Agreement, Congress plans to scarcely spend a billion dollars in excess of President Bush's request. I for one am tired of this charade and refuse to stand idly by I know that I am just one member of this body, and that I can't halt the inevitable passage of this spending bill. However, I will not lend my approval to a bill that ensures veterans in Oregon are worse off than they were at this time last year—especially when hundreds of Oregon Guardsmen and Reservists have been called up to fight in and support our first war of the 21st century. As such, I will vote against this spending bill, and I urge every single one of my colleagues to work with me to seek the allocation of more funding.

Moreover, in the coming months, I plan to continue using my position on the House Budget Committee to fight to keep our promise to veterans. When we ask people to put their lives on the line to protect our country, we have a profound obligation to honor our promises to those whose service has kept our Nation free. The men and women who have served our country so honorably know best that freedom is never free, that it is only won and defended with great sacrifices. And we should honor those sacrifices by keeping our promises to our veterans.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the VA/HUD Conference Report.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees have included a significant increase in funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF). Today, NSF is at the forefront of innovation, supporting cutting-edge research to answer fundamental questions within and across scientific disciplines. Often the potential for failure is as great as that for success. But by encouraging such risks, NSF has helped fuel new industries and jobs that have propelled economic prosperity and changed the way we live.

Many of the technologies that come from NSF research may also help us in the fight against terrorism. Nanotechnology, for exam-

ple, promises revolutionary advances. Research will enable the development of sensors for biological and chemical agents that may be used on the battlefield or even, unfortunately, may find their way into domestic civilian systems. NSF-sponsored research in this area has led to the development of a simple, relatively inexpensive sensor that can selectively detect the DNA of biological agents. It is now in commercial development with successful tests against anthrax and tuberculosis.

NSF has also demonstrated the dual use of its research by quickly dispatching its earthquake engineering experts to the World Trade Center who will use the knowledge gained to improve building designs. Robots, developed with NSF support were also sent to New York to help in the search for victims and I understand that FEMA is now considering adopting these robots for all of its search and rescue operations.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, I will be looking for ways to engage NSF more fully in this effort. It seems clear that basic research enables so many unforeseen advances that will help us face this new terrorism threat and that now more than ever we must renew our commitment to supporting this research.

NSF programs also play a big role in increasing the pool of talented scientists in our universities and workforce. This is critical. It is estimated that by 2020, 60 percent of the jobs will require the skills only 22 percent of the workforce has today.

As this Conference Report shows, there is strong bipartisan support for increased investment in basic science. It includes an 8.2 percent increase in the NSF budget to nearly \$4.8 billion for fiscal year 2002. This is the largest budget ever for NSF.

I am particularly pleased that the conferees have specified \$75 million for plant genomics research on commercially important plants, an area in which I have a great interest. Agricultural biotechnology is beginning to fulfill its potential, but we have only just scratched the surface. This funding will help scientists develop new knowledge that will propel this field forward. The enhanced crop plants coming from this research will help feed the world, reduce our use of chemicals, and create new markets for farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the science funding in this bill will help keep the pipeline of new ideas and innovation flowing. I urge my colleagues to support this Conference Report.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to speak during the Floor consideration of the VA—HUD—IA appropriations conference report. However, I have changed my mind because I believe that it is important that we give some consideration to the future of the International Space Station program as we debate the level of funding for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Given all of the uncertainty that has been surrounding the Space Station program of late, I am pleased that the appropriations conference has been able to provide almost all of the requested funding for the Station. I also am heartened that the conference retained funding needed for the eventual restoration of capabilities that were cut from the Space Station program by the Administration earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Science Committee, on which I am privileged to serve as

the Ranking Member, held a hearing on the report of the independent task force that was charged with examining the current state of the International Space Station program. I expect that the task force's report will be an important input into the decisions that Congress and the Administration will have to make concerning the future of the Space Station program. All of us owe Tom Young and his team a debt of gratitude for their dedicated efforts over the last several months.

As many of you know, I have long been a supporter of the Space Station. And I believe that NASA and the International Partners should be proud of what they have accomplished to date. It has been a stunning technical achievement, and the assembly and operation of the Space Station have gone much more smoothly than any of us had the right to expect. Nevertheless, there has been significant cost growth in the program since the 1993 redesign, and there is not now adequate confidence in Congress and the Administration that we know what the total cost of the Station program is likely to be. It is important that we take whatever steps are prudent and sensible to ensure that the Space Station program is well managed and that taxpayer dollars are not wasted. The task force has made a number of recommendations to improve the situation, and we will need to examine them carefully.

At the same time, I hope that we don't let a preoccupation with cost issues cause us to lose sight of the fundamental decision we need to make about the future of the International Space Station program. That decision is quite simple: Are we committed to a Space Station that achieves its unique research potential, and if so, are we willing to budget honestly for it? We have clear guidance from the Space Station task force about what kind of Station won't meet that goal. One of the principal findings included in the task force's report reads as follows: "The U.S. Core Complete configuration (three-person crew) as an end state will not achieve the unique research potential of the International Space Station." The reason is quite simple: with a 3-person crew, there won't be time to do any significant research—all the astronauts' time will be taken up with maintenance and operations activities.

Our International Partners have also made it quite clear that a 3-person Space Station as an end-state instead of the originally agreed-upon 7-person Station and a unilateral U.S. decision to walk away from its long-standing commitment to provide crew rescue and habitation facilities are not consistent with the international agreements governing the Space Station program. We are asking our international friends to stand with us in the global fight against terrorism; while the two situations are not comparable, I think that is only right that we continue to meet our commitments to them in the Space Station program. They are looking to us for leadership in this partnership, and I think that it is important for both Congress and the Administration to send a strong, clear signal that we are not going to walk away from that responsibility.

In its report, the task force concluded that: "Lack of a defined program baseline has created confusion and inefficiencies." However, the approach the task force seems to recommend—that is, keeping the question of the

ultimate Space Station "end-state" open for two or more years—seems to me to be a prescription for keeping the program in just the sort of limbo that the task force properly decries. As I said at yesterday's hearing, I think we need a different approach. If we believe that it is important to build a Space Station with the unique potential that the scientific community and successive Administrations and Congresses have sought, we need to say so now and plan accordingly. We should be explicit that we are committed to completing the Space Station with its long-planned 7-person crew capability. We should not keep the dedicated researchers, the International Partners, and our U.S. Space Station team in continuing uncertainty about the end-goal of this program—doing so will just lead to waste and inefficiency down the road that could otherwise be avoided.

At the same time, we should be unwavering in our determination to make whatever changes are required to the Station's management structure and cost control system to minimize the future cost and risk of this program. The task force is very clearly telling us that "business as usual" will not suffice for a program that is as important as the International Space Station.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Administration needs to make clear its commitment to the ultimate restoration of the full capabilities of the Space Station even as it takes steps to improve the program's cost management processes and operations strategy over the near term. If it does so, I believe that Congress will work constructively with the Administration over the coming weeks and months to put the Space Station program on a sound footing.

For more than a decade, successive Administrations and Congresses have reaffirmed the importance of the Space Station. 15 nations have joined with the United States to build an orbiting research facility that I am confident will deliver unprecedented benefits to all of our citizens as well as position our nation for eventual exploration of the rest of the solar system. We should not falter in meeting our national commitment just as we are beginning to reap the rewards of our past investments in the Space Station program.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of increasing the FHA multifamily loan limits. Tens of thousands of working families in our country pay more than 50 percent of their income toward housing, or live in severely inadequate housing. Yet, the FHA multifamily loan program has not kept pace with construction costs. For example, in the last four years only one project with 192 units was produced in Cincinnati, despite the nearly twenty thousand working families facing critical housing needs there. Without affordable financing, developers cannot produce affordable housing stock.

With the increasing need for housing far outpacing the available supply, the need for available FHA financing is critical. By increasing the loan limits by 25 percent, the first increase since 1992, we can provide a vehicle to alleviate the housing crisis facing our nation. I urge strong support for this provision.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Conference Report directs the EPA Administrator to put into effect without delay the 10 parts per billion standard for arsenic promulgated in the Clin-

ton administration rule published in the Federal Register on January 22, 2001. The Bush administration has, without justification, delayed the effective date of the January 22nd rule and has been in clear violation of Federal law. Congress had set a deadline to have a new final standard for arsenic in effect no later than June 22 of this year. The House of Representatives, in July, sent the administration a clear message when it voted to have an arsenic standard no higher than 10 parts per billion so the United States would be in line with the World Health Organization, the U.S. Public Health Service, and the European Community. The current standard of 50 parts per billion has not been updated in 60 years.

We informed Administrator Whitman last spring that her action on the arsenic standard was a serious mistake and it has proven to be so. Late last week she publicly acknowledged that the Clinton administration standard of 10 parts per billion was the right standard for arsenic and 2006 was the appropriate compliance date.

According to EPA data, there may be as many as 367,000 individuals in approximately 176 communities in Michigan drinking water that contains arsenic at concentrations that exceed 10 parts per billion. The Congress and the Administration must work together to provide the financial assistance necessary for small communities to rapidly come into compliance with the new standard. No person, whether living in a small community or large, should have arsenic in their drinking water, presenting an unreasonable health risk. Especially when the best peer-reviewed science tells us that exposure to arsenic in drinking water causes lung, bladder, and skin cancer.

Mr. Speaker, the 10 parts per billion standard for arsenic is supported by more peer-reviewed science than perhaps any other drinking water standard ever promulgated by EPA. In just the last two years, two National Academy of Science reports were issued. The June 1999 report called on the EPA to move to a more protective standard "as promptly as possible." The second National Academy of Sciences' study, completed two months ago, found that the risks of bladder and lung cancer from arsenic contaminated water were much greater than previously assessed. This finding was based on the best and most recent scientific research and is based on studies of human populations. The independent Science Advisory Board at EPA also found evidence linking arsenic consumption to heart disease, diabetes, and hypertension.

I would say to my friends on the Appropriations Committee that it is a mistake to encourage small communities to seek lengthy compliance time extensions as they continue to drink water with unhealthy levels of arsenic. Nor should they seek a rollback in our environmental protection laws. We would work together to identify or develop additional cost-effective technologies and provide targeted financial assistance where necessary to bring small water systems into compliance with the new protective standard for arsenic.

The existing drinking water State Revolving Loan Fund contains \$850 million for grants and loans to public water systems. This fund is authorized at one billion dollars and the appropriation is \$150 million less than the

authorized level. I am, therefore, surprised and concerned that the Conference Report fails to direct any financial assistance to help small systems come into compliance with the new arsenic standard. I would hope this problem is rectified in the future.

In conclusion, I support the Conference Report and I am pleased that it requires the adoption of the safe arsenic standard without delay.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY,

Washington, DC, October 31, 2001.

Hon. JOHN DINGELL,

Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: As you know, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been conducting a thorough review of the appropriate standard for arsenic in drinking water, based upon the best available science. Throughout this process, I have made it clear that EPA intends to strengthen the standard for arsenic by substantially lowering the maximum acceptable level from 50 parts per billion (ppb), which has been the lawful limit for nearly half a century.

I can now report that the drinking water standard for arsenic will be 10 ppb, and we will maintain the compliance date of 2006. This standard will improve the safety of drinking water for million of Americans, and better protect against the risk of cancer, heart disease, and diabetes.

As required by the Safe Drinking Water Act, a standard of 10 ppb protects public health based on the best available science and ensures that the cost of the standard is achievable. Over the past several months, we have had the benefit of insight provided by national experts who conducted three new independent scientific studies—the National Academy of Sciences, the National Drinking Water Advisory Council, and EPA's Science Advisory Board. In addition, we have received more than 55,000 comments from the public.

Nearly 97 percent of the water systems affected by this rule are small systems that serve fewer than 10,000 people each. I recognize the challenges many small systems will face in complying with this standard, given their higher per capita costs. Therefore I am committed to working closely with states and small water systems to identify ways to reduce arsenic levels at a reasonable cost to ratepayers.

EPA plans to provide \$20 million over the next years for research and development of more cost-effective technologies to help small systems to meet the new standard. EPA will also provide technical assistance and training to operators of small systems, which will reduce their compliance costs. EPA will work with small communities to maximize grants and loans under the existing State Revolving Fund and Rural Utilities Service programs of the Department of Agriculture. Finally, I have directed my staff to identify other ways that we may help smaller water systems reduce arsenic levels at a reasonable cost. Our goal is to provide clean, safe, and affordable drinking water to all Americans.

I look forward to working with Congress; my colleagues in the Administration; state, local and tribal governments; and other interested parties as we move forward with this protective standard. It's not enough just to set the right standard—we want to work with local communities to help them meet it. Working together, we can ensure the continuing viability of small, rural water systems, and meet our common goal of improv-

ing water quality and protecting public health.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE TODD WHITMAN.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support of the conference report for H.R. 2620, providing appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs (VA) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other Independent agencies for fiscal year 2002. This Member would like to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished Ranking Member from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and all the members of the Subcommittee for their work on this important bill.

This Member is especially pleased that funding was included for several important projects in the 1st Congressional District of Nebraska. First, \$490,000 was included in the conference report for Doane College in Crete, Nebraska, which will be used for the continuing effort to rehabilitate the historic Whitcomb Conservatory for joint use by the college and the community as a performing arts center. This Member greatly appreciated the previous inclusion of \$430,000 for this project in the FY2001 appropriations legislation. The additional funding provided for FY2002 should provide much of the resources to complete this project.

The Whitcomb Conservatory is a unique, five-sided structure, built on the "Prairie" or "Frank Lloyd Wright" architectural style, which was completed in 1907 and is a component of the Doane College Historic District National Register listing. The additional funding is needed for major structural repair of its roof, installation of a new mechanical system (including a new heating and cooling plant), new wiring, and a complete cosmetic refurbishing.

The Conservatory has been vacant for more than 30 years. However, the Crete community—as well as the student population of Doane College is growing—and necessitates refurbishing the building. Doane College and the Crete community have a close and long-standing working relationship and have a formal joint-use agreement for the future use of Whitcomb Conservatory. The restoration of the Conservatory will create a community resource and provide a setting for musicals, summer community theater, special concerts and lectures.

Second, this Member is most pleased that \$240,000 was allocated for the Walthill Public School in Walthill, Nebraska, to be used to improve the facilities for science education in this school district. The resources are badly needed by this school system which has a very large Native American student body. The students at Walthill are 97 percent Native American and come from primarily low-income families.

Therefore, this Walthill initiative will serve to supplement a state initiative focused on serving a predominately Native American population. Almost certainly, this school is the least adequate public education facility in the 1st Congressional District of Nebraska. Since the school district's land consists primarily of Indian reservation land, which is not subject to the property tax that is the predominant source of funding for public schools in Nebraska, Walthill Public School receives Federal Impact Aid funds. As a result, Walthill has

virtually no tax base available for bond issues. This proposal is an attempt to reverse the recent re-segregation of the Native American population at the school, which has resulted from the declining level of education and education services at Walthill.

Third, this Member appreciates the \$500,000 in funds provided in the Environmental Protection Agency's portion of this conference report for the University of Nebraska-Lincoln's Water Sciences Laboratory at the Water Center. These funds are needed by the Water Sciences Laboratory to assist in the purchase of the next generation in field and laboratory equipment so that it can maintain its capability to address ground and surface water quality problems.

