



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2002

No. 9

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 7, 2002.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: This is the day, Lord, You have made. We are glad and rejoice in it.

This morning, Lord, at the National Prayer Breakfast, President George W. Bush and many Members of Congress, with over 3,800 individuals from all walks of life, representing over 170 nations, joined in prayer and fellowship to Your honor and glory.

How inspiring it is, Lord, for people of faith to gather and manifest again the rich heritage of America's commitment to religious freedom.

We praise You, Lord God, and we thank You, for You continue to inspire people to build a truly better world, a world in which freedom is ordered to truth and goodness, while religion is celebrated openly with a wide expression of faith perspective. Rooted in various religious traditions, Your people give You glory because moral norms give them life, direction and great fruitfulness in works of justice and service.

This prayer breakfast was a vision of the globalized world come together for prayer. Government leaders confessing their human limitations, looking to

You, Almighty God, for strength and guidance to bring peace to the world.

Continue to bless the work begun by the National Prayer Breakfast, because it brings to life the prayer and vision of Jesus, who came not to be served but to serve, now and forever. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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. GIBBONS. 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 pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCNULTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCNULTY 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.

### CONGRATULATING DR. MICHAEL ALESSANDRI FOR HIS WORK WITH AUTISTIC INDIVIDUALS AND THEIR FAMILIES

(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 have often spoken about the importance of funding research for autism and its related spectrum disorders. Today I congratulate a scholar who for over 20 years has been dedicated to working with individuals who have autism and their families, Dr. Michael Alessandri. Michael has consulted nationally and abroad on developing educational programs on autism spectrum disorder. But perhaps it is Dr. Alessandri's inherent commitment to educating individuals with autism that has enabled him to touch the lives of so many, especially in my congressional district. South Florida families living with autism are fortunate to have Michael leading the battle at the University of Miami Center for Autism and Related Disabilities, which under his direction was named the National Autism Program of the Year in 1999 by the Autism Society of America.

Please join me in congratulating Dr. Michael Alessandri and the University of Miami's CARD for their contributions to the field of autism research.

### BRING OUR CHILDREN HOME

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, as of today, Jeff Koons, a custodial parent in New York, has not spoken with his son Ludwig for 2 months. Jeff and Ludwig were supposed to spend the holidays together in Rome. Jeff went to Rome, but was denied access to his son by the noncustodial mother, Ilona Staller. He

□ 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.

H203

was not even allowed to talk with him on the phone.

Nothing is being done. Ms. Staller is clearly in violation of all agreements and court orders. Ludwig is in great danger, as he is being raised in a pornographic compound in Rome, Italy. Yet there is no authority enforcing Mr. Koons' and Ludwig's rights. It is absolutely critical that Jeff, at the very least, be allowed contact with his son. It is critical to Ludwig's welfare.

Mr. Speaker, this body, the administration, the State Department, and the Justice Department must do something now. These children must be returned to our home, the United States of America. Ludwig Koons can wait no longer. Bring our children home.

#### YUCCA MOUNTAIN

(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, yesterday in the Washington Post John W. Bartlett, an engineer who headed the Yucca Mountain project for the DOE from 1990 to 1993 stated:

"The rock formations were found to be far inferior to that originally expected in terms of preventing contamination."

Mr. Bartlett is not the only former DOE official opposed to Yucca Mountain. Kenneth Davis, Energy Under Secretary from 1981 to 1983, has also said that Yucca Mountain as a waste repository is not reasonable in his view and should be put in mothballs. Former senior DOE geologist Jerry Szymanski has found that an earthquake could dramatically elevate the water table, potentially flooding the repository. The Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board and the GAO have also said that the DOE's science is weak to moderate and that recommendation is not prudent or practical.

Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me to think that the Energy Secretary is willfully ignoring the concerns of his own experts. Unless the DOE stops the Yucca Mountain project when it comes time, and Mr. Abraham is quoted saying that Yucca Mountain was a mistake, it will be too late for the American people.

#### ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX (AMT) REPEAL

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have here the National Taxpayer Advocate's Annual Report to Congress.

As my colleagues well know, the National Taxpayer Advocate is an independent agent within the IRS that helps our constituents resolve their tax problems. It should interest Members of this body that the very agent within the IRS tasked with helping our con-

stituents has suggested that we abolish the alternative minimum tax.

As my colleagues well know, the AMT was the subject of considerable debate when this body voted to pass not one but two stimulus bills. As I recall, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle complained that eliminating the AMT would only help the wealthy.

I ask my colleagues to consider that a mother of five who earned \$45,000 in 2000 had to pay \$1,850 in AMT alone. That is a lot of money. I find it disconcerting that Members of this body would oppose commonsense tax reform that would help the economy and really help their constituency.

I do not take any word from anybody, and I do not expect Members to accept my words, Mr. Speaker, but read this report for yourself. Unless the opponents of the AMT are prepared to call the National Taxpayer Advocate the handmaiden of the wealthy, then I think it is time that we heed the Tax Advocate's recommendations and eliminate the AMT.

#### NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, my wife, Karen, and I just returned from celebrating, along with 3,800 other citizens of both political parties, the 50th National Prayer Breakfast here in Washington, D.C. It was truly an inspiring morning. I offer congratulations to the organizers, in both political parties, with the National Prayer Breakfast for this inspiring event.

We gathered, Mr. Speaker, because it is a chance to honor heroes, like Lisa Beamer and the New York firefighters whom we heard from today. We gather because it is obviously a tradition begun with President Dwight David Eisenhower. But as we were reminded so poignantly today by leaders of both parties and eloquently by our President and the Chief of Naval Operations, we gather as Americans because we believe that if His people who are called by His name will humble themselves and pray and seek His face, He will today, as He always has, hear from heaven, forgive our sins and heal our land.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3394, CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 343 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 343

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the

Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3394) to authorize funding for computer and network security research and development and research fellowship programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(a) of rule XIII are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 343 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 3394, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. This is a fair and open rule that will provide every Member with the opportunity to offer amendments, allowing Members ample time to debate the important issues related to this legislation.

□ 1015

Mr. Speaker, the attacks of September 11 have forced the American people and this Congress to recognize that the threat of terror is present on many fronts. To adequately protect the United States, we must address all of our security vulnerabilities. This enormous task includes securing our Nation's computer and communications infrastructure.

The urgency with which we must proceed with regard to this infrastructure has already been demonstrated. In 1997, the Pentagon conducted an information warfare exercise to test the vulnerability of the U.S. information infrastructure. The exercise consisted of 35 National Security Agency computer

specialists using off-the-shelf technology to attack U.S. information systems. The group of NSA specialists were able to attack and penetrate government and commercial sites.

The next year, failure of the Galaxy 4 communications satellite further demonstrated the effects that a cyberattack could have on our information systems. The failure of Galaxy 4 disrupted credit card purchases, ATM transactions, 90 percent of the Nation's pagers and emergency communications. While studies have concluded that the United States is vulnerable to cyberattacks, not enough has been done to safeguard this sensitive information system.

This is of grave concern for the safety of the Nation. Just this past Tuesday it was reported that since September 11 there has been a series of cyberattacks that have targeted the Pentagon, the Department of Energy, NASA and other agencies, resulting in the theft of vast quantities of national defense research. One of the groups went as far as declaring a "cyber jihad" against the United States.

We need only look 90 miles off the coast of Florida to see the possibility of future attacks, Mr. Speaker. This past year the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency testified before the Senate Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that the Cuban regime could initiate information warfare or computer network attacks that could seriously disrupt the United States military.

That regime, which is the only one of the seven states on the State Department's list of terrorist nations in our hemisphere, is believed to share information with other terrorist states such as Iran, Libya and Iraq. With its significant ties to fellow terrorist nations in the Middle East, the Cuban regime has the ability to serve as a type of forward-operating location for terror in our hemisphere.

The potential for cyberwarfare is real, and the underlying legislation that we are going to address to date helps to address that threat. H.R. 3394 is a bipartisan piece of legislation designed to increase research efforts which are needed to fill the void in this critical area. The legislation will task the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to coordinate a partnership with academic institutions to ensure that information systems are secure in the United States.

This partnership will face the emerging threat by increasing the amount of cybersecurity research being supported by the Federal Government and by increasing the number of cybersecurity researchers in the Nation. The bill will provide \$878 million over 5 years to implement new academic programs, provide grants and fellowships, providing for the common defense of our Nation's technological infrastructure.

The underlying legislation, as I stated before, is a product of bipartisan-

ship. It was reported out of the Committee on Science by voice vote. It is a very important bill that focuses on obviously a very important subject matter. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, it is an open rule. It is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act and in support of the rule. I want to especially congratulate the Committee on Science chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for their very hard work on this bill and for their recognition of the importance to the entire country of the necessary investments in research that this bill funds.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that in 21st century America there is barely a thing that we do that does not involve the computer. From simple e-mail from a parent to a child in college, to computer-guided missiles that fall precisely on their targets, computers are the very backbone of our society today.

Currently, the vulnerability of our Nation's computer system to cyber terrorism is great, as my friend from Florida has pointed out. This bill is the first step in a long process to secure our Nation's technological lifeblood.

In college I was a science major, and I well know the importance of research and development in helping to solve this country's most difficult problems. I also had the distinct honor to serve in Congress on the Committee on Science, and I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, we have a serious problem on our hands, and it is up to the emerging scientists and engineers to fix it.

Why are they not doing it now? Because the Federal Government is not providing enough resources nor offering the proper incentives. This bill is a step forward to change this pattern for years to come.

For just a moment I want to discuss a portion of the bill relating to minority participation in the programs created in this bill. I was going to offer an amendment, and I shall not in light of discussions that I had with the Chair of the Black Caucus, and report language that seemingly covers some of what I had in mind.

In particular, I want to commend the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for her very hard work on this issue.

A report of the National Science Foundation reveals that blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans comprise 23 percent of the population, but earn on a whole only 14.2 percent of the bachelor's degrees, 8.1 percent of the

master's degrees and 5 percent of the doctorate degrees in science and engineering. This bill gives the NSF and the National Institute of Standards and Technology the tools to correct the imbalances uncovered in their own studies showing, as throughout government, that minorities are not being hired at a pace that they should, and that the process itself is so extraordinary that it makes it difficult for people to even accomplish the standards that are set forth.

If, Mr. Speaker, we are to ensure American security from terrorist threats, we will need to mobilize all of the human resources available. That includes minority Americans.