The Water Sciences Laboratory does both regional field research and analytical research in ground and surface water quality throughout the north-central United States. The Laboratory is responsible for the development of innovative field methods to remediated hazardous water contamination.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support the conference report for H.R. 2620.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the conference report will be followed immediately by a 5-minute vote on the motion to instructed conferees on H.R. 3061.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 18, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 434]

YEAS—401

Abercrombie	Borski	Coyne
Ackerman	Boswell	Cramer
Aderholt	Boucher	Crane
Akin	Boyd	Crenshaw
Allen	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Culberson
Armey	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Baca	Brown (OH)	Cunningham
Bachus	Brown (SC)	Davis (CA)
Baird	Bryant	Davis (FL)
Baker	Burr	Davis (IL)
Baldacci	Buyer	Davis, Jo Ann
Baldwin	Callahan	Davis, Tom
Ballenger	Calvert	Deal
Barcia	Camp	DeFazio
Barr	Cannon	DeGette
Barrett	Cantor	DeLauro
Bartlett	Capito	DeMint
Barton	Capps	Deutsch
Bass	Cardin	Diaz-Balart
Becerra	Carson (IN)	Dicks
Bentsen	Carson (OK)	Dingell
Bereuter	Castle	Doggett
Berkley	Chabot	Dooley
Berman	Chambliss	Doollittle
Biggert	Clay	Doyle
Bilirakis	Clayton	Dreier
Bishop	Clement	Duncan
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Dunn
Blumenauer	Coble	Edwards
Blunt	Collins	Ehlers
Boehlert	Combest	Ehrlich
Boehner	Condit	Emerson
Bonilla	Cooksey	Engel
Bonior	Costello	English
Bono	Cox	Eshoo

Etheridge
 Evans
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Forbes
 Ford
 Fossella
 Frank
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Gekas
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Grucci
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Harman
 Hart
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Herger
 Hill
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeffel
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Horn
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Hyde
 Inslee
 Isakson
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)

Rodriguez
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schroock
 Scott
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watkins (OK)
 Watson (CA)
 Watt (NC)
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Berry
 Capuano
 Filner
 Flake
 Hefley
 Hoekstra
 Burton
 Conyers
 Cubin
 Delahunt
 DeLay
 Ganske
 Kilpatrick
 Largent
 Lofgren
 Maloney (NY)

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1337

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. KERNs and Mr. HOEKSTRA changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. BIGGERT and Messrs. WEINER, WU and THOMPSON of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, because my beeper malfunctioned, I did not arrive here in time to vote on the conference report on H.R. 2620, otherwise known as the VA-HUD bill.

Had I been here I would have voted in favor.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3061, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is agreeing to the motion to instruct conferees on the bill, H.R. 3061, offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 367, nays 48, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 435]

YEAS—367

Abercrombie
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Andrews
 Arney
 Baca
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldwin
 Ballenger
 Barcia
 Barr
 Barrett
 Bass
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Bereuter
 Berkley
 Bertram
 Berry
 Biggart
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Blagojevich
 Blumenauer
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Brown (SC)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carson (IN)

Carson (OK)
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clement
 Clyburn
 Combest
 Condit
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Coyne
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Cunningham
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutsch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Dooley
 Doyle
 Dreier
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 Emerson
 Engel
 English
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Farr
 Fattah
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Forbes
 Ford
 Fossella
 Frank
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Gekas
 Gephardt
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Grucci
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hansen
 Harman
 Hart
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hill
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoeffel
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Horn
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Inslee
 Isakson
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 John
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rivers
 Hyde
 Inslee
 Isakson
 Israel
 Issa
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Kleczka
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Olson
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Platts
 Pomeroy
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Quinn
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rivers
 Schaffer
 Sensenbrenner
 Shays
 Tancredo
 Toomey
 Weldon (FL)
 Ose
 Otter
 Traficant
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 Roybal-Allard
 Leach
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Lucas (OK)
 Luther
 Lynch
 Maloney (CT)
 Manzullo
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller, Dan
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Miller, Jeff
 Mink
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Osborne
 Owens
 Oxley
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rivers
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schroock
 Scott
 Serrano
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tauzin
 Taylor (MS)
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 Thune
 Thurman
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Vitter
 Walden
 Walsh
 Wamp
 Waters
 Watkins (OK)
 Watson (CA)
 Watt (NC)
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Yynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Walden	Watts (OK)	Wilson
Walsh	Waxman	Wolf
Wamp	Weiner	Woolsey
Waters	Weldon (PA)	Wu
Watkins (OK)	Weller	Wynn
Watson (CA)	Wexler	Young (AK)
Watt (NC)	Whitfield	Young (FL)

NAYS—48

Akin	Goodlatte	Putnam
Bartlett	Hall (TX)	Radanovich
Barton	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Blunt	Hefley	Royce
Brady (TX)	Herger	Ryun (KS)
Cantor	Hostettler	Schaffer
Coble	Hunter	Sensenbrenner
Collins	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Cox	Jones (NC)	Shadegg
Crane	Kerns	Smith (MI)
Culberson	Myrick	Stearns
DeMint	Otter	Stump
Doolittle	Paul	Tancredo
Duncan	Pence	Tiahrt
Flake	Pitts	Toomey
Goode	Pombo	Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	DeLay	Lofgren
Baldacci	Evans	Maloney (NY)
Burton	Ganske	Ose
Conyers	Johnson (CT)	Trafficant
Cubin	Kilpatrick	Wicker
Delahunt	Largent	

□ 1347

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to personal business in my district, I am unable to be present for legislative business scheduled for today, Thursday, November 8. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 433, on approving the Journal; rollcall No. 434, H.R. 2620, the VA-HUD appropriations conference report; and rollcall No. 435, on the motion to instruct House conferees on the bill H.R. 3061, the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I was detained at a meeting, my beeper did not go off and I missed two critically important votes.

On the conference report on H.R. 2620, I would have voted "yes"; and on the motion to instruct conferees on 3061 for Labor, HHS, Education Appropriations bill to insist the House level for education, I certainly would have voted "yes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. REGULA, YOUNG of Florida, ISTOOK, DAN MILLER of Florida, WICKER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, SHERWOOD, OBEY, HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute).

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas to inquire about next week's schedule.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet for legislative business on Tuesday, November 13 at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. The House will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow. The House will also consider the Agriculture appropriations conference report, and we hope to complete an agreement to consider the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report as well.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, Members should be aware that there will be no recorded votes before 6:30 p.m. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat. In compliance with a request from the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), on Tuesday no recorded votes are expected before 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and the balance of the week, the House will consider several authorization and appropriations bills now in conference. I will be happy to schedule them as soon as they become available.

Chairman YOUNG also reports that the markup of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act should be completed early next week, and I will schedule that bill for consideration in the House as soon as it is ready for the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also take this opportunity to remind Members that as we approach the Thanksgiving holiday, we are working very hard to complete our business for the year. There are obviously many important pieces of legislation to complete prior to adjournment, so I would advise Members that the House should be prepared to continue its work into next weekend and early in the following week in order to finish our work for the year, if at all possible.

Mr. FROST. I would ask the gentleman from Texas, do you expect fast track trade legislation to be on the floor next week?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I should only say it is possible at this point. That is really as much as I can say.

Mr. FROST. I would further ask the gentleman, we have heard rumors of a terrorism insurance bill also making its way to the floor. Should we expect that next week?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, Chairman OXLEY and his committee have in fact completed their markup of this legislation. It is very important. But it is a legislation with respect to which the Committee on the Judiciary shares some

jurisdiction. At this point, the gentleman from Texas should be advised I am going to be consulting with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to see if it is possible we can work that bill out and have it to the floor next week.

Mr. FROST. I would further ask the gentleman, with the holidays approaching, many people are anxious that we ensure flying is as safe as possible. Do we have any idea when we will get the airline security conference report to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. Again, I thank the gentleman for the inquiry.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's point is extremely well taken. As I entered the building at 8 o'clock this morning, I saw the conferees moving to the other side of the building for the purpose of beginning that work. I have been assured by Chairman YOUNG that they are aware of how important it is, they are trying to proceed with that conference, and we would hope and expect they could complete that work for consideration next week.

Mr. FROST. I would point out to the distinguished majority leader that it will be very difficult for Members of Congress to leave town unless we have acted on that legislation. They will not feel good about going home and seeing their constituents until we have taken action on that bill.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's point, and I am sure the conferees are well aware of that as well.

Mr. FROST. I would ask the gentleman one additional question. I noticed in his initial statement that he discussed the possibility of being in session next weekend and perhaps into the following week. The following week is the week of Thanksgiving. At what point will a decision be made by the majority as to whether we will be in session next weekend or whether we would vote another continuing resolution and come back after Thanksgiving?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. The point is very well taken and a good question.

Sometime as we proceed next week and we get the measure of some of these very important appropriations bills and conferences, as we get the measure of their progress, we should be able then to give the Members definitive answers with respect to working even possibly through the weekend, the weekend next or, of course, that Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week. I think it would be prudent of me to advise most Members that irrespective of what we do relative to the weekend preceding Thanksgiving week, that they should anticipate being here on Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving week and working on those 2 days.

Mr. FROST. I thank the gentleman. We look forward to seeing the schedule as it develops next week.

RANKING OF MEMBERS ON COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 282) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 282

Resolved, That Mr. Lynch of Massachusetts shall rank after Mr. Shows of Mississippi on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 283) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 283

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Armed Services: Mr. Jeff Miller of Florida.
Veterans Affairs: Mr. Jeff Miller of Florida.

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2001, TO TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 2001

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, November 9, 2001, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 13, 2001, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA ON OCCASION OF HIS VISIT TO UNITED STATES

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on International Relations be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 264) expressing the sense of Congress to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on the occasion of his visit to the United States, and to affirm that India is a valued friend and partner and an important ally in the campaign against international terrorism, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York, so that he may explain the reasons for moving this resolution immediately to the floor.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking minority member on the Committee on International Relations, for crafting H. Con. Res. 264, a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on the occasion of his visit to our Nation, and to affirm that India is a valued friend and partner and an important ally in the campaign against international terrorism.

India and the United States share a common destiny. Our people thrive on democracy, the rule of law and the right to freely worship God, and our governments understand that these rights and freedoms are essential for our civilizations to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, this past Monday in New Delhi, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and India's Minister of Defense, George Fernandes, met and agreed to expand and intensify our mutual cooperation in the war against international terrorism. We are delighted that India and the United States are moving closer to becoming allies in every sense of the word.

An alliance between our Nation and India could specifically be used to promote democratic governments in the region and to combat drugs and terrorism. And our Nation appreciates the immeasurable contributions to our society made by the more than 1 million Americans of Indian origin.

This past summer, Russian President Putin and Chinese President Jiang

Zemin gave each other a bear hug and signed a so-called "friendship treaty." We are now embarking on a similar friendship with India and Prime Minister Vajpayee.

□ 1400

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am delighted to speak in support of this resolution which welcomes Prime Minister Vajpayee of India to the United States and expresses the deep appreciation of the American people for the strong and immediate support India has provided us at the time of the events of September 11.

Many of our colleagues do not realize, Mr. Speaker, that India also lost over 200 of its own citizens in the dreadful attack on the World Trade Center. As a matter of fact, while this terrible terrorist act was a first for us, I think it is important for all of us to understand that some of our democratic friends and allies have been subjected to terrorist attacks for many years. Our democratic friend, India, and our democratic friend, the State of Israel, have been subjected to terrorism for over half a century. Following our tragic event on September 11, on October 7 terrorists attacked the Parliament House in Kashmir claiming the lives of scores of innocent Indian citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to realize that today we have the pleasure of welcoming to our Congress the Prime Minister of the largest democracy on the face of this planet. There are 1 billion people in India, Mr. Speaker. Many were doubtful years ago that a society, at that time quite poor, in many ways undeveloped, could maintain a political democracy. There was a lot of skepticism as to whether you could have a viable political democracy with 1 billion people of enormous ethnic variety and with hundreds of millions of those people living in abject poverty.

India has proven the pessimists wrong. India today is the fourth largest economy on the face of this planet, and it is the largest political democracy on this planet. Political elections unfold, governments change peacefully, as they do here in the United States.

A great deal has been made in recent times, since September 11, of our building a global coalition against international terrorism; and we all support the effort of the President, the Secretary of State and others to move along these lines. But I think it is important to realize that some Members of this coalition share our values. India is one of them.

Not all members of the coalition are built on the same set of democratic values that our society is built on and India's society is built on. For many, this coalition is just a marriage of convenience. With respect to India, it is a marriage based on shared and common values of pluralism, respect for minorities, freedom of religion, political privileges of voting, freedom of press,

freedom of movement, and freedom of expression.

India, with its vibrant democracy and secular government, is a rich and diverse society which stands as a beacon of example to many others in that region. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that our friendship with India will continue to grow and deepen, and it is in this spirit that we welcome Prime Minister Vajpayee to the United States and to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT), the chairman of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The 120-some members of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans are very excited to have the Prime Minister here in Washington, D.C. We just had a wonderful lunch where we greeted him, and we look forward to having a positive relationship develop to an even deeper level. The 11th of September was a day that jolted us all, and almost immediately Prime Minister Vajpayee was on the phone to the United States putting out his hand in help, offering bases, something that had never happened before.

This is a major sea change in the relationship between India and the United States. I think all the Members of Congress who understand the importance of a stable Central and South Asia understand the strength that Prime Minister Vajpayee has brought to that area. He reached out to his neighbor, Pakistan, and took a bus trip to Pakistan, the first time an Indian Prime Minister had done that in the whole history of India-Pakistan relations. He is a man who walks the talk of peace, and he has become our friend; and we are very glad to have him here.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation of objection, I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was very pleased today to have another opportunity at the India Caucus luncheon to meet and talk with Prime Minister Vajpayee. I admire him so much for all that he has done in India, both as a minority leader as well as now the Prime Minister. I have met him on many occasions and have always been very impressed by him.

I think this resolution is important; and obviously I would urge its adoption, because it sets forth three things that I think are important:

One is that India, like the United States, has historically been a victim of terrorism. India has been extremely supportive of the United States in the aftermath of September 11, in part be-

cause of their friendship with the United States, but also because they understand the negative impact of terrorism on their own state and own population, particularly as it has often occurred in Kashmir. India has been involved with the U.S. in acting against terrorism for a long time and has worked for several years with the United States in that regard and will continue to.

The second thing I would mention is that India is very important to the United States because of the growing relationship that we share on every level. Certainly when we talk about trade, the growing trade relationship, when we talk about culture, there is so much interest in India culture in the United States and vice-versa.

But more important right now, I think, is the importance of the defense relationship, and we understand that some of the conversations and talks that are taking place between the Prime Minister and President Bush relate to that defense relationship. I have been a long advocate of the need to increase our defense relationship, whether that means supplying military equipment or doing more military exercises with India.

I think many of us know that, historically, India had relied on the former Soviet Union for much of its military equipment. I would like to see that change. I think the U.S. should be the main country that they look to in that regard. So I am hopeful that this week both the trade ties, but, more important, the defense ties, between India and the United States, will see some significant positive action. I am hopeful that that will in fact be the case.

The third thing I wanted to mention, and we all know about the growing importance of the Indian-American community here in the United States, my district, my old district before the redistricting that took place a few weeks ago in New Jersey, had a very large Indian-American population. That has even increased more with the new district that I will be representing, hopefully, after this next year. I think that that Indian-American community has gone far towards building the ties between the United States and India based on democracy, based on capitalism, based on shared culture interests. The Prime Minister took note of that today at our luncheon, and I know that he is very proud of the impact that the Indian-American community has had here in the United States.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished Republican cochair of the India caucus.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, today we had a luncheon where we heard from Prime Minister Vajpayee. It is always good to see the Prime Minister consulting with the Congress and the administration to strengthen the ties between India and the United States. We

all know how the ties between India and the United States have solidified over the years. However, since September 11 that relationship has reached new heights.

India has been with the United States every step of the way. India has long known the horrors of terrorism, and now the United States has joined India in the fight against terrorism. India quickly condemned the attacks and immediately offered assistance to the U.S. India has provided the intelligence support, as well as the use of its military bases and air space.

I had a chance to be there during the international fleet review in Mumbai and see why Colin Powell, our Secretary of State, said that India has the strength to keep the peace in the vast Indian Ocean and its periphery.

Today, President Bush is skillfully leading what will be a difficult struggle, but India has demonstrated that it will be a key ally in this war. For that, we are appreciative.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, today, with this resolution, the House welcomes a friend, the Prime Minister of India, His Excellency Atal Bihari Vajpayee. The Prime Minister is in Washington in the course of visits to several capitals to emphasize India's longstanding commitment to fight terrorism.

This is a matter on which we can all agree. America and India need to step up our security and political cooperation; India's importance to world security is obvious to anyone who possesses a map. Of course, Indians and Americans agree on many other subjects, especially on the benefits of democracy and human rights and on the benefits of trade.

American-Indian relations have been getting better for many years, following the steady, upward path of bilateral trade. The fact that more and more individuals of Indian ancestry are contributing to our society, becoming citizens, and taking part in civic and business endeavors is another factor that contributes mightily to our improving relationship. As this trend continues, Americans get to know Indian culture and Indians are more likely to have friends and relatives in this country and have a realistic picture of life here.

The United States wants to help India and its neighbors live in peace in a stable South Asia. It has become clear that, in the first instance, this will require the extirpation of al Qaida and the defeat of those who harbor it, the Taliban.