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the rest of the Committee on Science for their recognition of that need and their attempts to address it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a necessary bill. It has earned the bipartisan support of the Committee on Science, and I would suggest that it deserves the same bipartisan support here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again reiterate my strong support for the underlying legislation, as well the rule before us.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SUNUNU). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. 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 pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Barcia	Blumenauer
Ackerman	Barr	Blunt
Aderholt	Barrett	Boehert
Akin	Bartlett	Boehner
Allen	Bass	Bonilla
Andrews	Becerra	Bonior
Armey	Bentsen	Boozman
Baca	Bereuter	Borski
Bachus	Berkley	Boswell
Baird	Berman	Boucher
Baker	Berry	Boyd
Baldacci	Biggert	Brady (PA)
Baldwin	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Ballenger	Bishop	Brown (FL)

Brown (OH) Gutknecht  
Brown (SC) Hall (TX)  
Bryant Hansen  
Buyer Harman  
Callahan Hart  
Calvert Hastings (FL)  
Camp Hastings (WA)  
Cannon Hayes  
Cantor Hayworth  
Capito Hefley  
Capps Herger  
Cardin Hill  
Carson (IN) Hilliard  
Carson (OK) Hinchey  
Castle Hinojosa  
Chabot Hobson  
Chambliss Hoeffel  
Clayton Hoekstra  
Clement Holden  
Clyburn Holt  
Coble Honda  
Collins Hooley  
Combest Horn  
Condit Hostettler  
Conyers Houghton  
Cooksey Hoyer  
Costello Hulshof  
Cox Hunter  
Coyne Inslee  
Cramer Isakson  
Crane Israel  
Crenshaw Issa  
Crowley Istook  
Culbertson Jackson (IL)  
Cummings Jackson-Lee  
Cunningham (TX)  
Davis (CA) Jenkins  
Davis (FL) John  
Davis (IL) Johnson (CT)  
Davis, Jo Ann Johnson (IL)  
Davis, Tom Johnson, E. B.  
Deal Johnson, Sam  
DeFazio Jones (NC)  
DeGette Jones (OH)  
Delahunt Kanjorski  
DeLauro Keller  
DeLay Kelly  
DeMint Kennedy (MN)  
Deutsch Kennedy (RI)  
Diaz-Balart Kerns  
Dicks Kildee  
Dingell Kilpatrick  
Doggett Kind (WI)  
Dooley King (NY)  
Doolittle Kingston  
Doyle Kirk  
Dreier Knollenberg  
Duncan Kolbe  
Dunn Kucinich  
Edwards LaFalce  
Ehlers LaHood  
Ehrlich Lampson  
Emerson Langevin  
Engel Lantos  
English Larsen (WA)  
Eshoo Larson (CT)  
Etheridge Latham  
Everett LaTourette  
Farr Leach  
Ferguson Lee  
Filner Levin  
Flake Lewis (CA)  
Fletcher Lewis (GA)  
Foley Lewis (KY)  
Forbes Lipinski  
Ford LoBiondo  
Fossella Lofgren  
Frank Lowey  
Frost Lucas (KY)  
Gallegly Lynch  
Ganske Maloney (CT)  
Gekas Manzullo  
Gephardt Markey  
Gibbons Mascara  
Gilchrest Matheson  
Gillmor Matsui  
Gilman McCarthy (MO)  
Gonzalez McCarthy (NY)  
Goodlatte McCollum  
Gordon McCrery  
Goss McGovern  
Graham McHugh  
Granger McInnis  
Graves McIntyre  
Green (TX) McKeon  
Green (WI) McNulty  
Greenwood Meehan  
Grucci Meek (FL)  
Gutierrez Meeks (NY)

Menendez  
Mica  
Millender-McDonald  
Miller, Dan  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Miller, Jeff  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Osborne  
Ose  
Otter  
Owens  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Pastor  
Paul  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Phelps  
Pickering  
Platts  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reyes  
Reynolds  
Rivers  
Rodriguez  
Roemer  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Ryun (KS)  
Sabo  
Sanchez  
Sanders  
Sandlin  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaffer  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrock  
Scott  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Sherman  
Sherwood  
Shimkus  
Shows  
Shuster  
Simmons  
Simpson  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Stupak  
Sununu  
Sweeney  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Terry

## NOT VOTING—43

Barton  
Blagojevich  
Bono  
Burr  
Burton  
Capuano  
Clay  
Cubin  
Evans  
Fattah  
Frelinghuysen  
Goode  
Hall (OH)  
Hastert  
Hilleary

Hyde  
Jefferson  
Kaptur  
Kleccka  
Largent  
Linder  
Lucas (OK)  
Luther  
Maloney (NY)  
McDermott  
McKinney  
Moore  
Northup  
Obey  
Pitts

Walsh  
Wamp  
Watkins (OK)  
Watson (CA)  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Weller  
Wexler  
Wicker  
Wilson (SC)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Wynn  
Young (FL)

□ 1048

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3394) to authorize funding for computer and network security research and development and research fellowship programs, and for other purposes, with Mr. SUNUNU in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3394.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to bring H.R. 3349, The Cyber Security Research and Development Act, before the House. Like other congressional responses to terrorism, this is a bipartisan bill. I want especially to thank our ranking minority member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), who joined me in introducing this bill; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Baird), whose own legislation is incorporated in H.R. 3394; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Dr. EHLERS) who chair the subcommittee with jurisdiction over this bill, and their ranking members, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

Also, I would be remiss if I did not thank Dr. Bill Wulf, the president of the National Academy of Engineering and one of the Nation's leading computer scientists, whose ideas were the inspiration for so much of this legislation.

I am convinced that over time H.R. 3394 will come to be seen as a fundamental turning point in the Nation's approach to cybersecurity. This bill is the equivalent of legislation the Congress passed in the wake of the Sputnik launch in the late 1950s.

We will recall that the unexpected Soviet launch of the Sputnik forced us to focus on the Nation's deficiencies in science and led us to pass breathtaking, and, it turned out, overwhelmingly effective legislation to improve

□ 1047

So the resolution 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. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 12 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 586. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exclusion from gross income for foster care payments shall also apply to payments by qualified placement agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed without amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution recognizing the 91st birthday of Ronald Reagan.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1274. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs for the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of stroke.

S. 1275. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for public access defibrillation programs and public access defibrillation demonstration projects, and for other purposes.

## CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to House Resolu-

the Nation's ability to conduct research and educate students.