India and Pakistan, rivals and sometimes enemies, are on the same side in this endeavor. I pray that they will take the opportunity to achieve some level of confidence in one another in a common struggle. I hope that American leadership will help bring them together wherever we can in fact be of assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important visit. The Indian Prime Minister is a most welcome guest, and one whom we are most pleased to honor with this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 264

Whereas Congress is pleased to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, on his visit to the United States;

Whereas the United States and India, the world's two largest democracies, are natural allies, based on their shared values and common interests in building a stable, peaceful, and prosperous world in the 21st century;

Whereas from the very day that the terrorist attacks in New York and Washington occurred, India has expressed its condolences for the terrible losses, its solidarity with the American people, and its pledge of full cooperation in the campaign against international terrorism;

Whereas India, which has been on the front lines in the fight against international terrorism for many years, directly shares America's grief over the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, with the number of missing Indian nationals and persons of Indian origin estimated at 250;

Whereas the United States and India are engaged as partners in a global coalition to combat the scourge of international terrorism, a partnership that began well before the tragic events of September 11, 2001;

Whereas cooperation between India and the United States extends beyond the current international campaign against terrorism, and has been steadily developing over recent years in such areas as preserving stability and growth in the global economy, protecting the environment, combating infectious diseases, and expanding trade, especially in emerging knowledge-based industries and high technology areas; and

Whereas more than 1,000,000 Americans of Indian heritage have contributed immeasurably to American society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress—

(1) to welcome the Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, to the United States;

(2) to express profound gratitude to the Government of India for its expressions of sympathy for the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and its demonstrated willingness to fully cooperate with the United States in the campaign against terrorism; and

(3) to pledge commitment to the continued expansion of friendship and cooperation between the United States and India.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 264.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2500, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROHRABACHER moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2500, be instructed to insist on the language contained in section 626 of the House-passed bill and section 623 of the Senate amendment, prohibiting the use of funds in the bill by the Department of Justice or the Department of State to file a motion in any court opposing a civil action against any Japanese person or corporation for compensation or reparations in which the plaintiff alleges that, as an American prisoner of war during World War II, he or she was used as slave or forced labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is highly unusual. It is highly unusual because the Parliamentarian's Office has not been able to find another instance in the history of this House in which a motion was offered to instruct conferees to keep something in a conference report that was approved by both the House and the Senate in identical form. In theory, such a motion should be completely unnecessary, because under the rules of both Houses, this House and the Senate, any provision that has been approved by each House in identical form is "non-conferenceable," which means it automatically goes to the conference and goes into the conference report as it passed both Houses. That is called democracy, where the majority of people in both Houses vote for something, and then it stays in the bill as the bill goes through the system.

□ 1415

Unfortunately, the lobbying of Japanese corporations and other very powerful interest groups in this city over this period of time has been unusually heavy. They have been spreading misinformation about the peace treaty with Japan, and it appears that our courageous World War II POWs will feel the brunt of this deception. The fact is that private companies did use American POWs during World War II as slave laborers.

In his recent decision, Judge William F. McDonald rejected all arguments by the State Department that such a court hearing, in terms of a hearing of our own POWs' requests for compensation from these Japanese companies that enslaved them, Judge McDonald decided that this would not violate the treaty which ended World War II, although what we have been hearing over and over and over again in this town is, my gosh, we cannot permit our greatest war heroes, the survivors of the Bataan Death March to sue the Japanese corporations that used them as slave labor in the war, because this would violate the treaty that ended the war.

Well, already we have a judge suggesting, a Federal judge suggesting that that argument does not hold water, and a reading of the treaty itself suggests that that does not hold water.

What do we have, then? We have a situation where this judge, a neutral party, an American judge, has decided that our POWs under the treaty have the right to file a claim in court.

In the past what has happened, and the reason this legislation is necessary, is our greatest American war heroes from World War II, the survivors of the Bataan Death March, not only were they left out on their own and betrayed by our country in a certain way, at least if not betrayed, let down, that we did not come to their rescue; then they served as prisoners of war and as slave labor; and then after the war, we betrayed them again, we let them down again in that they were told that the treaty prevented them from suing the corporations that had used them as slave labor.

Well, as I say, in the treaty there is a provision that says very clearly, any rights not granted to American citizens in this treaty that are granted to other citizens of other countries in other treaties, subsequent treaties, will automatically be the rights of the American people as well, and since that time, of course, Japan has signed many other treaties and other people have had the right to sue these Japanese corporations.

We are not talking about suing the Japanese Government, we are talking about suing Japanese corporations. It is the courts, not the executive branch, that will ultimately determine the meaning of what this treaty is all about. We already have a court decision.

The political question is what we need to decide, and that is what is happening today, and that is what happened in a decision in this body overwhelmingly and a decision in the Senate. Both in this House and the Senate, we decided that our American heroes of the Bataan Death March, their claims are more important than bending over backwards to try to recognize claims of big Japanese corporations that used our people as slave labor during the war. The courts have found that factual issues exist for the application of our people. That means that our POWs have a right to sue, they have an actual, factual claim, and the court has decided that the 1951 peace treaty with Japan does not, does not prevent the plaintiffs from filing action in the court.

Now, I would ask my colleagues to vote for this motion, and I would ask them to pay particular attention, and the American people to pay attention, to what is going on here. What has been voted on on the floor, some people are trying to take out behind closed doors in the conference. It is the first time in history we have a motion to recommit, to insist on language that has been passed in both Houses. I think it

is vitally important for us to pay attention to this, because I can see when these things happen why people lose faith in democracy.

Let me also note that the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has a bill just to provide \$20,000 as compensation from the United States Government to these American heroes. One would think that at the very least, the Cox bill would be implemented if they were going to try to take out the legislation that we passed in both Houses. But no. Again, our POWs are not being treated justly.

I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this motion to direct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly know of the passion with which the gentleman from California speaks. He is very much committed to this issue. I would love to correct him, just momentarily, on the fact that some things, when they leave the House Floor, somehow end up in conference a little different than when they left the House Floor, so this may not be the only time that this has been changed.

But we do understand how serious he and other Members are about this issue. There are some concerns, but as we go into conference later today, we know that his concerns will be seriously taken into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), my chairman.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2500 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, on the Rohrabacher amendment, the whole concept behind it I support and agree with, and I think it is fair to say that most Members agree with it.

Secondly, if we are going to do this, we ought to be suing the Japanese Government as well as the corporations; and we do not sue the government and, therefore, it is flawed.

Thirdly, we have a legal opinion. When this came up, we asked the Congressional Research Service to give us a legal opinion of the Rohrabacher amendment. I would like to insert the entire opinion into the RECORD, but I will read one sentence. It says, "The Rohrabacher amendment is likely to

have more of a symbolic effect and not likely to have a substantive effect on the legal interpretations and posture of the peace treaty with Japan under U.S. law and international law."

It is a symbolic thing.

I think the gentleman is correct in what he said with regard to the Cox language. If we want to do something substantive rather than just a symbolic act, then we ought to pass the Cox language which is in the authorizing language.

Lastly, the conference report will carry language, if it is approved, that says the following: "The conference agreement does not include language proposed in both House and Senate bills regarding the civil actions against Japanese corporations for compensation in which the plaintiff alleges that as an American prisoner of war during World War II, he or she was used as slave or forced labor. The conferees understand that the administration opposes this language and is concerned that the inclusion of such language in the act would be detrimental to the ongoing effort to enlist multilateral support for the campaign against terrorism."

It ends by saying, "The conferees strongly agree that the extraordinary suffering and injury of our former prisoners of war deserve further recognition and acknowledge the need for such additional consideration."

We are at war. You shook your head no, that we are not at war? I said we are at war and you shook your head no.

We are at war. There were 27 families in my congressional district that died as a result of what took place at the Pentagon, and the Bush administration is trying to put together a multilateral, broad-based coalition effort. Right now, the Japanese Government has offered, with regard to military troops, to help them participate. And I would think sincerity ought to be questioned, and then take the language, and when the Cox language went in and the International Relations bill comes up, offer it there and I will vote for it, but not with regard to an appropriations bill.

Lastly, this language says, "It is likely to have more of a symbolic effect and not likely to have a substantive effect on the legal interpretation and posture of the peace treaty with Japan under U.S. law and international law."

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,

Washington, DC, October 2, 2001.

To: Hon. Frank R. Wolf, Attention: Geoff Gleason.

From: Margaret Mikyung Lee, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division.

Subject: Analysis of H. Amndt. 188, the Rohrabacher amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act, 2002, H.R. 2500.

This memorandum is in response to your request for an analysis of H. Amndt. 188, the Rohrabacher Amendment to the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act, 2002, H.R. 2500, which would prohibit the use of funds

by the Departments of State and Justice to oppose a civil suit brought by a former American prisoner of war against a Japanese person or corporation for reparations or compensation for forced labor. This provision became §626 of H.R. 2500 as passed by the House of Representatives and §623 in the version of H.R. 2500 passed by the Senate. In light of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, some opponents of this provision have criticized it as jeopardizing foreign policy objectives of the United States in seeking the support and solidarity of Japan and other nations in its antiterrorism efforts by calling into question the reliability of the United States in abiding by its international obligations. Although Japan may look askance at Congress' revisit of this issue and in direct expression of support for the lawsuits, the Rohrabacher Amendment is likely to have more of a symbolic effect, and not likely to have a substantive effect on the legal interpretation and posture of the Peace Treaty with Japan under U.S. law and international law.

This provision apparently is a reaction to the submission of statements of interest by the Department of Justice on behalf of the United States in *In Re World War II Era Japanese Forced Labor Litigation*. The United States filed two statements of interest in that case. Although the plaintiffs filed suit in California state courts and only alleged claims under a California state statute, some cases were removed to the federal courts and then consolidated before the District Court for the Northern District of California. These cases resulted in three separate decisions dismissing three separate subclasses of the cases concerning the plaintiffs who were U.S. nationals, those who were Korean and Chinese nationals, and those who were Filipino nationals. This memorandum will discuss below the decisions concerning the U.S. nationals and Korean or Chinese nationals respectively. The first statement of interest stated that the cases were controlled by federal law and thus should be heard in federal court. The federal law was the international agreement embodying the peace settlement between Japan and the major Allied Powers, including the United States, which was intended to constitute the final disposition of claims between the Allied Powers and its nationals against Japan and its nationals arising from actions in the course of the prosecution of the war. The United States later filed a second statement of interest setting out in detail its position that it had lawfully espoused and settled the claims of U.S. nationals against Japan and its nationals arising out of the war; that this settlement had been carried out through the compensation system established by the War Claims Act of 1948, which disbursed compensation funded by the liquidation of Japanese assets confiscated by the Allied Powers pursuant to the peace treaty with Japan; and that the California state law claims were preempted by the 1951 Peace Treaty with Japan and the War Claims Act in accordance with the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution, which provides that "[t]his Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding."

When the District Court of the Northern District of California dismissed the cases with regard to the plaintiffs who were U.S. nationals or military veterans of the Allied Powers, it found that the Treaty by its terms constituted a comprehensive and exclusive settlement plan and that Article 14(b) of the

Treaty unambiguously waived any further claims. Even if the language of the Treaty were ambiguous, the court found that the context of the Treaty, the history of the negotiations, and the Senate debate over its ratification supported the view that Article 14(b) waived any further claims by U.S. nationals against Japanese nationals, and that U.S. nationals must look to the Congress for relief of claims not compensated by the Treaty. Furthermore, and most significantly for the Rohrabacher Amendment, the court found that the position of the United States, expressed by the Department of State and the statements of interest in the instant case, carried "significant weight." However, the court also noted that the "government's position also comports entirely with the court's own analysis of the treaty and its history." This indicates that even in the absence of a contemporary brief filed by the United States, the court would have reached the same conclusion.

The court also addressed and dismissed several other arguments proffered by the plaintiffs, including the contentions that the suits represent a private dispute between parties which arose from activities distinguishable from those in pursuit of the war effort, that the waiver of individual claims in the Peace Treaty was unconstitutional and invalid, and that subsequent peace agreements between Japan and other countries revived the plaintiffs' claims under Article 26 of the Peace Treaty. Article 26 of the Peace Treaty provides that "should Japan make a . . . war claims settlement with any State granting that State greater advantages than those provided by the present Treaty, those same advantages shall be extended to the parties to the present Treaty." With regard to that argument, the court held that Article 26 of the Peace Treaty only conferred rights on the states parties to the Treaty, and therefore only the United States, and not the plaintiffs, could seek to raise the issue of more favorable terms. Were the United States to espouse the interpretation of Article 26 sought by the plaintiffs in court, Japan would likely dispute an interpretation which would permit further claims by individual nationals; under Article 22 of the Peace Treaty any dispute concerning the interpretation and execution of the Treaty must be referred to the International Court of Justice.

The District Court for the Northern District of California also dismissed a case involving Korean and Chinese nationals finding, *inter alia*, that the California statute creating the cause of action is an unconstitutional infringement on the Federal Government's exclusive power over foreign affairs. The court had concluded that the Treaty could not be read as waiving claims of Korean and Chinese nationals brought under California statutes and the federal Alien Tort Claims Act since neither China nor Korea were signatories to the Treaty. It then concluded that the California statute creating a cause of action for World War II prisoners of war against Japanese nationals was unconstitutional. It further concluded that forced or slave labor was a violation of the customary international law of human rights and therefore a suit could be brought under the Alien Tort Claims Act, but for the fact that the applicable statute of limitations barred the suit. Finally, the California statute of limitations barred any claims under California statutes concerning false imprisonment, forced labor, assault and battery, etc.

With regard to the impact the Rohrabacher Amendment might have on the Treaty and U.S. relations with Japan, it appears that the only U.S. court to have ruled on the reparations issue and the interpretation of the

Peace Treaty with Japan would have dismissed the claims of U.S. prisoners of war concerning forced labor compensation even if the United States had not filed briefs opposing the claims. There apparently are appeals pending in this litigation which have not yet been decided, and there are apparently other similar lawsuits pending. It is uncertain whether the ultimate disposition in any of these cases might be a ruling in favor of the plaintiffs. However, the Japanese government may not necessarily view the silence of the United States in these other cases negatively since the United States is already on the historic and contemporary record as having the same position as that espoused by Japan, that further claims are waived by the Treaty. On the other hand, a diplomatic note transmitted from Japan to the United States on August 8, 2000, stated that "recent efforts to seek further compensation in United States courts for actions taken by Japanese nationals during World War II would be inconsistent with both the letter and the spirit of the Peace Treaty, and would necessarily be detrimental to bilateral relations between our two countries."

The Restatement (Third) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States notes that an "international agreement is to be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to its terms in their context and in the light of its object and purpose" and that the "President has authority to determine the interpretation of an international agreement to be asserted by the United States in its relations with other states. . . . Courts in the United States have final authority to interpret an international agreement for purposes of applying it as law in the United States, but will give great weight to an interpretation made by the Executive Branch." The Restatement further observes that the courts have given "great weight" to the interpretation of a treaty by the executive branch, giving more deference perhaps to an executive branch interpretation which is contemporaneous with the negotiation of the treaty than to one adopted by the executive branch in a case before the courts, in the interest of ensuring that the United States speaks with one voice in conducting its international relations. In the Japanese Forced Labor Litigation cases discussed above, the court found that the historical and contemporaneous interpretation of the Peace Treaty expressed the same view with regard to the waiver of further claims. The Restatement also notes that although the Senate's contemporaneous interpretation of a treaty to which it gives consent is binding, later interpretations by the Senate have no special authority. In light of the decisions from the only court to rule on the interpretation of the Treaty and the Restatement's description of the principles of foreign relations law for the United States, it seems likely that other courts would arrive at similar conclusions.

If you need further assistance, please contact us.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about what is going on here. The American POWs from World War II, the survivors of the Bataan Death March were used as slave labor during the war, and after the war, they were told that they did not even have a right to sue these Japanese corporations that had used them as slave labor.

Let us note that German corporations have paid reparations, even Japanese corporations in Japan have paid reparations, but our own people, our

greatest heroes, have been denied that right. Whether or not this is symbolic or not, I think that is a matter for the lawyers to determine.

But what we should do as legislators is bend over backwards to watch out for the interests of our great American heroes, the survivors of the Bataan Death March and not try to give the benefit to Japan or the Japanese corporations that use them as slave labor. A court will decide, and already we have an opinion, as I said, in one court that has decided that this is much more than symbolic.

Now, how about the argument that because we are now at war, we should not do right by the heroes of World War II? I do not think so. I do not think that is the way that we send a good message to those people serving this country. I think it is just the opposite.

The fact is, Japan needs to close the books on this incident, that these Japanese corporations do not want to admit that they used our people as slave labor and they tortured people and committed crimes. I am sorry. They did. And it is time, like the Germans did, to just recognize it and close the book.

That does not mean that we are not going to work with the Japanese anymore, and they may be angry. But it is time for us to stand up for our own people. If there is any message we need to send in a war, it is that our soldiers who fight and die for us or are taken prisoner, we are going to watch out for them and they are our number one priority afterwards.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA), who is actually the coauthor of this bill and has been my partner in this gallant effort.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for the time. I would like to associate myself with his words also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for this motion to instruct. Before I address the reasons for my support, I would like to take a moment to thank the gentleman from California for his tireless advocacy on behalf of our men and women in our Armed Forces and our veterans.

We in Congress always talk about our strong support for the men and women who currently serve and have served in our armed services, and I have no doubt in my mind that this support is genuine. The support we show our soldiers, past and present, is especially timely in light of the Veterans Day celebration we would be celebrating this weekend. The efforts of my colleague from California go well beyond most people's efforts in this regard.

On the issue of justice for our prisoners of war during World War II, I am proud to be working with my good friend from California, and I thank him for his leadership on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, the instructions we give today are straightforward and are

worth repeating. None of the funds made available in this act may be used by the Department of Justice or the Department of State to file a motion in this court opposing the civil action against any Japanese person or corporations for compensation or reparations in which the plaintiff alleges that as an American prisoner of war during World War II, he or she was used as slave or forced labor.

□ 1430

On July 18, the House voted by an overwhelming 395 to 33 margin to include language in the bill that comports with these instructions, and on September 10, the other body included identical language in their version of the bill.

Clearly, it is the desire of both Houses of Congress to have this language included in the final conference report. No one can deny that our brave veterans who were prisoners of war in Japan and forced into slave labor deserve to have their day in court. They should not have to fight their own government to get a fair hearing.

Some of those who opposed that amendment are claiming that somehow the peace treaty with Japan will be abrogated should this amendment pass. Well, this is simply not the case. Article 26 of the treaty clearly states, and I quote, "Should Japan make a peace settlement or war claims settlement with any state granting the state greater advantages than those provided by the present treaty, then those same advantages shall be extended to the parties to the present treaty."

Since other countries such as Denmark, Sweden, and Spain subsequently signed peace treaties with Japan that did not attempt to preclude the rights of their citizens to sue, the rights of our own citizens to seek justice are actually preserved by the terms of the treaty.

Indeed, in cases involving Holocaust survivors, the State Department has maintained the U.S. Government does not even have the authority to conclude treaties that bar losses by U.S. citizens against foreign corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a very insightful piece from the New York Times outlining the diplomatic two-step that took place giving the impression that certain rights were waived when, in fact, they were not.

The material referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 2001]

RECOVERING JAPAN'S WARTIME PAST—AND OURS

(By Steven C. Clemons)

WASHINGTON.—Celebrations this Saturday of the 50th anniversary of the San Francisco Treaty of Peace, which established the postwar relationship between Japan and the world, will focus on Japan's emergence as a pacifist market economy under the tutelage of its conqueror and later ally, the United States. Little attention will be paid to questions of historical memory or of liability for Japan's behavior during the war. The 1951 treaty, largely through the efforts of Amer-

ica's principal negotiator, John Foster Dulles, sought to eliminate any possibility of war reparations. This undoubtedly cemented Japan's alliance with the United States and helped its economic rebirth. But Dulles's and Japan's strategy also fostered a deliberate forgetfulness whose consequences haunt us today.

Dulles had been a United States counsellor at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, with special responsibility for reparations. He had opposed, without much success, the heavy penalties imposed by the Allies on Germany. These payments were widely seen as responsible for the later collapse of Germany's economy and, if obliquely, for the rise of Nazism. After World War II, Dulles feared that heavy reparations burdens would similarly cripple Japan, make it vulnerable to Communist domination and prevent it from rebuilding. It was crucial to Dulles that Japan not face claims arising from its wartime conduct. The San Francisco Treaty has been used to this day, by Japan and America, as a shield against any such claims.

Nonetheless, when he had to, Dulles allowed an exception, one that has remained largely hidden. The signatories to the San Francisco Treaty waived "all reparations claims of the Allied Powers, other claims of the Allied Powers and their nationals arising out of any actions taken by Japan and its nationals in the course of the prosecution of the War." But recently declassified documents show that Dulles, in negotiating this clause, also negotiated a way out of it.

Dulles had persuaded most of the Allied powers to accept the treaty. One major nation that refused to sign was Korea, because of its enmity against Japan for colonizing the Korean Peninsula. India, China and the Soviet Union also declined to sign.

For a brief while it appeared that the Netherlands would do likewise. Only days before the treaty was to be signed, the Dutch government threatened to walk out of the convention because it feared that the treaty "expropriated the private claims of its individuals" to pursue war-related compensation from Japanese private interests. Tens of thousands of Dutch civilians in the East Indies had lost their property to Japanese companies, which had followed Japan's armies to the Indies. They wanted compensation, and they had political power in Holland.

European opinion mattered to Dulles, who feared that a Dutch exodus might lead the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand to drop out as well. On the day before and the morning of the signing ceremony, Dulles orchestrated a confidential exchange of letters between the minister of foreign affairs of the Netherlands, Dirk Stikker, and Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida of Japan. Yoshida pledged that "the Government of Japan does not consider that the Government of the Netherlands by signing the Treaty has itself expropriated the private claims of its nationals so that, as a consequence thereof, after the Treaty comes into force these claims would be non-existent."

Article 26 of the Treaty states that, "should Japan make a peace settlement or war claims settlement with any State granting that State greater advantages than those provided by the present Treaty, those same advantages shall be extended to the parties to the present Treaty." This is why the letters had to be confidential: they preserved the rights of some Allied private citizens, in this case Dutch citizens, to pursue reparations.

Such an agreement, if publicized, could have opened the way for other claims—reparations was a huge and emotional issue after the war. These letters were not declassified until April 2000, by which time most potential claimants were probably dead.

In 1956, the Dutch did successfully pursue a claim against Japan on behalf of private citizens. Japan paid \$10 million as a way of "expressing sympathy and regret." Japan had been slow about making its deal with the Netherlands, and the United States had to remind the Japanese that, as a declassified State Department document puts it, the United States had "exerted considerable pressure on the Netherlands representatives with a view to their signing the Peace Treaty," and "one of the arrangements was assurance that the terms of the Yoshida-Stikker letters would be honored."

A year before the British noted two other instances in which governments had made deals with Japan for reparations: a settlement with Burma that provided reparations, services and investments amounting, over 10 years, to \$250 million; and an agreement with Switzerland that provided "compensation for maltreatment, personal injury and loss arising from acts illegal under the rules of war."

The British Foreign Ministry elected not to take any action on behalf of British nationals—and chose not to publicize the information. The United States concurred, with one official commenting, "Further pressure would be likely to cause the maximum of resentment for the minimum of advantage." Nonetheless, the Stikker-Yoshida letters and the Burmese and Swiss agreements could all be used to make Japan, under Article 26 of the San Francisco Treaty, offer similar terms to the treaty's 47 signatories.

The price Japan might have paid, in 1951 or later, as atonement for its crimes would, presumably, have been high. Perhaps Dulles's public policy was best. But it may also be that Japan, and even the United States, are paying a different sort of price for the amnesia and secrecy that both countries chose after the war. An American group of former prisoners of war, for example, has pledged to protest the conferences and commemorative galas. These veterans are pursuing financial relief for having been enslaved in wartime by Japanese corporations, notably Mitsui and Mitsubishi. The P.O.W.'s have already lost one case in California. The judge, Vaughn Walker, decided that because of the success of the San Francisco Peace Treaty and of Japan in becoming a strong ally and partner of the United States, the waiver of individual rights to pursue to private parties in Japan was justified. This has been the argument in the dozens of suits brought in Japan and a smaller number of cases in American courts. And the argument has so far prevailed.

Judge Walker did recognize that Japan's reparations deals with some countries might present the opportunity for the signatory nations of 1951 to bring their own claims, as provided for in Article 26 of the treaty. However, "the question of enforcing Article 26," he wrote, is "for the United States, not the plaintiffs, to decide."

The failure to support war claims is one of the reasons Japan is still struggling with other nations over its history. The Germans—at least, West Germans—have engaged in five decades of public debate about Hitler and the Holocaust. And Germany and other European countries have accepted the need, for their governments or their corporations, to pay reparations for crimes very similar to those committed by Japan and Japanese companies in the same period.

The Japanese, however, have not witnessed the court cases and public debates that would help shape a shared understanding of history among Japanese and their neighbors. Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi's visit last month to the Yasukuni shrine—which honors the souls of Japan's war dead, including the souls of war criminals—and the relentless efforts of some Japanese textbook writers to minimize Japan's wartime aggression against Korea and China have further

aggravated regional tension over Japan's official history. Because Japan is so ill at ease with debate about its past, other nations understandably distrust a more powerful Japan.

What we know only today is that the State Department arranged a deal that arguably allows Americans and others to pursue personal claims against Japan or Japanese firms—but tried to keep the agreement quiet. The State Department even filed briefs in the California court against the former American prisoners of war. Of course, it was the State Department that once advanced the claims of Dutch citizens.

Japan clearly deserves criticism for its inability to debate its past openly. However, the United States, as evidenced by the emerging controversy about the terms of the San Francisco Treaty, has also played a role in Japan's historical amnesia. By withholding documents on American foreign policy, the United States has contributed to a failure of memory that will continue to have consequences for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is critical that we address historical injustices and not sweep them under the rug. Brave men such as Dr. Lester Tenney, Frank Bigelow, George Cobb, just to name a few, are part of this Nation's greatest generation and deserve their day in court without interference from our own government.

I am very sensitive to the fact that today more than ever the relationship between the U.S. and Japan is crucial in the international arena, and the U.S. and Japan have had and currently have strong friendships for these many decades. Nothing we do in this provision will undermine the friendship we now have with Japan. But we cannot have a true and honest relationship with Japan if we ignore the past.

On a cautionary note, I would emphasize that anyone who would use this effort on behalf of our POWs to further an agenda that fosters anti-Asian sentiments and racism or Japan-bashing, or otherwise fails to distinguish between Japan's war criminals and Americans of Japanese ancestry, or Japan's current population, for that matter, should be severely admonished.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this important motion, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for those reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or those listening to this debate, let us understand exactly what is going on here.

Before the Second World War, America sent thousands of troops to the Philippines in order to defend that country and to deter war with Japan. During the war, of course, Japan attacked and occupied the Philippines and took tens of thousands of American troops into custody, and it was one of the most brutal incarcerations and treatment of prisoners in the history of humankind.

In fact, it resulted in what was called the Bataan Death March, where these men, these Americans who had fought and been in our uniform, they were just marched for days and days without water and food, and thousands of them

died along the way in the most brutal type of conditions.

The United States has let those men down. We have told them if they held out in the Bataan Peninsula, that we would come and rescue them. We could not do it during the war because the Japanese had attacked Pearl Harbor and we did not have the military strength to do it, so we let them down.

Then, after they were incarcerated, they were sent to work camps and slave labor camps and concentration camps in Japan and in Manchuria. They were worked like slaves where, again, many of them died under the worst possible conditions.

As the war ended and we put together a peace treaty with Japan, we let them down again. In the treaty, we put some provisions that sounded like we were waiving their rights to sue those Japanese corporations that had tortured them and used them as slave labor. But there was a provision in the treaty that said if Japan signs another treaty with another country that grants more rights to those citizens than our citizens have in the treaty we signed, those rights automatically become American citizens' rights, as well.

So the Japanese, guess what, have signed other treaties, and other people have been permitted to sue those Japanese corporations.

Are we going to let these American heroes down again out of consideration of some huge Japanese corporations who do not want to apologize or to give them some just compensation? I do not think so. This body voted overwhelmingly for that, on the side with our great heroes, overwhelmingly, and the Senate voted for it in a heated debate.

All we are saying today is we are demanding that our conferees not take out this provision behind closed doors. The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has a measure that suggests that our government pay \$20,000 apiece. At the very least, if they are not going to give the right to sue, they should at least come up with the \$50 million needed to pay our people off by ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, our American POWs deserve truth and justice. They deserve their day in court. They do not deserve just a stipend from us. We did let them down, but we were not the ones who tortured them and worked them as slave laborers. They deserve their day in court, they deserve an honest opinion, they deserve an apology from Japan, and yes, they deserve compensation from those Japanese companies that worked them as slave labor.

These are our greatest heroes. This is the message to send to our defenders: We will never let you down again; and those people who march off to defend this country, whether it is against them, the terrorists, or wherever it is, they will know that the American people will not let them down because they have not let us down.

Mr. Speaker, let me just suggest to the gentleman from California (Mr.

HONDA), he has worked so hard on this and I deeply admire him for this, because he could have taken some personal criticism from people who tried to make this into a racial issue.

This is not a racial issue. I lived in Japan as a young man myself, and we think nothing but good thoughts and goodwill toward the people of Japan. Most of the people in Japan, as we know, had nothing to do with this, but those Japanese corporations that did, they deserve to be held accountable.

The patriotism of the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) and his stepping forward and his courage at a time like this are deeply appreciated because it helps define the issue in the way it should be. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should pay close attention to what the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) said. We are not debating, perhaps, the merits of this issue. What we are concerned about is, on an appropriations bill, at this time that our country finds itself in, trying to rally support throughout the world, to bring up issues that may only serve to create difficulties.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA) brought up a subject that was on my mind and that, in all honesty, I did not want to bring up. I can tell the Members that, as a Hispanic American, we are living through a time now where a lot of people in this country are taking the opportunity to be nervous about anyone who does not look or act like a "typical American" because of what we are going through. So if one is from a group in this country that makes some folks nervous, people are paying too much attention to that and making people's lives a little uncomfortable.

I am also concerned, as he was mentioning it, that some folks would take the opportunity of this discussion to begin to point fingers and be nervous about other groups.

That is our concern. Our concern is not about the merits of the gentleman's presentation; that, we agree with and we understand that is a very serious concern.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, we need to take a look at what this is all about. The House and Senate voted overwhelmingly in the House, and yes, with a solid majority in the Senate, to make sure that the survivors of the Bataan Death March, our greatest American heroes, were able to sue those Japanese corporations that worked them as slave labor.

After the war, there was a provision put in the treaty which prevented them from suing these Japanese corporations until the situation changed, which it

did when Japan had agreements with other countries that permitted those countries and the citizens from those countries to sue.

So what we have now is a situation that even after the status of their case and their ability to sue had changed, our State Department became the biggest block to having these heroes from the Bataan Death March exercise their right, because our State Department would intercede in their court cases and undermine their right to sue in court.

What this bill does and why it is necessary to put it on this appropriations bill is, it prevents the State Department from using its resources or its people to interfere with the rights of those American POWs and interfere with their right to take their case to court.

That is why it was important for us to get it on this bill. This was the vehicle. It was written in a way that was ruled in order, so the provision was ruled in order by the Parliamentarian.

This gives us an opportunity to bring justice to these men. They are dying every day. Every day there is another survivor of the Bataan Death March who passes away. All of us have family members who were in World War II, and we are seeing them pass away, at great pain to us. We need to make sure that when they die, they know their country has done right by them.

That is what this is all about. Every day that we postpone this, another number of these men pass into eternity. Let us let them go knowing their country backed them up and appreciated what they did.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BRITISH-AMERICAN INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 United States Code 2761 and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the British-American Interparliamentary Group in addition to Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, chairman, and Mr. GALLEGLY of California, vice-chairman, appointed on May 1, 2001:

Mr. BEREUTER of Nebraska;
Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina;
Mr. HORN of California;
Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin;
Mr. BROWN of South Carolina;
Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina;
Mr. PRICE of North Carolina;
Mr. POMEROY of North Dakota;
Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina; and
Mr. ALLEN of Maine.
There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COLLINS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1445

MEDICAL EDUCATION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the Medical Education for National Defense Act in the 21st Century, H.R. 3254. I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS). These are Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs,

Committee on Armed Services and Committee on Energy and Commerce, with whom we have coordinated on this bill.

This legislation would authorize funds to establish partnership between the Department of Veterans' Affairs, the VA, and the Department of Defense, we call DOD, to develop education and training programs on medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities.