Similarly, the attacks of September 11 have turned our attention to the Nation's weaknesses, and, again, we find our capacity to conduct research and to educate will have to be enhanced if we are to counter our foes over the long run. No less than the Cold War, the war against terrorism will have to be waged in the laboratory as well as on the battlefield.

And I would add that I am pleased that the Committee on Science, which was created in response to the Sputnik launch, will help lead the effort to ensure our Nation's laboratories are up to the challenge.

One of the most critical problems our Nation's researchers need to focus on is how to protect our Nation's computers systems and networks from attack. For a while, most Americans have been focused exclusively on the hijackings and the bombings and bioterrorism. The experts tell us that the Nation is also profoundly at risk from cyber terrorism. That is a new word that has entered our vocabulary, unfortunately, but it is one we have to be constantly aware of, and we have to prepare.

In an era when virtually all the tools of our daily lives are connected to and rely upon computer networks, a cyberattack could knock out electricity, drinking water and sewage systems, financial institutions, assembly lines and communications, and that is just naming a few. We must improve our ability to respond to these threats, and our response must go beyond immediate defensive measures. That is not good enough.

We need to conduct the research and development necessary to make computers and networks much harder to break into and much less subject to damage when they are violated. That will require a focused, well-funded research and development effort in cybersecurity, something we are sorely lacking now.

In fact, expert witnesses at our Committee on Science hearings have described the current state of cyber security research as woefully underfunded, understaffed, timid, unimaginative and leaderless. That is not good enough. H.R. 3394 will change all of that.

Our bill capitalizes on the expertise of two well-run Federal agencies with historic links to both academia and industry necessary to jump-start our cybersecurity efforts.

Under the bill the National Science Foundation will fund the creation of new cybersecurity research centers, undergraduate and master's degree programs and graduate fellowships. The National Institute of Standards and Technology will create new program grant for partnerships between academia and industry, new postdoctoral fellowships and a new program to encourage senior researchers in other fields to work on computer security.

The result over the next several years will be to promote new research

that produces innovative, creative approaches to computer security, to draw more researchers into the field, and to develop a cadre of students who will become the next generation of cybersecurity researchers.

This approach is measured and targeted, and it will be successful. As with the programs that were created in response to Sputnik, the programs in H.R. 3394 will ensure that we make the long-term investment in research and students needed to develop the tools that will protect us from cyberattacks.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will provide funding for a wide range of research, a range far larger even than the illustrative list that is even in the legislation. For example, research would include work on firewall and antivirus technology, vulnerability assessment, operations and control systems management, and management of the interoperable digital certificates.

I also want to note that in addition to providing funding and programming, this bill provides Federal leadership. The National Science Foundation will have the responsibility of making sure that the Nation's overall research and education enterprise is producing the knowledge in students we need to combat cyberterrorism.

I have been asked by some, "Cannot the private sector just take care of this?" Unfortunately, the answer is a resounding no. Even after September 11, the private sector has little incentive to invest heavily in cybersecurity because the market is more concerned with speed and convenience. That is not my personal conclusion, that is what the industry leaders in cybersecurity have said in testimony before our committee.

In addition, we need to invest in our universities which will work with private industry to do the basic research needed to come up with radically new approaches to protecting our computer systems and to attract the students who will keep the field healthy in the future.

That is why H.R. 3394 is endorsed by leading industry groups including the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Information Technology Association of America, as well as a wide range of groups representing educational institutions.

The bill, I am pleased to report, is also supported by the administration, which provided much guidance as H.R. 3394 moved through our committee.

So I urge my colleagues to follow the lead of the Committee on Science, which approved this bill without dissent. Years from now we will see H.R. 3394 as the measure that galvanized the Federal Government, industry and academia into eliminating the cybersecurity weaknesses that today threaten our economy and our basic public services. I urge support for this important bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. It is a bill that committee has worked in a bipartisan manner, and I think it fills a very important gap in current information technology research programs, namely the need for improved security for our computers and digital communication networks.

I, of course, congratulate and thank the Committee on Science chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT). He has done a very good job of laying out the thrust of the bill, and I also thank him for his leadership and thank him for working so closely with me and with others on our side of the dock to bring this bill to this stage.

I also want to acknowledge the work of my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), a clinical psychologist before he came to the Congress, a man that has unusual ability and is knowledgeable about research and development. Actually, it was a provision pertaining to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, his provisions that originated in his bill, that we have used in this bill.

Many systems that are vital to the Nation such as electric power grids, transportation and financial services, all of these rely on the transfer of information through computer networks.

□ 1100

The trend in recent years of interconnecting computer networks has had some unintended consequences, one of them being making access of these very critical systems easier for criminals and actually potentially easier for terrorists, and that is something that we are very aware of today.

As a result, there have been an increased number of assaults on network systems. Computer viruses, attacks by computer hackers, and electronic identification theft have become more common. The events of last fall, as the chairman stated, have made us all realize just how vulnerable we are to attack, and we now understand that we have to enhance the protection of the Nation's physical and electronic infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3394 establishes substantial new research programs also at the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology. The goal of both of these multiyear programs is not only to advance computer security research but also to expand the community of computer security researchers.

These programs will support graduate students. They will support postdoctoral researchers and senior researchers while encouraging stronger ties between universities and industry.

The key to ensure information security for the long term is to establish a

vigorous and creative basic research effort focused on the security of networked information systems. H.R. 3394 will make a major contribution toward accomplishing this goal.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this measure to my colleagues and ask for their support and ask for its passage by this House.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science and has been a leader in this overall effort.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we learned from the September 11 attack and from the information gathered in Afghanistan to expect the unexpected.