We are fighting a war on terror on two fronts, domestically and overseas. Unfortunately, as a Nation, we are not prepared for the new face of terror that we have been exposed to in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks. What has become all too clear is that our health care providers are not armed with the proper tools to diagnose and treat casualties in the face of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.

The events of September 11 have forced the American people to reexamine many facets as to how we live our lives. We have been forced as a Nation to become more aware of our surroundings and more vigilant in the defense of our freedoms.

Most recently, we have come under attack through our own mail systems by terrorists who have used its efficiency to spread the deadly disease of anthrax. The difficulty experienced by government officials and our health care community, in responding to this attack, use infectious diseases rarely seen by medical personnel that should serve as wake-up call for us all.

A Washington Post article on November 1, 2001 by Susan Okie is a perfect illustration of the urgency of our medical community's lack of preparedness to deal with biological, chemical, and nuclear attacks. Ms. Okie reports the accounts of two of the heroic physicians who treated victims of the anthrax attacks: Dr. Susan Matcha, a Washington, D.C. area physician, and Dr. Carlos Omenaca, of Miami, Florida.

Dr. Matcha was quoted as saying, "We're really in uncharted territory here. As much as we want to have literature to look at, we really have nothing to guide us." According to the article, Dr. Omenaca, who encountered a rare form of inhalation anthrax in the case of Ernesto Blanco, found the description of the symptom that Mr. Blanco displayed in a 1901 textbook.

Just think, a doctor in the United States of America, home of the best medical system of the world, this doctor had to use a medical textbook from the first half of the last century to acquire information that he sought on the diagnosis and prognosis of the anthrax. I find that not only unbelievable but unacceptable.

As disturbed as this makes me, we are not here to try to place blame on this predicament to any group or organization. The reason why so many of our medical personnel feel uncomfortable about their ability to respond to these situations is because very few of

them were taught how to diagnose and give a prognosis for these types of rare diseases in medical school.

In fact, out of all of the medical schools in our country, only one, the Department of Defense Uniform Services University of Health Science, USUHS, has in its core curriculum a program to teach its medical students how to diagnose and treat casualties that have been exposed to chemical, biological, or radiological agents.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I have introduced legislation to create a partnership between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans' Affairs that tasks these two agencies to develop and disseminate a program to both our current medical professionals and current medical students in the Nation's medical schools. We already have a nexus in place between our medical universities, where there is a VA hospital in close proximity. That nexus is already in place and that is what we plan to tap into.

The combination of DOD's expertise in the field of treating casualties resulting from an unconventional attack and the VA's infrastructure of 171 medical centers, 800 clinics, satellite broadcast capabilities, and a preexisting affiliation with 80 medical schools will enable the current and future medical professionals in this country to become knowledgeable and medically competent in the treatment of casualties that we all hope will never materialize.

However, Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to assume that our country will never have to experience a massive biological, chemical, or radiological attack on the American people. We must, as elected Members, sent by our constituents to Washington to represent their interests, act to ensure that if the worst of fears are realized, our medical professionals will be ready and able to deal with these situations.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the rest of the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot impress upon you enough the urgency of making sure this proposal is adopted. Both the American Medical Association and the American Association of Medical Colleges have thrown the full weight of their support behind this plan. These two organizations, made up of the doctors who will be on the front lines of this new war, know how vital it is to receive this educational package that the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences and the VA are currently developing to disseminate to the Nation's medical community.

It is often said that knowledge is power, and in this instance nothing could be truer. The knowledge resulting from the implementation of this act is critical. Our medical professionals need to be exposed to training methods that would enable them to save lives, and I can think of no greater power than that.

Please, join with me and support this important piece of legislation.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I had two countervailing experiences today. One was to travel to the botanical gardens here on the Capitol Mall and meet with the extraordinary personnel of the Environmental Protection Agency that are overseeing the decontamination at the Hart Senate Office Building and in the offices of the three Members of Congress who have been affected by anthrax contamination.

I witnessed then, as I have witnessed in days past, extraordinary professionalism and a deep commitment to creating an environment that is safe for us and for our staff. The EPA has earned a special place in my heart in the last week. But then I traveled just moments later, Mr. Speaker, across the street where I chaired the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight where I serve as chairman on the Committee on Small Business.

It was there that we took a hard look at the inadequacy of regulatory analyses that agencies use to support rule-making. And the special emphasis regrettably, Mr. Speaker, was on one agency in particular that was singled out by witness after witness for its poor regulatory analyses, and that agency was the Environmental Protection Agency.

The hearing that we convened today was all about the way that the EPA goes about evaluating the cost and benefit of regulations on small businesses. Small business owners are very familiar with the burdens that Federal regulations place on them. Many studies including those sponsored by the Office of Advocacy of the United States Small Business Administration have shown that small businesses face disproportionately higher costs to comply with Federal regulations, including those issued by the EPA than their larger business counterparts. Thus, accurate estimates of costs, if derived from the experiences of large businesses often, Mr. Speaker, paint a false picture of the impact of regulations or the impact of an EPA regulation on a small business. And if the EPA misjudges the economic impact, it often produces an irrational rule that wages war on the vitality of small business America.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the polestar of the rule-making process is

that regulations should be rational. When Congress passed the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, it believed that the process of notice, comment, and agency response to the public comment would be sufficient conditions to ensure rational outcome. After the regulatory onslaught in the 1970's which saw the creation of the EPA, and the enactment of many statutes that EPA implements by rule-making, Congress and the executive branch determined that further refinements were necessary.

Congress imposed new analytical requirements to assess the impacts on small business and other entities. Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton produced executive orders all in different ways mandating the analysis of cost and benefits. And even my own predecessor, Congressman David McIntosh, led the charge here on Capitol Hill to create a rational process whereby the regulatory state would analyze the cost of the regulations versus the benefit to the environment or the health and safety of employees.

In 1980 Congress enacted the Regulatory Flexibility Act as well. The RFA represents another tool in the decisional calculus designed to develop rational rules. The Reg Flex Act, as it is affectionately known by many in small business circles, requires Federal agencies to consider whether their proposal for final regulations will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small businesses.

Despite this legacy since 1946 of demanding a rational foundation for government regulations, Mr. Speaker, sadly, today at our hearing we heard of a very very different tale, indeed. What I heard from one witness after another is that not only the EPA but many Federal and administrative agencies pay very little regard to the difference between the size of businesses when they impose paperwork requirements. And their estimates of the cost of compliance are often far afield of the reality of many small businesses like the one that I started in my basement or like the one my late father ran throughout his lifetime in Columbus, Indiana.

There is a great Biblical tale of the pharisee, Mr. Speaker, who heaps burden upon burden on the traveler but never lifts a finger to help them carry that burden. At our hearing today for the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Oversight of the Committee on Small Business, we heard the need for the EPA and other elements of the administration in the regulatory state to cease adding burdens to travelers but now to begin to think about the size and scope of those enterprises, to lift that burden and let us begin an era of unburdening American small business of Federal and regulatory red tape.

HATE CRIMES LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, the savage attacks of September 11 resulted in the deaths of more than 5,000 innocent victims. To add to this horror, the horror of terrorist strikes, acts of violence against Muslims and Arab-Americans increased dramatically throughout the United States since September 11.

The Council of American Islamic relations has received more than 300 reports of harassment and abuse committed against innocent Sikhs, Arabs, Indians, and people of Muslim faith.

Communities across the Nation are horrified by these brutal crimes: a threat to a turban-wearing Sikh in Connecticut, an attack of a woman on a Maryland college campus, rocks thrown through an open bedroom window in Roanoke, Virginia.

Hate crimes are not new to our country, but these are different. The victims of these hate crimes were children. The victim in Connecticut was a second grader. The woman was a teenager attacked by fellow young adults. And the child who barely missed being hit by a rock was only two years old.

Throughout the country, Muslim and other Arab-American children are fearful of attacks on the street, in their homes, and at their schools in reprisal for the terrorist strikes of September 11.

Muslim private schools have canceled classes. Parents are being asked to help patrol school yards, and according to the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, many parents have kept their children home from both public and private schools.

Although hate crimes have been on the decline recently, law enforcement officials and leaders in Arab-American and Muslim communities are preparing for more trouble because children are still being attacked by fellow classmates and schools are still being vandalized.

□ 1500

In the past week, two Malaysian students at Indiana University were assaulted and an Afghan student in New York was attacked by fellow students. Only last month a threatening note found by a Palmdale, California, high school forced five Muslim-American students to stay home for their own safety.

No one in America should live in fear because of his or her ethnic background or religious affiliation. This is especially true for children. That is why it is clearer than ever before just how important it is to pass meaningful hate crimes legislation.

Children and their families are suffering as a result of the ignorance, fear and hate of others. We need to strengthen our existing laws to protect them against all hate crimes. We must send a message, especially to our chil-

dren, that hateful behavior is wrong and will not be tolerated.

Children must be given guidance to resolve conflicts peacefully, to build bridges across issues of difference. As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I worked to pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, reauthorization, which includes funding for education and training programs, curricula and instructional materials to prevent crimes. We need to build on this education step because State governments and local police need vigorous tools to fight and prosecute hate crimes. Sadly, existing Federal law is inadequate.

That is why I am a strong supporter of the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of the year 2001, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). That act will empower existing hate crime legislation by making it easier for Federal law enforcement to investigate and prosecute crimes motivated by race, by color, by religion and national origin, as well as gender, sexual orientation, and disability.

Cosponsored by 199 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act has, unfortunately, been cast aside by the Republican leadership. That is absolutely unacceptable. There could not be a better or more needed time to bring this legislation to the floor and to pass it. It will give Federal authorities the jurisdictional muscle they need to effectively prosecute hate crimes.

Parents and young adults need to be examples to our children. We need to show them how to deal with conflict, how to avoid hate crimes, and how much we disapprove of hate crimes. Teaching our children how to resolve issues of difference and broadening the scope of punishable hate crimes will ensure America's future by protecting our children.

After the attacks of September 11, innocent children must not be added to the long list of victims in our Nation.

HUMANITARIAN AND FOOD ASSISTANCE IN RESPONSE TO TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the events of September 11 have been devastating to the country. The horrific attacks upon the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the subsequent anthrax attacks have shaken all of us deeply.

It is both appropriate and imperative that we respond swiftly and surely to those who have perpetrated these horrific deeds. We must not allow actions of terror against American citizens to be carried out without a response.

However, alongside our military response, we must implement our hu-

manitarian and diplomatic response where it shows our compassion and care for those citizens of developing worlds who have suffered greatly at the hands of autocrats and dictators who would keep them in fear. We must exert the same kind of energy and resources against poverty, hunger, and autocracy that we are appropriately exerting against terrorism. This allows us to eradicate the scourge of terror of the threat to American citizens and our interests nationally and internationally.

Fighting terror is not just a matter of eliminating military threats, as the President has appropriately said, but is also for eliminating the root of the desperation as well as the root of the fears and the misconceptions that are born out of a life without hope and a childhood without thoughts of a better tomorrow.

In short, as we fight this campaign against this awful terror that has been brought against us, we must strive to ensure that our humanitarian response is not seen as an afterthought or as secondary to our military and democratic success, but as an intricate part of our foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues who will soon be considering the conference bill of Foreign Operations to bear in mind the importance of strengthening our foreign assistance humanitarian response to terror alongside our military campaign, and to act to increase our commitment to fighting the scourge of terror, hunger, and poverty through foreign assistance which supports economic and political opportunities and encourages political stability, thereby strengthening American interests internationally.

This Foreign Operations budget contains many tools in the fight against terror. We must focus our assistance upon the most vulnerable populations of the world who bear the burden of terror and of dictatorship all over their countries.

Among other things, the foreign operations budget contains money for combating the infectious disease that has indeed engulfed and has ravaged developing countries across the world, that of AIDS and tuberculosis. It provides money for the United Nation's High Commission on Refugees, again an appropriate appropriation. It also funds our commitment for the World Food Program, which, in recent weeks, has been working against terrible odds, with millions of people starving in Afghanistan who, too, hate the Taliban just as much as we do. They do not have an opportunity for an average life or making decisions. These resources, indeed, would help us help them to have a better life.

I urge my colleagues today to consider the value of these important investments as they consider the resources of the Foreign Operations budget and to ratchet up, not reduce down, the fight against terrorism by increasing our financial commitment

to a worthy cause that indeed allows us to show our humanitarian side as well as our diplomatic side, which are important complementary tools in our fight against terrorism.

A LEADER FOR SPACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, today, the House has taken final action on the appropriations bill that funds the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This is an appropriate time to recognize the extraordinary contributions of NASA Administrator Dr. Dan Goldin, whose energy and vision have been essential to continuing our Nation's leadership in space exploration.

As he prepares to leave NASA and return to the private sector, we should recognize Dan Goldin's superb leadership during his tenure as head of America's space agency.

My association with Dan Goldin began not long after I came to the House of Representatives in 1993. I learned that NASA was considering cutting jobs at the space shuttle manufacturing plant in Downey. We discussed NASA's plans over coffee in the Members Dining Room, and I told him of my concerns about further job losses in Southern California, where the economy already was devastated.

I was impressed from the very beginning by Dan's forthrightness, his commitment to what he viewed as best for the space program, and his willingness to listen to new and different ideas. Unfortunately, the scale-down of the shuttle program and the consolidation of space-related activities was unavoidable.

The manufacturing plant in Downey, sadly, has been closed. Those who worked there have retired or have gone to other jobs in Southern California. These are the workers who developed and built the Apollo moon capsules, the Sky Laboratory, and all of our space shuttles.

Throughout this process, Dan Goldin has been true to his word in working with me and the City of Downey to address hardships created by the closure and to overcome barriers to an orderly transfer of the NASA property to the City of Downey. He recognized the city's need to get on with its economic revitalization. He has consistently directed NASA officials in Washington and Houston to work with Downey to move forward.

In October 1998, a ceremony was held in Downey for the transfer of the first parcels of the NASA property to the city. The transfer process had faced various delays and complications, but the ceremony was a great tribute to the strong working relationship that had been developed between NASA and the city in completing this difficult transition.

NASA's timetable calls for completion of the process in March 2002. A

number of steps are required between now and then, and it is critical for Downey that there be no slips in that time line. It already has been several years since the facility was closed. It is critical that Downey receive the final parcels so that its economic revitalization plan can move forward and the developer can begin working to restore the city's economy.

We continue to work with Dan Goldin, Associate Administrator Sutton, and other senior NASA officials in this important effort. I know they will continue to do all they can to keep the schedule on track.

I wish Dan Goldin all the best as he leaves NASA for new challenges. I know that Downey officials look forward to inviting Dan to visit the city so they can thank him for helping advance a much-needed economic recovery effort.

Mr. Speaker, Dan Goldin is the ablest leader and executive of any major department in Washington during the years I have had in Congress. When President Clinton cut \$5 billion from the NASA budget and the space shuttle program, many key people went elsewhere. They gave up. Dan Goldin refused to despair. Instead, he provided the leadership that was needed to pull the program together and continue NASA's vital missions.

As a result, today we have an excellent space program and a growing partnership with Russia. Dan Goldin deserves our thanks for a job well done and our best wishes in all of his new endeavors. He has served our Nation well.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 981

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 981.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 1999 REPORTS ON ACTIVITIES UNDER NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT OF 1966, HIGHWAY SAFETY ACT OF 1966, AND MOTOR VEHICLE INFORMATION AND COST SAVINGS ACT OF 1972

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the Department of Transportation's Calendar Year 1999 reports on Activities Under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safe-

ty Act of 1966, the Highway Safety Act of 1966, and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 8, 2001.

HONOR THE FALLEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a growing list of over 3,000 individuals who perished on September 11, 2001. This list, provided by the Congressional Research Service, includes the names of many of the victims of the recent horrific attacks on our great Nation. I stand before the House to pay my respects to our fallen brothers and sisters, and I encourage my colleagues to join me today, and for as many days as it takes, in honoring those individuals who lost their lives or are still missing.

We have all heard the numbers, the devastation, the pain of the families and our Nation's anguish. What we have not heard in Washington are these names. These individuals all represented a life, a family, an employer, a country, a way of life. I hope to in some small way honor these individuals by reading their names aloud for all to hear of America's and our world's tremendous pain and loss.

These individuals will not be soon forgotten. By reading their names, we do not bring them back or even ease the pain of families and friends, but again we show that this House and our Nation honor our fallen brothers and sisters.

As the wife of a retired professional firefighter of 30 years, this tragedy hit especially close to home. Hundreds of firefighters and police officers were killed and injured on September 11, 2001, because of their brave attempts to save victims of the brutal attacks, and left families, friends, and countrymen grieving the loss of these courageous souls. These dedicated professionals are in my thoughts and prayers.

I, like many of my colleagues, lost constituents in this awful attack. I ask for God's blessing on Virginia's First District residents Teresa Martin, Marian Serva, Martha Reszke, Allen Boyle and Brenda Gibson. Please forgive me in advance for any mispronunciations of names.

Additionally, I ask for God's blessings on the following:

□ 1515

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Gordon McCannel Aamoth, Maria Rose Abad, Edelmiro Abad, Andrew Anthony Abate, Vincent Abate, Laurence Abel, William Abrahamson, Richard Anthony Aceto, Heinrich B. Ackermann, Paul Andrew Acquaviva, Christian Adams, Stephen George Adams, Donald Leroy Adams, Shannon Lewis Adams, Patrick

Adams, Ignatius Adanga, Christy A. Addamo, Terence E. Adderley, Jr., Sophia Buruwa Addo, Lee Adler, Daniel T. Afflitto, Emmanuel Afuakwah, Alok Agarwal, Mukul Agarwala, Joseph Agnello, David S. Agnes, Joao A.D. Aguiar, Jr., Brian G. Ahearn, Joanne Ahladiotis, Shabbir Ahmed, Terrance Aiken, Godwin Ajala, Nana Akwasi-Mienkah, Boutros al-Hashim, Gertrude "Trudi" M. Alagero, Andrew Alamenno, Manuel A. Alarcon, Margaret "Peggy" Jezycki Alario, Gary Albergo, Jon L. Albert, Peter Craig Alderman, Jacquelyn D. Aldridge, Grace Alegre-Cua, David Dewey Alger, Ernest Alikakos, Edward L. Allegretto, Eric Allen, Samantha Lightbourn Allen, Richard L. Allen, Joseph Ryan Allen, Richard Allen, Christopher E. Allingham, Anna Williams Allison, Janet Alonso, Anthony Alvarado, Antonio Javier Alvarez, Telmo Alvear, Cesar A. Alviar, Tariq Amanullah, Angelo Amaranto, James M. Amato, and Joseph Amatuuccio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Paul Ambrose, Christopher C. Amoroso, Craig Amundson, Kazuhiro Anai, Calixto "Charlie" Anaya, Jr., Jorge Octavio Santos Anaya, Joe Anchundia, Peter Anchundia, Jeff John Andersen, Kermit Charles Anderson, Yvette C. Anderson, John Andreacchio, Michael Rourke Andrews, Jean A. Andrucki, Siew Nya Ang, Joseph Angelini, Jr., Joseph Angelini, Sr., David Lawrence Angell, Lynn Angell, Laura Angilletta, Doreen J. Angrisani, Lorraine Del Carmen Antigua, Seima Aoyama, Peter Paul Apollo, Faustino Apostol, Jr., Frank Thomas "F.T." Aquilino, Patrick Michael Aranyos, David Arce, Michael G. Arczynski, Louis Arena, Barbara Arestegui, Adam P. Arias, Michael Joseph Armstrong, Jack Charles Aron, Joshua Todd Aron, Richard A. Aronow, Myra Aronson, Japhet Aryee, John Asam, Carl Asaro, Michael Asciak, Michael Edward Asher, Janice M. Ashley, Thomas J. Ashton, Manuel O. Asitimbay, Gregg Atlas, Debbie S. Attilas-Bellows, Gerald Atwood, James Audiffred, Frank Louis Aversano, Jr., Ezra Aviles, Alona Avraham, Samuel Ayala, Sandy Ayala, Arlene T. Babakitis, Eustace "Rudy" Bacchus, John Badagliacca, Jane Ellen Baeszler, Robert John Baierwalter, Garnet "Ace" Bailey, Brett T. Bailey, Andrew J. Bailey, Thomas Baiter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to my colleague from Virginia.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Tatyana Bakalinskaya, Anthony Daniel Baker, Michael S. Baksh, Julio Minto Balanca, Sharon Balkcom, Michael Andrew Bane, Kathy Bantis, Gerard Baptiste, Guy Bar-Zvi, Walter Baran, Gerard A. Barbara, Paul V. Babaro, James W. Barbella, Ivan Kirylos Fairbanks Barbosa, Victor Daniel Barbosa, Christine Barbuto, Geraldo Barcene, Colleen Ann (Meehan) Barkow, David Michael Barkway, Sheila P. Barnes, Melissa Rose Barnes,

Matthew Barnes, Evan J. Baron, Renee Barrett-Arjune, Arthur T. Barry, Maurice "Moe" Vincent Barry, Diane Barry, Scott D. Bart, Carlton W. Bartels, Inna Basina, Alysia Basmajian, Kenneth W. Basnicki, Steven Bates, Paul James Battaglia, W. David Bauer, Marlyn Bautista, Ivhan Luis Carpio Bautista, Mark Bavis, Jasper Baxter, Lorraine G. Bay, Michelle Beale, Todd Beamer, Paul F. Beatini, Jane S. Beatty, Alan Beaven, Larry Beck, Manette Marie Beckles, Carl Bedigian, Michael E. Beekman, Marla Asuncion Behr, Max Beilke, Helen Bellilovsky, Nina Patrice Bell, Stephen Belson, Paul Benedetti, Denise Lenore Benedetto, Eric Bennett, Bryan Craig Bennett, Judith Bennett, Oliver Bennett, Margaret L. Benson, Dominick J. Berardi, James Patrick Berger.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Steven Howard Berger, John Bergin, Alvin Bergsohn, Daniel D. Bergstein, Michael Berkeley, Graham Andrew Berkeley, Donna Bernaerts-Kearns, William "Bill" Bernstein, David M. Berray, Joseph J. Berry, David S. Berry, William Reed Bethke, Cynthia Betia, Yeneneh Betru, Timothy D. Betterly, Carolyn Beug, Bob Beurlein, Jr., Edward F. Beyea, Paul Beyer, Anil T. Bharvaney, Bella Bhukan, Jim Biberson, Shimmy D. Biegeleisen, Peter Bielfeld, William Biggart, Ralph Bijoux, Brian Bilcher, Mark Bingham, Carl Bini, Gary Bird, Joshua David Birnbaum, Geroge John Bishop, Kris Romeo Bishundat, Jeffrey D. Bitner, Balewa Albert Blackman, Christopher Blackwell, Carrie Blagburn, Susan Blair, Harry Blanding, Jr., Craig Michael Blass, Rita Blau, Richard M. Blood, Michael Andrew Boccardi, John Paul Bocchi, Michael L. Bocchino, Susan M. Bochino, Deora Bodley, Bruce Douglas Boehm, Mary Catherine Boffa, Nicholas A. Bogdan, Darren C. Bohan, Lawrence F. Boisseau, Vincent Boland, Jr., Touri Bolourchi, Howard J. Bolton, Jr., Alan Bondarenko, Andre Bonheur, Renato Bonifacio, Colin Arthur Bonnett, Yvonne L. Bonomo, Frank Bonomo, Sean Booker, Kelly Ann Booms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Canfield D. Boone, Mary Jane "M.J." Booth, Juan Jose Borda Leyva, Sherry Bordeaux, Krystine C. Bordenabe, Martin Boryczewski, Richard E. Bosco, Klaus Bothe, Carol Bouchard, J. Howard Boulton, Jr., Francisco Bourdier, Thomas H. Bowden, Jr., Donna Bowen, Kimberly S. Bowers, Veronique Nicole Bowers, Shawn Edward Bowman, Jr., Larry Bowman, Kevin L. Bowser, Gary Box, Gennady Boyarsky, Michael Boyce, Pamela Boyce, Michael Boyle, Allen Boyle, Alfred J. Braca, Sandra Conaty Brace, Kevin Bracken, Sandra W. Bradshaw, David Brian Brady, Alexander Braginsky, Nicholas Brandemarti, David Brandhorst, Daniel Brandhorst, Michelle Renee Bratton, Patrice Braut, Lydia E. Bravo, Ronald

Breitweiser, Peter Brennan, Thomas M. Brennan, Michael Emmett Brennan, Edward A. "Ted" Brennan, III, Frank Brennan.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Daniel J. Brethel, Gary L. Bright, Jonathan Briley, Mark A. Brisman, Paul Bristow, Victoria Alvarez Brito, Marion Britton, Mark Francis Broderick, Herman Broghammer, Keith Broomfield, Bernard Curtis Brown, Janice J. Brown, Patrick Brown, Lloyd Brown, Bettina Browne-Radburn, Mark Bruce, Richard Bruehert, Andrew Brunn, Vincent Brunton, Ronald Paul Bucca, Brandon Buchanan, Greg Joseph Buck, Dennis Buckley, Nancy Bueche, Patrick Joseph Buhse, John E. Bulaga, Jr., Steve Bunin, Christopher Lee Burford, Matthew J. Burke, William F. Burke, Jr., Thomas Daniel Burke, Charles "Chick" Burlingame, III, Thomas E. Burnett, Jr., Donald James Burns, Keith James Burns, Kathleen A. Burns, John Patrick Burnside, Irina Buslo, Milton Bustillo, Rachel Butler, Thomas Butler, Timothy G. Byrne, Daniel Martin Caballero, Jesus N. Cabezas, Lillian Caceres, Brian Cachia, Steven Cafiero, Jr., Richard Caggiano, Cecile Caguicla, John Brett Cahill, Thomas J. Cahill, Scott Walter Cahill, Michael John Cahill, George Cain, Salvatore Calabro, Joseph Calandrillo, Philip V. Calcagno, Jose Orlando Calderon, Edward Calderon, Kenny Caldwell, Dominick Calia, Bobby Calixte, Felix Calixte, Liam Callahan, Frank Callahan, Suzanne Calley, Gino Calvi, Luigi Calvi, Roko Camaj, Michael Cammarata, Geoffrey Thomas Campbell, David Otey Campbell, Robert Campbell, Sandra Campbell, Jill Marie Campbell, Juan Ortega Campos, Sean T. Canavan, John A. Candela, Vincent Cangelosi, Stephen J. Cangialosi, Lisa Cannava, Brian Cannizzaro, Christopher Sean Canton.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

□ 1530

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Michael R. Canty, Louis A. Caporicci, Jonathan Neff Cappello, James Christopher Cappers, Richard Caproni, David Cardinale, Jose Cardona, Dennis Carey, Edward Carlino, Michael Carlo, David G. Carlone, Rosemarie C. Carlson, Mark Stephen Carney, Joyce Carpeneto, Ivhan Carpio, Alicia Acevedo Carranza, Jeremy M. Carrington, Peter J. Carroll, Michael Carroll, James J. Carson, Jr.; Christoffer Carstanjen, Angelene C. Carter, James Cartier, Joel Cartridge, Sharon Carver, Vivian Casalduc, John F. Casazza, Paul Reegan Cascio, Nellie Anne Heffernan Casey, William Cashman, Margarito Casillas, Thomas Anthony Casoria, William Otto Caspar, Alejandro Castano, Arcelia "Chela" Castillo, Leonard Castrianno, Jose Raymond Castro, William E. Caswell, Richard G. Catarelli, Sean Caton, Robert J. Caufield, Mary Teresa Caulfield, Judson Cavalier, Michael Joseph

Cawley, Jason D. Cayne, Juan Armando Ceballos, Marcia G. Cicil-Carter, Jason Cefalu, Thomas J. Celic, Ana M. Centeno, John J. Chada, Jeffrey M. Chairnoff, Swarna Chalasani, William Chalcoff, Eli Chalouh, Valerie Chambers, Charles "Chip" Chan, Linda Chang, Mandy Chang, Rosa Maria "Rosemary" Chapa, Mark L. Charette, David M. Charlebois, Gregorio Manuel Chavez.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Pedro Francisco Checo, Yuan Chenglian, Stephen Patrick Cherry, Douglas MacMillan Cherry, Vernon Paul Cherry, Swede Joseph Chevalier, Nestor Chevalier, Alexander H. Chiang, Dorothy J. Chiarchiaro, Luis Alfonso Chimbo, Robert Chin, Wing Wai "Eddie" Ching, Nicholas Chiofalo, John Chipura, Peter A. Chirchirillo, Catherine E. Chirls, Kyung "Kacey" Cho, Yeon Ho Choi, Mohammad Salahuddin Chowdhury, Abdul K. Chowdhury, Kirsten L. Christophe, Pamela Chu, Steven P. Chucknick, Wai Chung, Christopher Ciafardini, Alex Ciccone, Frances Ann Cilente, Elaine Cillo, Edna Cintron, Nestor Andre Cintron, Robert Cirri, Juan Pablo Cisneros, Sarah Clark, Buddah Clark, Thomas R. Clark, Gregory A. Clark, Eugene Clark, Benjamin Keefe Clark, Mannie Leroy Clark, Christopher Robert Clarke, Donna Clarke, Michael Clarke, Suria R.E. Clarke, Kevin F. Cleary, Jim Cleere, Nestor Clinton, Geoffrey W. Cloud, Susan M. Clyne, Steven Coakley, Jeffrey Coale, Patricia A. Cody, Daniel Michael Coffey, Jason Matthew Coffey, Kevin Sanford Cohen, Florence Cohen, Anthony Coladonato, Stephen J. Colaio, Mark J. Colaio, Christopher Colasanti, Kevin N. Colbert, Michel Paris Colbert, Tarel Coleman, Keith E. Coleman.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Scott Thomas Coleman, Liam Colhoun, Robert D. Colin, Jean M. Colin, Robert Joseph Coll, Thomas J. Collins, John Collins, Michael Collins, Jeffrey Collman, Patricia M. Colodner, Linda M. Colon, Sol E. Colon, Ronald Comer, Jaime Concepcion, Albert Conde, Robert Condon, Denease Conley, Susan Clancy Conlon, Margaret Mary Conner, John E. Connolly, Jr., Cynthia L. Connolly, James Lee Connor, Jonathan "J.C." Connors, Kevin P. Connors, Kevin F. Conroy, Brenda E. Conway, Dennis Michael Cook, Helen Garcia Cook, Kevin Cook, Jeffrey Coombs, Julian Cooper, Zandra Cooper, John Cooper, James L. Cooper, Joseph J. Coppo, Jr.; Gerard J. Coppola, Joseph A. Corbett, John "Jay" Corcoran, Robert Cordice, David Vargas Cordoba, Ruben D. Correa, Daniel A. Correa-Gutierrez, Georgine Rose Corrigan, James Corrigan, Carlos Cortes, Adianes Cortes-Oyolla, Kevin M. Cosgrove, Dolores Marie Costa, Digna A. Costanza, Charles G. Costello, Michael Costello, Asia Cottom, Conrad K.H. Cottoy, Sr.; Martin Coughlan, Timothy John Coughlin, John Coughlin, James Cove, Frederick John Cox, Andre Cox, James Raymond Coyle, Michelle Coyle-Eulau,