Part of the new commitment to homeland security is improving the security of our Nation's computer and networking infrastructure. In the past decade this networking has been firmly embedded in our economy, and we have become more dependent on these technologies. Whether it is delivering agricultural products or supporting banking and financial markets, moving electricity along interconnected grids, providing government services or maintaining our national defense, we have become dependent on computer networks for our economic and national security.

The networks I think also are a potent symbol of our open society and free markets which thrive on the uninhibited flow of information. However, the technological advancement in computers and software and the networking and information technology which is a bill, H.R. 3400, which is coming before this body in the next several weeks, the potential threat of cyberattack is real and growing. Terrorists will always probe for our weakest points, so we must remain vigilant and confront these new realities.

As we become even more dependent on computer networks and as terrorists become more technologically sophisticated, we should anticipate the possibility of attacks launched on cyberspace.

Computer viruses, computer hackers, electronic identification theft are just a few of the new challenges we face. What is needed is this bill, which moves us into a comprehensive plan to address the growing linkages between national security and cybersecurity. We need to engage the best minds in America to make us immune from these kinds of attacks.

H.R. 3394 does just that. It authorizes research programs at the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to decrease the vulnerability of our computer systems and address emergency problems related to computer networking and infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we have coordination

among all government agencies in this effort, especially the military complex, if we are to be efficient, effective and if we are to succeed.

We need this kind of legislation to move ahead; and I just want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and certainly our chairman, for the inspiration to timely move this bill forward; and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), for purposes of control.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by commending and thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their leadership on this matter. I am tremendously honored that they have chosen to include my computer security bill, which establishes a research and development program on computer and network security grants to the National Institute of Standards and Technology in today's bill.

The chairman's legislation will address long-term needs in securing the Nation's information infrastructure as well as securing or strengthening the security of the nonclassified computer systems of Federal agencies.

Because of September 11, focus and attention has been focused in an unprecedented way on increasing our security against terrorism. Today, security has to mean more than locking doors and installing metal detectors. In addition to physical security, virtual systems that are vital to the Nation's economy must be protected. Telecommunications and computer technologies are vulnerable to attack from far away by enemies who can remain anonymous, hidden in the vast maze of the Internet. Examples of systems that rely on computer networks include the electric power grid, rail networks, and financial transaction networks.

I should commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), particularly, and former chair of the committee, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), for their foresight in this because prior to September 11 they had both had the foresight to conduct numerous hearings on the issue of computer security. It is that kind of forward thinking that we need and now in the post-September 11 time have the opportunity to implement some of these measures that came forward in those hearings.

The vulnerability of the Internet computer viruses, denial of service attacks and defaced Web sites is well-known to the general public. Such widely reported and indeed widely experienced events have increased in frequency over time. These attacks disrupt business and government activi-

ties, sometimes resulting in significant recovery costs. We have yet to face a catastrophic cyberattack thus far; but Richard Clarke, the President's new terrorism czar, has said that the government must make cybersecurity a priority or we face the possibility of what he termed a "digital Pearl Harbor."

Potentially vulnerable computer systems are largely owned and operated by the private sector, but the government has an important role in supporting the research and development activities that will provide the tools for protecting information systems. An essential component for ensuring improved information security is a vigorous and creative basic research effort focused on the security of networked information systems.

Witnesses at our Committee on Science hearings last year noted the anemic level of funding for research on computer and network security. Such lack of funding has resulted in the lack of a critical mass of researchers in the field and has severely limited the focus of research. The witnesses at the hearings advocated increased and sustained research funding from the Federal Government to support both expanded training and research on a long-term basis.

The chairman's bill will provide the resources necessary to ensure the security of business networks and the safety of America's computer infrastructure. I would like to thank the staff of the Committee on Science for their good work on this, as well as my own staff member, Brooke Jamison. I would urge all Members to support this important measure.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a scientist in his own right and a legislator of the first order. He is the chair of our key Subcommittee on Environment, Technology and Standards; and I am pleased to yield the time to him.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to rise in support of H.R. 3394, a piece of legislation that is badly needed.

Most of the citizens of this land do not understand the broad dimensions of the problems of cybersecurity. I was privileged a few years ago to write a report for the cybersecurity of NATO parliamentary assembly but which was under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) at that time, and it was a real eye-opener to look into all of the dimensions of cybersecurity, both hardware and software.

On the hardware end, we are extremely vulnerable as a Nation in many ways, particularly to a high-level nuclear explosion, which would probably have no direct casualties but

could wipe out most of the computers and microprocessors in this Nation.

This bill addresses primarily the other dimension of security and that is the software problem. We have been very fortunate as a Nation that most of the breaches of security that have taken place so far have been caused by hackers, pranksters and petty thieves; but we are extremely vulnerable in many other ways due to the proliferation of computers in our country, and I am not referring just to the proliferation of microprocessors which have essentially invaded our homes, our businesses in numerous quantities. They are vulnerable in different ways; but any time one attaches a computer to a network, they are vulnerable to activities that take place on that network.

We have gained tremendously as a Nation through the use of computers and networks, but we have not taken account of the tremendous opportunities for breaches of security. It is essential that we train our people to deal with these; but above all, we must begin by doing more research in how we can deal with breaches of security. We know so little about it that we are at a disadvantage and we are at the mercy of the hackers, the pranksters, the thieves and, indeed, of other countries.

It is essential that this bill pass; that we begin the process of developing a superstructure and an infrastructure to deal with cybersecurity. We need more research. We need more scholars. We need more researchers, and we need more people who are capable of dealing directly with problems that occur.