Christopher S. Cramer, Anne Martino Cramer.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Eric Allen Cranford, Denise Crant, Robert Crawford, James Leslie Crawford, Jr.; Tara Kathleen Creamer, Joanne Cregan, Lucia Crifasi, John Crisci, Daniel Crisman, Dennis A. Cross, Helen Crossin-Kittle, Thomas G. Crotty, Kevin Raymond Crotty, John R. Crowe, Welles Remy Crowther, Robert Cruikshank, Francisco Cruz, John Robert Cruz, Grace Cua, Kenneth John Cubas, Francisco C. Cubero, Thelma Cuccinello, Richard Joseph Cudina, Neil Cudmore, Thomas P. Cullen, III; Joyce Cummings, Brian Thomas Cummins, Nilton Albuquerque Fernao Cunha, Michael "Mickey" J. Cunningham, Robert Curatolo, Lawrence Curia, Paul Dario Curiali, Patrick Currihan, Beverly Curry, Michael Curtin, Patricia Cushing, Gavin Cushny, Vincent D'Amadeo, Jack L. D'Ambrosi, Mary Yolanda D'Antonio, Edward D'Atri, Michael D'Auria, Manuel J. Da Mota, Caleb Arron Dack, Carlos S. DaCosta, Jason Dahl, Brian Paul Dale, John Dallara, Thomas A. Damaskinos, Jeannine Damiani-Jones, Patrick Danahy, Vincent G. Danz, Dwight Donald Darcy, Elizabeth Ann Darling, Mellisa Darmis, Annette Andrea Dataram, Scott Matthew Davidson, Lawrence Davidson, Michael Allen Davidson, Julane Davidson, Niurka Davila, Rose Feliciano Davila, Ada Davis.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Clinton Davis, Wayne T. Davis, Calvin Dawson, Richard Dawson, Edward James Day, Gloria De Barrera, Jayceryll M. De Chavez, Emerita De la Pena, Azucena de la Torre, Cristina de Laura, Oscar de Laura, Frank A. De Martini, Melanie de Vere, William T. Dean, Robert J. DeAngelis, Jr.; Thomas P. DeAngelis, Dorothy Dearaujo, Tara Debek, James Debeuneure, Anna DeBin, James Vincent Deblase, Paul DeCola, Gerald Francis Deconto, Simon Dedvukaj, Jason DeFazio, David DeFeo, Nereida DeJesus, Monique E. DeJesus, Jennifer DeJesus, Manuel Del Valle, Jr.; Donald A. Delapenha, Vito J. DeLeo, Danielle Delie, Joseph Della Pietra, Andrea Dellabela, Palmina Deli Gatti, Colleen Ann Deloughery, Joseph DeLuca, Anthony Demas, Martin N. DeMeo, Francis X. Deming, Carol K. Demitz, Thomas F. Dennis, Kevin Dennis, Jean C. DePalma, Jose Nicholas Depena, Robert Deraney, Michael DeRienzo, David Derubbio, Christian D. DeSimone, Edward DeSimone, Andrew J. Desperito, Michael J. Desposito, Cindy Deuel, Jerry DeVito, Robert P. Devitt, Jr.; Dennis Devlin, Gerard Dewan, Simon Dhanani, Michael Diagostino, Nancy Diaz, Lourdes Galleti Diaz, Matthew Diaz.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Judith Berquis Diaz-Sierra, Patricia F. Dichiaro, Rodney Dickens, Jerry D. Dickerson, Joseph Dermott Dickey, Jr.; Lawrence Patrick Dickinson, Michael David Diehl, Michael Diez-Piedra, III; John DiFato, Vincent Francis DiFazio, Carl DiFranco, Donald J. DiFranco, Eddie

Dillard, Debra Ann DiMartino, David DiMeglio, Stephen Patrick Dimino, William J. Dimmling, Marisa DiNardo Schorpp, Christopher M. Dincuff, Jeffrey M. Dingle, Anthony DiOnisio, George DiPasquale, Joseph DiPilato, Douglas F. DiStefano, Donald Ditullio, Mark Dixon, Ramzi Doany, Johnnie Doctor, Jr.; John J. Doherty, Melissa Doi, Robert Edward Dolan, Brendan Dolan, Neil M. Dollard, James Domanico, Benilda P. Domingo, Alberto Dominguez, Geronimo "Jerome" Dominguez, Charles Dominguez, Kevin W. Donnelly, William Howard Donovan, Jacqueline Donovan, Stephen S. Dorf, Marcello S. Dos-Santos, Thomas Dowd, Kevin Dowdell, Mary Yolanda Dowling, Ray M. Downey, Frank Joseph Doyle, Joseph Doyle, Randy Drake, Stephen Patrick Driscoll, Patrick Joseph Driscoll, Janet Driscoll, Charles Droz, Mirna A. Duarte, Michelle Duberry, Rita DuBrow, Luke A. Dudek, Christopher Michael Duffy, Michael Joseph Duffy, Gerard Duffy, Thomas W. Duffy, Antoinette Dugar.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Sareve Dukat, Allen D. Duncan, Christen Duncan, Donrad Duncan, Patrick S. Dunn, Richard Dunstan, Patrick Dwyer, Joseph Anthony Eacobacci, Bruce Eagleson, Catherine Eagon, Edward Thomas Earhart, Robert Eaton, Dean P. Eberling, Margaret Echtermann, Paul Robert Eckna, Gus Economos, Barbara G. Edwards, Dennis M. Edwards, Michael Hardy Edwards, Martin J. Egan, Jr.; Lisa Egan, Samantha Egan, Michael Egan, Christine Egan, Carole Eggert, Lisa Caren Weinstein Ehrlich, John Ernst "Jack" Eichler, Brian Eill, Eric Adam Eisenberg, Daphne Elder, Michael Elferis, Mark Ellis, Valerie Silver Ellis, Albert Alfy William Elmarry, Robert Randolph Elseth, Edgar H. Emery, Henry Eneman, Doris Suk-Yuen Eng, Christopher S. Epps, Ulf R. Ericson, Erwin L. Erker, William John Erwin, Sarah Ali Escarcega, Melaku Eskedar, Fanny M. Espinoza, Francis Esposito, Michael Esposito, William Esposito, Brigitte Esposito, Ruben Esquilin, Jr., Sadie Ette, Barbara G. Etzold, Robert Evans, Eric Brian Evans, Meredith Ewart, Jason Ezker, John Fabian, Patricia M. Fagan, Catherine K. Fagan, Michael Fahey, Keith Fairben, Charles S. Falkenberg, Dana Falkenberg.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Zoe Falkenberg, Jamie Lynn Fallon, William F. Fallon, Jr.; William L. Fallon, Jr.; Anthony J. Fallone, Jr.; Dolores Fanelli, Robert J. Fangman, John Joseph "Jack" Fanning, Kit Faragher, Shea Faria, Thomas J. Farino, Nancy Carol Farley, Paige Farley-Hackel, Betty Farmer, Douglas Farnum, Thomas P. Farreley, Terrence Patrick Farrell, John William Farrell, John Gerard Farrell, Joseph Farrelly, Syed Abdul Fatha, Christopher Faughnan, Wendy Faulkner, Shannon Fava, Bernard D. Favuzza, Robert Fazio, Ronald Carl Fazio, Nikia Feaster, Janet Feathers, William M. Feehan, Francis "Frank"

Feely, Garth E. Feeney, Sean Fegan, Lee Fehling, Peter Feidelberg, Alan D. Feinberg, Arnold Feinberg, Edwardo Feliciano, Rosa M. Feliciano, Edward Porter Felt, Diane Fenelli, Chris Fenyo, Edward T. Fergus, Jr.; James Joe Ferguson, George J. Ferguson, Henry Fernandez, Judy H. Fernandez, Jose Manuel Contreras Fernandez, Julio Fernandez Ramirez, Joy Fernandez, Elisa Ferraina, Robert Ferris, Vincent W. Ferrone, David Francis Ferrugio, Louis Fersini, Mike Ferugio, Bradley Fetchet, Jennifer Louise Fialko, Kristen Fiedel, Amelia Virginia Fields, Samuel Fields, Alex Filipov, Michael Bradley Finnegan.

□ 1545

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Timothy J. Finnerty, Michael Firoe, Steven J. Fiorelli, Paul Fiori, John Fiorito, John Fischer, Gerald P. Fisher, Thomas Joseph Fisher, John Roger Fisher, Bennett Lawson Fisher, James Fisher, Andrew Fisher, Lucy Fishman, Michael Joseph Fitzgerald, Ryan Daniel Fitzgerald, Tom Fitzpatrick, Richard Fitzsimons, Sal A. Fiumefreddo, Wilson "Bud" Flagg, Darlene D. Flagg, Christina Flannery (Donovan), Eileen Flecha, Andre Fletcher, Carl M. Flickinger, Matthew Michael Flocco, John Joseph Florio, Joseph W. Flounders, Carol Flyzik, Michael N. Fodor, David Lawrence William Fodor, Steven Mark Fogel, Thomas Foley, Jane C. Folger, David Fontana, Dennis Foo, Bobby Forbes, Delrose Forbes-Cheatam, James Henry Lee Ford, Godwin Forde, Gregg Foreman, Donald A. Foreman, Christopher Hugh Forsythe, Sandra N. Foster, Claudia Alicia Foster, Noel J. Foster, Ana Fosteris, Robert J. Foti, Yolet Fouchet, Jeffrey L. Fox, Virginia Fox, Lucille Virgen Francis, Pauline Francis, Joan Francis, Jean-Pierre Francois, Peter Christopher Frank, Gary J. Frank, Morton Frank, Colleen Fraser, Richard K. Fraser, Kevin Joseph Frawley, Clyde Frazier, Jr., Lillian I. Frederick, Andrew Fredericks.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Tamitha Freeman, Jamitha Freeman, Brett O. Freiman, Peter L. Freund, Arlene Fried, Alan Wayne Friedlander, Paul J. Friedman, Andrew K. Friedman, regg J. Froehner, Lisa Frost, Peter C. Fry, Christopher Fugarino, Clement Fumando, Steven Elliot Furman, Paul James Furmato, Karleton D.B. Fyfe, Fredric Gabler, Richard P. Gabriel, Richard S. Gabrielle, James Andrew Gadiel, Pamela Gaff, Ervin Gailliard Grace Galante, Deanna Galante, German Castillo Galicia, Daniel James Gallagher, Anthony Edward Gallagher, John Gallagher, Bernardo Gallardo, Lourdes Galletti, Cono E. Gallo, Vincenzo Gallucci, Thomas Edward Galvin, Giovanna "Genni" Gambale, Thomas Gambino, Jr., Ronald Gamboa, Glenn F. Gamboa, Peter Ganci, Claude Michael Gann, Charles Garbarini, Juan Garcia, David Garcia, Andrew Garcia, Mardeny Garcia, Cesar Garcia, Jorge

Luis Morron Garcia, Marlyn Carmen Garcia, Jeffrey B. Gardner, Douglas B. Gardner, Thomas A. Gardner, Harvey Jose Gardner, Christopher Gardner, William Arthur "Bill" Gardner, Francesco Garfi, Rocco Gargano, James Michael Gartenberg, Matthew David Garvey, Bruce H. Gary, Boyd A. Gatton, Donald Gavagan, Peter Allan Gay, Kamardinoza Gazkharoy, Terence Gazzani.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Gary Geidel, Paul Hamilton Geier, Julie Geis, Peter Gelinias, Steven Paul Geller, Howard G. Gelling, Jr, Peter Victor Genco, Steven Gregory Genovese, Alayne F. Gentul, Linda George, Michael George, Edward F. Geraghty, Suzanne Geraty, Ralph Gerhardt, Robert J. Gerlich, Denis Germain, Marina R. Gertsberg, Susan M. Getzendanner, Lawrence Daniel Getzfred, James "Jimmy" Gerald Geyer, Cortz Ghee, Joseph M. Giaccone, Vincent F. Giammona, Vince Giamonna, Debra L. Gibbon, James Giberson, Brenda Gibson, Craig Neil Gibson, Ronnie E. Gies, Laura Giglio Marchese, Timothy Paul Gilbert, Andrew Clive Gilbert, Paul Stuart Gilbey, Paul J. Gill, Mark Y. Gilles, Evan Gillette, Ronald Gilligan, Rodney Gillis, Laura Gilly, John Ginley, Jeffrey Giordano, John J. Giordano, Donna Marie Giordano, Steven A. Giorgetti, Martin Giovinazzo, Jr., Jinny Lady Giraldo, Kum-Kum Girolamo, Salvatore Gitto, Cynthia Giugliano, Mon Gjonbalaj, Dianne Gladstone, Keith Glascoe, Thomas I. Glasser, Edmund Glazer, Harry Glenn, Jeremy Glick, Barry H. Glick, Steven Lawrence Glick, John Gnazzo, William "Bill" R. Godshalk, Michael Gogliormella, Brian Frederic Goldberg, Jeffrey Grant Goldflan.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Michelle Herman Goldstein, Steven Goldstein, Monica Goldstein, Ron Golinski, Andrew H. Golkin, Dennis J. Gomes, Manuel Gomez, Enrique Antonio Gomez, Jose Bienvenido Gomez, Wilder Gomez, Max Gomez, Jenine Gonzalez, Rosa Julia Gonzalez, Ana Irene Medina Gonzalez, Joel Guevara Gonzalez, Tambi Gonzalez, Lynn Goodchild, Calvin J. Gooding, Harry Goody, Kiran Reddy Gopu, Catherine Gorayeb, Lisa Penn Gordenstein, Kerene Gordon, Sebastian Gorki, Thomas E. Gorman, Michael Edward Gould, Olga Kristin Gould White, Douglas A. Gowell, Yuji Goya, Jon Grabowski, Christopher Michael Grady, Edwin J. Graff, III, David M. Graifman, Gilbert Granados, Lauren Grandcolas, Elvira Granitto, Winston A. Grant, Ian Gray, James M. Gray, Christopher S. Gray, Linda Mair Grayling, John Michael Grazioso, Tim Grazioso, Wanda Anita Green, Andrew Peter Charles Curry Green, Derrick Arthur Green, Wade Brian Green, Elaine Greenberg, Donald F. Greene, Gayle R. Greene, James A. Greenleaf, Jr., Eileen Marsha Greenstein, Elizabeth "Lisa" Gregg, Florence Gregory, Donald H. Gregory, Jack Gregory, Denise Gregory, Pedro

Grehan, Joseph Grezлак, John M. Griffin, Tawanna Griffin, Joan D. Griffith, Warren Grifka, Ramon Grijalvo, Joseph F. Grillo, David Grimmer, Francis Grogan, Linda Gronlund, Arthur Grossman, Kenneth G. Grozalis, Matthew J. Grzymalski, Robert Joseph Gschaar, Liming Gu, Richard Guadagno, Jose Guadalupe, Yan Z. "Cindy" Guan, Geoffrey E. Guja, Joseph Gullickson, Babita Guman, Douglas B. Radianz Gurian, Janet H. Gustafson, Philip T. Guza, Sabita Guzman, Barbara Guzzardo.

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Peter Mark Gyulavary, Gary Robert Haag, Peter Haberland, Andrea Lyn Haberman, Barbara Contarino Habib, Philip Haentzler, Nizam Hafiz, Karen Hagerty, Steven Michael Hagsis, Mary Lou Hague, David Halderman, Jr, Maile Rachel Hale, Diane M. Hale-McKinzy, Vaswald Hall, Stanley Hall, Richard Hall, Robert John Halligan, Vincent Halloran, Carolyn B. Halmon, James D. Halvorson, Mohammad Hamdani, M. Salman Hamdani, Felicia Hamilton, Robert Hamilton, Carl Max Hammond, Frederic Kim Han, Sean Hanley, Christopher Hanley, Valerie Joan Hanna, Thomas Hannafin, Kevin James Hannaford, Michael L. Hannan, Dana Hannon, Christine Hanson, Peter Hanson, Sue Kim Hanson, Vassilios G. Haramis, James A. Haran, Gerald F. Hardacre, Jeffrey P. Hardy, Timothy J. Hargrave, Daniel Harlin.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Frances Haros, Harvey Harrell, Stephen G. Harrell, Stewart Dennis Harris, Aisha Harris, John Hart, Eric Samadikan Hartono, John Clinton Hartz, Emeric J. Harvey, Peter Hashem, Thomas Haskell, Timothy Haskell, Joseph John Hasson, III, Terence S. Hatton, Leonard William Hatton, Michael Helmut Haub, Timothy Aaron Haviland, Donald G. Havlish, Jr, Anthony Hawkins, Nobuhiro Hayatsu, James E. Hayden, Philip Thomas Hayes, Robert Hayes, William Ward Haynes, Scott Hazelcorn, Michael K. Healey, Roberta Bernstein Heber, Charles Francis Xavier Heeran, John E. Hefferman, Michele Heidenberger, Sheila Hein, Howard Joseph Heller, JoAnn L. Heltbridle, Ronald John Memenway, Mark F. Hemschoot, Ronnie Lee Henderson, Janet Hendricks, Brian Hennessey, Ted Hennessy, Michelle Marie Henrique, William Henry, Joseph Henry, John C. Henwood, Robert Hepburn, Mary "Molly" Herencia, Lindsay Coates Herkness, III, Harvey Hermer, Norberto Hernandez, Claribel Hernandez, Raul Hernandez, Anabel Hernandez, Eduardo Hernandez, Gary Herold, Jeffrey A. Hersch, Thomas Hetzel, Brian Hickey, Donald Hickman, Jsidro Hidalgo-Tejada, Timothy B. Higgins, Robert Higley, Todd Russell Hill, Neal Hinds, Clara Victorine Hinds.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mark D. Hindy, Heather Malia Ho, Tara Yvette Hobbs,

Thomas A. Hobbs, James L. Hobin, Robert Wayne Hobson, III, DaJuan Hodges, Ronald G. Hoerner, Patrick Alloysius Hoey, John Hofer, Stephen G. Hoffman, Frederick J. Hoffman, Michele Lee Hoffman, Joseph Hoffman, Marcia Hoffman, John Hoffman, Judith Florence Hofmiller, Wallace Cole Hogan, Thomas Warren Hohlweck, Jr., Jonathan R. Hohmann, Cora Holland, Joseph Francis Holland, John Holland, Jimmie Ira Holley.