We have heard mention of the electric grid and other such things as this; but it can appear in much more minor ways, simply denial of service which costs our economy billions of dollars each year. Recently, I had a call from someone who had received an e-mail sent by way of a government department's computer. A hacker had gotten into that computer and used this government's agency computer to send out millions of e-mails to prevent service from major entities in this country.

So I urge that we join together and we pass this bill and also be sure to alert the American public of the nature of cyberterrorism, cyberinsecurity and that we deal with this problem.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) will control the majority's time.

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor and first want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their bipartisan efforts to address an issue that is so very important to our Nation's economy and Nation's infrastructure.

We are at war today. We are at war against terrorism, and one of the lessons of September 11 is no more complacency. Clearly our Nation's IT infrastructure is one area where we historically have been very, very complacent; and as we work to win this war on terrorism, we also must work to strengthen our homeland security, and clearly this legislation, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act, is part of our efforts to strengthen our Nation's homeland security.

Our IT infrastructure is important. We use it in our everyday lives, whether it is our banking, insurance, our schools, our businesses, how we operate our utilities, and serve our Nation's infrastructure; and all of it is in jeopardy of a cyberattack.

All of us have learned, I believe, over the last several years the creativity of those who hack into our computer systems, those who create computer viruses for malicious destruction, in many cases causing billions of dollars of damage and costs to our Nation as well as our global economy. Unfortunately, very little research and development has been conducted in this important area of homeland security, finding better ways to protect our Nation's information technology systems.

The private sector historically has little incentive to invest because the market emphasizes speed and convenience. Yet the Federal Government historically has not filled the gap. This legislation is important legislation and deserves bipartisan support and enlists our Nation's universities as well as research institutions to find solutions to protect and secure our Nation's IT infrastructure.

There is also more we need to do. I think we are all disappointed after the House passed an economic stimulus package that the accelerated depreciation component that this House passed was not included in action in the other body. My hope is that the accelerated depreciation which would help our businesses and private sector also acquire the hardware and software to protect their IT systems will eventually be included in a stimulus package that we send to the President and get this economy moving again.

□ 1115

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who is one of the leaders of the Committee on Science in so many areas, but particularly interested in this important area.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, it is with great pleasure that I rise as a co-sponsor of H.R. 3394, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) not only for his laudatory words but for his leadership as chairman of the Science Committee in crafting this piece of legislation and bringing it to the floor.

The ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), deserves to be

commended also for working together. As is often the case with legislation from the Committee on Science, this bill is the outcome of a tremendous bipartisan effort, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Computer networks and infrastructure have become one of America's greatest assets. Our ingenuity in developing new and exciting technologies to increase our productivity and quality of life have made us the envy of the modern world. These devices have changed the way we interact socially, conduct business, and have ingrained themselves in every aspect of our lives. We have embraced them and will continue to find exciting new ways to utilize these modern marvels.

Unfortunately, while these computer networks have given us great freedom and access, they have also created a new vulnerability. Our reliance on these networks creates a potential threat and the economic and social consequences to an attack in cyberspace cannot be ignored. In the past few months, we have been confronted with a number of threats to our physical well-being and have taken numerous steps to plug the many holes in our society's lax security practices. However, along with securing our borders and providing for defense of the homeland, we must also take steps to protect our virtual world.

As numerous hearings conducted in the House Committee on Science have shown, it is clear that we have two major problems in cyberspace. The first is that we have few, if any, standards as to what constitutes a secured network, nor do we have generally accepted procedures to evaluate our current systems and upgrade them with the most current security protocols. The second is quite simply too little cybersecurity research is being conducted by too few researchers and too few students to lead to the breakthrough of advancements that we will need to secure our networks in the 21st century.

To address our deficiencies in evaluation and implementation, last session the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1259, a bill I sponsored with the input of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and others, to upgrade the Computer Security Act of 1987 and give the National Institute of Standards and Technology the authority to develop and promote computer security standards within the Federal Government. Located in my home district of Montgomery County, Maryland, NIST is our Nation's premier developer of standards and guidelines and is ideally suited to lead our efforts in the implementation of security practices throughout our cyberworld.

Today, we take up the second issue. H.R. 3394 would provide critical funds to investigators to conduct groundbreaking research, anticipate future needs, and respond to new vulnerabilities. It supplies money to develop multidisciplinary centers between academia, business interests,

and government laboratories to further collaborative efforts. And it creates fellowships and scholarships to assure that we are training a sufficient number of new scientists to replace our current workforce and meet our future needs.

H.R. 1259 and H.R. 3394 represent two sides of the same cybersecurity coin. Implementation of current technology without inquiries into the next generation of countermeasures and best practices is as useless as research and development without evaluation and use. Last session, the House overwhelmingly approved the first step toward protecting our virtual presence with the passage of 1259, and today I urge my colleagues to take the second. Research into cybersecurity is vital to the health of our Nation. This bill provides the necessary tools.

I look forward to its passage and to working with Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member HALL in getting both H.R. 1259 and 3394 through the Senate and into law.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the distinguished chair of the House Republican High Technology Working Group, and the cochair of the Congressional Internet Caucus, and a real leader in all aspects of information technology.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his kind words, but I especially thank him for his leadership on this issue. I also thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking Democrat; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, on which I serve; and the other cosponsors of this legislation for their leadership in getting this done.

This is a serious problem in this country. We are vulnerable in many, many ways to cybercrime and cyberterrorism, and this legislation will help to cure that problem. We are not doing enough in the area of research in this area. We are most certainly not doing enough in the area of producing enough people to work in government and in the private sector to make sure that the computer infrastructure of this country is protected against hackers and criminals and terrorists. This legislation is going to provide more resources for those colleges and universities and other institutions that do this research and train the people.

In this area, I have a university in my district, James Madison University, which has been identified by the National Security Agency as an institution of excellence in doing research and, more importantly, education in this area. But when they sit down to write the curriculum on how to prevent cybercrime, to teach people how to work for companies or the government in protecting the computer infrastructure, that curriculum does not even change on an annual basis, does not even change on a monthly basis. It

changes on a weekly and daily basis as new information about viruses and other types of computer activity used by criminals and terrorists take place.

So I am strongly supportive of this legislation. I look forward to developing more curricula around the country to educate people and provide the literally tens of thousands of new jobs we are going to need in this country in this field, and this legislation lays the groundwork. I commend the gentleman from New York and others for bringing this legislation forward, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support it.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments, and I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), Chair of the Subcommittee on Crime, who helped to author this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland and my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation that increases the cybersecurity networks at our universities, businesses, and national laboratories. The facts speak for themselves. Last month, the CERT Coordination Center operated by Carnegie Mellon University reported that breaches in security of computer systems more than doubled from the year 2000 to 2001: 52,000 incidents were reported in 2001, up from 22,000 the year before. By comparison, in 1995, the number of incidents reported was only 2,400.

Last spring, the Subcommittee on Crime, of the Committee on the Judiciary, that I chair, held a series of hearings on cybercrime. We heard testimony from local, State, and Federal officials, as well as individuals from the private sector. A common theme emerged: the demand for highly-trained and skilled personnel to investigate computer crimes is tremendous. This problem is compounded by the rapid advances in technology which make continual training an absolute necessity.

In this new age we must have training both for a new generation of cyberwarriors, whose most important weapon is not a gun but a laptop, and for private sector companies who must continually protect their Internet presence. This bill seeks to expand what many States and cities are already doing: investing in cybersecurity training initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, in my hometown, the University of Texas at San Antonio has established the Center for Information Assurance and Security, CIAS. The CIAS will be the hub of a city initiative to research, develop, and address computer protection mechanisms to prevent and detect intrusions of computer networks.

This collaborative effort of CIAS brings together the best and brightest from the public sector, such as the Air Force Information Warfare Center, Air Intelligence Agency, and the FBI. The private sector, with such cybersecurity

companies as Ball Aerospace, Digital Defense, SecureLogix, SecureInfo, and Symantec, also are contributing to this effort.

With funding provided in this bill, UTSA and dozens of other universities will be able to train the next generation of cyberwarriors, cyberdefenders, and what we call "white hat netizens." This legislation supports the work at UTSA and other universities for students who want to pursue computer security studies.

While the benefits of the digital age are obvious, the Internet also has fostered an environment where hackers retrieve private data for amusement, individuals distribute software illegally, and viruses circulate with the sole purpose of debilitating computers. Mr. Chairman, a well-trained and highly skilled force of cyberprotectors is urgently needed, and I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as we wrap up this debate, I know a lot of people are wondering what is the big deal about cybersecurity; and my own wife, Marianne, who is frequently at the computer when I am home, says that we have to do a better job of explaining the importance of this, and she is absolutely right.

So much of what we do in this Nation is dependent upon the security of our computer systems. Everything is dependent upon computer technology today: our financial networks, our communication systems, our electric power grid, our water supply. The list goes on and on. If we have a clever 15-year-old hacker penetrate that system, that is mischief. But when we have a terrorist with a potential to penetrate that system and misuse it, that is serious business.

What we are about is very serious business: to train skilled people and to place the emphasis that needs to be placed on protecting our cybersystem in every way, shape, or manner. That is why I am so pleased that the administration has worked so well with us; that this Committee on Science has done what it does traditionally on a bipartisan basis, with people like the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) working with our side.

We are all in this together. We want to produce a product that is best for this Congress and best for America; and we have done so, and I am proud to be identified with it.

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

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to close as well by reiterating my thanks to Chairman BOEHLERT, Chairwoman MORELLA, Ranking Member HALL, as well as the committee staff.

Chairman BOEHLERT has stated it perfectly well: the American public often takes for granted our information infrastructure; but a coordinated attack on, for example, air traffic control, electrical power systems, or other major vital links in our information infrastructure, particularly if timed with a more conventional or even a more unconventional attack, could wreak havoc on our society and would clearly cost lives.

The importance of this bill cannot be overstated, and I commend the Chair and the ranking member for their leadership and appreciate the opportunity to work with them.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

H.R. 3394

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Cyber Security Research and Development Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Revolutionary advancements in computing and communications technology have interconnected government, commercial, scientific, and educational infrastructures—including critical infrastructures for electric power, natural gas and petroleum production and distribution, telecommunications, transportation, water supply, banking and finance, and emergency and government services—in a vast, interdependent physical and electronic network.

(2) Exponential increases in interconnectivity have facilitated enhanced communications, economic growth, and the delivery of services critical to the public welfare, but have also increased the consequences of temporary or prolonged failure.

(3) A Department of Defense Joint Task Force concluded after a 1997 United States information warfare exercise that the results "clearly demonstrated our lack of preparation for a coordinated cyber and physical attack on our critical military and civilian infrastructure".

(4) Computer security technology and systems implementation lack—

(A) sufficient long term research funding;

(B) adequate coordination across Federal and State government agencies and among government, academia, and industry;

(C) sufficient numbers of outstanding researchers in the field; and

(D) market incentives for the design of commercial and consumer security solutions.

(5) Accordingly, Federal investment in computer and network security research and development must be significantly increased to—

(A) improve vulnerability assessment and technological and systems solutions;

(B) expand and improve the pool of information security professionals, including researchers, in the United States workforce; and

(C) better coordinate information sharing and collaboration among industry, government, and academic research projects.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation; and

(2) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

#### SEC. 4. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION RESEARCH.

(a) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall award grants for basic research on innovative approaches to the structure of computer and network hardware and software that are aimed at enhancing computer security. Research areas may include—

(A) authentication and cryptography;

(B) computer forensics and intrusion detection;

(C) reliability of computer and network applications, middleware, operating systems, and communications infrastructure; and

(D) privacy and confidentiality.