□ 1600

Elizabeth Holmes, Thomas P. Holohan, Herbert W. Homer, LeRoy Homer, Bradley Hoorn, James Hopper, Montgomery McCullough "Monte" Hord, Michael Horn, Matthew D. Horning, Robert L. Horohoe, Jr., Michael R. Horrocks, Aaron Horwitz, Malverse Houscal, Uhuru Houston, Charles J. Houston, Angela Houtz, George Gerald Howard, Brady K. Howell, Michael C. Howell, Steven L. Howell, Jennifer Howley-Dorsey, Milagros "Millie" Hromada, Marian Hrycak, Stephen Huczko, Sandi Hudson, Kris R. Hughes, Melissa Harrington Hughes, Paul Hughes, Timothy Robert Hughes, Thomas F. Hughes, Jr., Robert Hughes, Susan Huie, Fang Huixin, Lamar Hulse, Mychal Hulse, Nicholas Humber, William C. Hunt, Kathleen "Casey" Anne Hunt, Joseph Hunter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Bonnie Hunter, Peggy Hurt, Robert Hussa, Stephen Neil Hyland, Mark Hylton, Robert J. Hymel, Walter G. Hynes, Thomas Hynes, John Hynes, Joseph Ianelli Jr., Zuhtu Ibis, Jonathan Lee Ielpi, Michael Patrick Iken, Daniel Ilkanayev, Frederick III Jr., Abraham Nethanel Ilowitz, Anthony P. Infante, Jr., Louis Steven Inghilterra, Christopher N. Ingrassia, Paul William Innella, Stephanie Irby, Doug Irgang, Kristin A. Irvine-Ryan, Todd Isaac, Erik Hans Isbrandtsen, William Iselepis, Taizo Ishikawa, Waleed Iskandar, Aram Iskenderian, John F. Iskyan, Kazushige Ito, Aleksander Ivantsov, Lacey B. Ivory, Virginia M. Jablonski, Bryan Creed Jack, Brooke Alexandra Jackman, Aaron Jacobs, Jason Kyle Jacobs, Michael Grady Jacobs, Ariel Jacobs, Steven A. Jacobson, Steven D. "Jake" Jacoby, Ricknauth Jaggernaut, Jake Jagoda, Yudh V.S. Jain, Maria Jakubiak, Robert Adrien Jalbert, Peter Jalinis, Gricelda E. James, Ernest James, Mark Jardin, Amy N. Jarret, Mohammed Jawara, Maxima Jean-Pierre, Paul E. Jeffers, John Charles Jenkins, Allen K. Jensen, Prem Nath Jerath, Farah Jeudy, Hweidar Jian, Yuan Jianhua, Luis Jiminez, Eliezer Jimenez, Jr., Charles Gregory John, Nicholas John, Nick John, Scott Michael Johnson, Dennis M. Johnson, LaShawna Johnson, William Johnston, Charles E. Jones, Judith Jones, Mary S. Jones, Donald W. Jones, Linda Jones, Arthur J. Jones, III, Allison Horstmann Jones, Donald Thomas Jones, II, Brian L. Jones, Christopher

D. Jones, Andrew Jordan, Robert Thomas Jordan, Karl Joseph, Stephen Joseph.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Robert Joseph, Ingeborg Joseph, Jane Eileen Josiah, Anthony Jovic, Angel Juarbe Jr., Karen Susan Juday, Mychal Judge, Ann Judge, Paul William Jurgens, Thomas Edwards Jurgens, Roya Kafaie, Wally Kaldens, Shari Kandell, Vincent Kane, Jennifer Lynn Kane, Howard Lee Kane, Joon Koo Kang, Sheldon R. Kanter, Robin Kaplan, Deborah H. Kaplan, Alvin Peter Kappelman, Jr., Charles Karczewski, William "Tony" A. Karnes, Douglas G. Karpiloff, Charles L. Kasper, Andrew Keith Kates, John Katsimatides, Robert M. Kaulfers, Don J. Kauth, Jr., Hideya Kawauchi, Anei Kazuhiro, Edward Thomas Keane, Richard M. Keane, Lisa Kearney-Griffin, Karol Ann Keasler, Paul H. Keating, Barbara Keating, Leo Russell Keene, III, Brenda Kegler, Chandler Keller, Joseph J. Keller, Peter Rodney Kellerman, Joseph P. Kellett, Frederick H. Kelley, Timothy C. Kelly, Thomas W. Kelly, Richard John Kelly, Jr., William Hill Kelly, Jr., James Joseph "Kells" Kelly, Thomas Michael Kelly, Thomas R. Kelly, Joseph Anthony Kelly, Maurice Patrick Kelly, Thomas J. Kennedy, Yvonne Kennedy, Robert C. Kennedy, John Keohane, Ralph Kershaw, Ronald Kerwin, Howard L. Kestenbaum, Douglas D. Ketcham, Ruth E. Ketler, Ren Keyoug.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Boris Khalif, Taimour Firaz Khan, Norma Khan, Sarah Khan, Rajesh Khandelwal, Devi Khemraj Bhowanie, Seilai Khoo, Michael Kiefer, Satoshi Kikuchiara, Don Kim, Andrew Jay-Hoon Kim, Lawrence Kim, Mary Jo Kimelman, Heinrich Kimmig, Karen A. Kincaid, Robert King, Jr., Amy R. King, Lucille King, Andrew Marshall King, Michele King, Lisa M. King-Johnson, Brian Kinney, Takashi Kinoshita, Chris Michael Kirby, Barry Kirschbaum, Glenn Davis Kirwin, Richard Klares, Peter A. Klein, Julie Klein, Alan David Kleinberg, Karen Joyce Klitzman, Robert Phillip Kloepfer, Eugene Kniazew, Thomas Patrick Knox, Andrew Knox, Rebecca Kobone, Deborah Kobus, Gary Koehler, Frank J. Koestner, Ryan Kohart, Vanessa Lynn Kolpak, Irina Kolpakova, Suzanne Kondratenko, Abdoulaye Kone, Bon-seok Koo, Dorota Kopiczko, Scott Kopytko, Bojan Kostic, Danielle Kousoulis, David Kovalcin, John J. Kren, William Krukowski, Lyudmila Ksido, Toshiya Kuge, Shekhar Kumar, Kenneth Kumpel, Frederick Kuo, Jr., Patricia Kuras, Nauka Kushitani, Thomas Kuveikis, Victor Kwaku, Victor Kwarkye, Kui Fai Kwok.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Angela R. Kyte, Kathryn L. LaBorie,

Amarnauth Lachhman, Andrew LaCorte, Ganesh Ladkat, James Patrick Ladley, Joseph Lafalce, Jeanette LaFond-Menichino, David LaForge, Michael Patrick LaForte, Alan Lafranco, Juan Lafuente, Neil K. Lai, Vincent A. Laieta, William David Lake, Franco Lalama, Chow Kwan Lam, Michael Scott Lamana, Steven LaMantia, Amy Lamonsoff, Robert T. Lane, Brendan Lane, Rosanne P. Lane, Vanessa Langer, Mary Lou Langley, Peter Langone, Thomas Langone, Michelle Lanza, Ruth S. Lapin, Carol LaPlant, Carol Ann LaPlante, Ingeborg Astrid Desiree Lariby, Robert Blair Larkey, Judy Larocque, Christopher Randall Larrabee, Hamidou S. Larry, Scott Larsen, Jude Larson, Natalie Larson, John Adam Larson, N. Janis Lasden, Gary E. Lasko, Nicholas C. Lassman, Paul Laszczynski, Amarnath Latchman, Jeffrey Latouche, Charles Laurencia, Stephen James Lauria, Maria LaVache, Dennis F. Lavelle, Jeannine Laverde, Anna A. Lavery, Robert A. Lawrence, Nathaniel Lawson, David W. Laychak, Eugene Lazar, James Leahy, Joseph Gerard Leavey, Neil Leavy, Robert LeBlanc, Leon Lebor, Kenneth Charles Ledee, Alan J. Lederman.

Mr. Speaker, today we have completed only a partial list of those who perished or are missing from the tragedy on September 11, but we will continue the reading of these names for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each day until we are finished, and it may take us into next year. I thank my colleagues from Illinois and Minnesota for helping me in this undertaking.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. OSE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLINS, for 5 minutes, November 13.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, November 13.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 9, 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:

4540. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301187; FRL-6806-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4541. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methoxyfenozide; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301185; FRL-6806-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4542. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Chlorothalonil; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301188; FRL-6807-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4543. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Requirements on Variability in the Composition of Additives Certified Under the Gasoline Deposit Control Program; Direct Final Rule [AMS-FRL-7096-5] (RIN: 2060-AJ69) received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4544. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hawaii: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL-7097-1] received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4545. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Reconsideration of the 610 Non-essential Products Ban [FRL-7101-1] (RIN: 2060-AH99) received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4546. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois NOx Regulations [IL208-2, IL209-2; FRL-7077-9] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4547. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agen-

cy's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Alabama: Attainment Demonstration of the Birmingham 1-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area [AL-056-200204; FRL-7098-7] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4548. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland: Control of Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Distilled Spirits Facilities, Aerospace Coating Operations and Kraft Pulp Mills [MD124-3084; FRL-7085-1] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4549. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); Alabama: Control of Gasoline Sulfur and Volatility [AL-056-2-200205; FRL-7098-6] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4550. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland: RACT for the Control of VOC Emissions from Iron and Steel Production Installations [MD117-3081; FRL-7083-7] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4551. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois: Oxides of Nitrogen Regulations [IL203-3; FRL-7077-8] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4552. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois: Ozone [IL200-2; FRL-7088-8] received October 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4553. A letter from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's annual report on the Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act for fiscal year 2001, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3810; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4554. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the Southeast Marketing Area—received November 1, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4555. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Debt Collection—Amendments to Collection Rules and Adoption of Wage Garnishment Rules [Release No. 34-44965] (RIN: 3235-AI34) received November 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4556. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a Building Project Survey for Colorado Springs, CO, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 610(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4557. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of a lease prospectus

and a design prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4558. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Customs Preclearance in Foreign Countries [T.D. 01-81] received November 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4559. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Medicare Program; Announcement of the Calendar Year 2002 Conversion Factor for the Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System and a Pro Rata Reduction on Transitional Pass-Through Payments [CMS-1159-F1] (RIN: 0938-AK54) received November 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2062. A bill to extend the effective period of the consent of Congress to the interstate compact relating to the restoration of Atlantic salmon to the Connecticut River Basin and creating the Connecticut River Atlantic Salmon Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-274 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2062. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than November 16, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RILEY (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 3252. A bill to amend the Education of the Deaf Act of 1986 to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish the National Junior College for Deaf and Blind at the Alabama Institute for Deaf and Blind; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BUYER, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 3253. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of emergency medical preparedness centers in the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUYER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 3254. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a partnership between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense to develop

and disseminate education and training programs on the medical responses to the consequences of terrorist activities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TURNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FROST, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BACA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MOORE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REYES, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 3255. A bill to respond to the threat of bioterrorism; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Armed Services, Science, Intelligence (Permanent Select), International Relations, Agriculture, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. SHOWS):

H.R. 3256. A bill to establish a National Center for Military Deployment Health Research in the Department of Health and Human Services to provide an independent means for the conduct and coordination of research into issues relating to the deployment of members of the Armed Forces overseas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, the Budget, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3257. A bill to amend the Act of September 30, 1961, to limit the antitrust exemption applicable to broadcasting agreements made by leagues of professional sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CUBIN:

H.R. 3258. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976 to clarify the method by which the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture determine the fair market value of rights-of-way granted, issued, or renewed under such Act to prevent unreasonable increases in certain costs in connection with the deployment of communications and other critical infrastructure; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself and Mr. HAYWORTH):

H.R. 3259. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to authorize Federal agencies to promptly respond to emergencies involving the health and safety of persons, in the same manner as such authority is available under the Wilderness Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas:

H.R. 3260. A bill to amend the Plant Protection Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a cost-share program with the States for the control of noxious weeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 3261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the offset against overpayments to include all State and local taxes owed by any person, whether or not a resident of the State seeking the offset, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3262. A bill to revitalize the international competitiveness of the United States-flag maritime industry through international tax parity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3263. A bill to amend section 7(a) of the Small Business Act to exempt small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans who have been discharged or released from military service for less than 5 years from guarantee fees; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota (for himself and Mr. POMBO):

H.R. 3264. A bill to terminate all Federal programs relating to price support and supply management for milk and to grant the consent of Congress to cooperative efforts by States to manage milk prices and supply; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 3265. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 5-month waiting period which is presently required in order for an individual to be eligible for benefits based on disability or for the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. RIVERS:

H.R. 3266. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit unauthorized trafficking in personal DNA information, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 3267. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for continuous open enrollment and disenrollment in MedicareChoice plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TAUZIN:

H.R. 3268. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen the limitations on the holding of any license, permit, operating authority by a foreign government or any entity controlled by a foreign government; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WATSON:

H.R. 3269. A bill to provide for the development of State medical disaster response plans regarding terrorist attacks that use biological or chemical weapons; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 3270. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 20 percent inpatient limitation under the Medicare Program on the proportion of hospice care that certain rural hospice programs may provide; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 3271. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct veterans outreach programs known as Stand Down events and to establish a pilot program to provide for an annual Stand Down event in each State; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution honoring veterans by requesting that television and radio stations provide a moment of silence or a public service announcement on November 11 at 11 a.m. each year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FROST:

H. Res. 282. A resolution designating minority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 283. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr.

KUCINICH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KIRK, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SIMPSON):

H. Res. 284. A resolution encouraging the people of the United States to support the Armed Forces and civilian personnel who are engaged in the war on terrorism as part of a united effort to be known as Operation Enduring Support; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mr. BONIOR):

H. Res. 285. A resolution commending President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan for his leadership and friendship and welcoming him to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 19: Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 141: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 162: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 218: Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. PORTMAN.
 H.R. 424: Mr. GEKAS.
 H.R. 425: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 439: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 547: Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 778: Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 783: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 831: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. SCHROCK.
 H.R. 938: Mr. BACA and Mr. HINCHEY.
 H.R. 951: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BACA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WU, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SHERWOOD, and Mr. BECERRA.
 H.R. 981: Mr. KELLER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 990: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1004: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1170: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.R. 1178: Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 1254: Mr. GEKAS, Mrs. THURMAN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 1307: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 1331: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1377: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1405: Ms. RIVERS.
 H.R. 1577: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 1584: Mr. CANNON and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1596: Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 1681: Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1754: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. GRUCCI.
 H.R. 1759: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 1810: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1814: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 2037: Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 2074: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2157: Mr. BISHOP.
 H.R. 2166: Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 2220: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 2269: Mr. GRUCCI.
 H.R. 2329: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 2348: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 2357: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVERETT, Ms. HART, and Mr. ISSA.
 H.R. 2485: Mr. HERGER and Mr. LINDER.
 H.R. 2527: Mr. WICKER.
 H.R. 2630: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2695: Mr. HERGER.
 H.R. 2837: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2841: Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SABO, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2887: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 2896: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
 H.R. 2946: Ms. WATERS and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 2949: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BACA, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
 H.R. 2965: Mr. WOLF and Mr. DOYLE.
 H.R. 2982: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3022: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 3026: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 3029: Mr. GILMAN.
 H.R. 3046: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 3054: Mr. BAKER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. OSE.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. SCHROCK.
 H.R. 3087: Mr. FALCOMAVEGA and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 3088: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 3101: Mr. GORDON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BACA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. HALL of Texas.
 H.R. 3131: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3143: Mr. BACA.
 H.R. 3154: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WYNN, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. WU.
 H.R. 3163: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3175: Mr. FRANK and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 3185: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3190: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 3209: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3219: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 3238: Mr. BACA and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3240: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3246: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BECERRA.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SABO, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FRANK, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BACA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. PASTOR, Ms. LEE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. REYES, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CRANE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAW, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. DUNN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H. Con. Res. 254: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. KANJORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 257: Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H. Res. 133: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H. Res. 241: Mr. WU.

H. Res. 281: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 981: Mr. COMBEST.