(2) MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.—Grants shall be awarded under this section on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

(A) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(B) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(C) \$46,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(D) \$52,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

(E) \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.

(b) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall award multiyear grants, subject to the availability of appropriations, to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish multidisciplinary Centers for Computer and Network Security Research. Institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) receiving such grants may partner with one or more government laboratories or for-profit institutions.

(2) MERIT REVIEW; COMPETITION.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(3) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Centers shall be to generate innovative approaches to computer and network security by conducting cutting-edge, multidisciplinary research in computer and network security, including the research areas described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) APPLICATIONS.—An institution of higher education (or a consortium of such institutions) seeking funding under this subsection shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the research projects that will be undertaken by the Center and the contributions of each of the participating entities;

(B) how the Center will promote active collaboration among scientists and engineers from different disciplines, such as computer scientists, engineers, mathematicians, and social science researchers; and

(C) how the Center will contribute to increasing the number of computer and network security researchers and other professionals.

(5) CRITERIA.—In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (4), the Director shall consider, at a minimum—

(A) the ability of the applicant to generate innovative approaches to computer and network security and effectively carry out the research program;

(B) the experience of the applicant in conducting research on computer and network security and the capacity of the applicant to foster new multidisciplinary collaborations;

(C) the capacity of the applicant to attract and provide adequate support for undergraduate and graduate students and postdoctoral fellows to pursue computer and network security research; and

(D) the extent to which the applicant will partner with government laboratories or for-profit entities, and the role the government laboratories or for-profit entities will play in the research undertaken by the Center.

(6) ANNUAL MEETING.—The Director shall convene an annual meeting of the Centers in order to foster collaboration and communication between Center participants.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

(A) \$12,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(B) \$24,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(C) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(D) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

(E) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.

#### SEC. 5. NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY PROGRAMS.

(a) COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education (or consortia thereof) to establish or improve undergraduate and master's degree programs in computer and network security, to increase the number of students who pursue undergraduate or master's degrees in fields related to computer and network security, and to provide students with experience in government or industry related to their computer and network security studies.

(2) MERIT REVIEW.—Grants shall be awarded under this subsection on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—Grants awarded under this subsection shall be used for activities that enhance the ability of an institution of higher education (or consortium thereof) to provide high-quality undergraduate and master's degree programs in computer and network security and to recruit and retain increased numbers of students to such programs. Activities may include—

(A) revising curriculum to better prepare undergraduate and master's degree students for careers in computer and network security;

(B) establishing degree and certificate programs in computer and network security;

(C) creating opportunities for undergraduate students to participate in computer and network security research projects;

(D) acquiring equipment necessary for student instruction in computer and network security, including the installation of testbed networks for student use;

(E) providing opportunities for faculty to work with local or Federal Government agencies, private industry, or other academic institutions to develop new expertise or to formulate new research directions in computer and network security;

(F) establishing collaborations with other academic institutions or departments that seek to establish, expand, or enhance programs in computer and network security;

(G) establishing student internships in computer and network security at government agencies or in private industry;

(H) establishing or enhancing bridge programs in computer and network security between community colleges and universities; and

(I) any other activities the Director determines will accomplish the goals of this subsection.

(4) SELECTION PROCESS.—

(A) APPLICATION.—An institution of higher education (or a consortium thereof) seeking funding under this subsection shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum—

(i) a description of the applicant's computer and network security research and instructional capacity, and in the case of an application from a consortium of institutions of higher education, a description of the role that each member will play in implementing the proposal;

(ii) a comprehensive plan by which the institution or consortium will build instructional capacity in computer and information security;

(iii) a description of relevant collaborations with government agencies or private industry that inform the instructional program in computer and network security;

(iv) a survey of the applicant's historic student enrollment and placement data in fields related to computer and network security and a study of potential enrollment and placement for students enrolled in the proposed computer and network security program; and

(v) a plan to evaluate the success of the proposed computer and network security program, including post-graduation assessment of graduate school and job placement and retention rates as well as the relevance of the instructional program to graduate study and to the workplace.

(B) AWARDS.—(i) The Director shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that grants are awarded under this subsection in a wide range of geographic areas and categories of institutions of higher education.

(ii) The Director shall award grants under this subsection for a period not to exceed 5 years.

(5) ASSESSMENT REQUIRED.—The Director shall evaluate the program established under this subsection no later than 6 years after the establishment of the program. At a minimum, the Director shall evaluate the extent to which the grants achieved their objectives of increasing the quality and quantity of students pursuing undergraduate or master's degrees in computer and network security.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (B) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;
- (C) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;
- (D) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and
- (E) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.

(b) SCIENTIFIC AND ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1992.—

(1) GRANTS.—The Director shall provide grants under the Scientific and Advanced Technology Act of 1992 for the purposes of section 3(a) and (b) of that Act, except that the activities supported pursuant to this subsection shall be limited to improving education in fields related to computer and network security.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$1,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

- (B) \$1,250,000 for fiscal year 2004;
- (C) \$1,250,000 for fiscal year 2005;
- (D) \$1,250,000 for fiscal year 2006; and
- (E) \$1,250,000 for fiscal year 2007.

(c) GRADUATE TRAINEESHIPS IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY RESEARCH.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a program to award grants to institutions of higher education to establish traineeship programs for graduate students who pursue computer and network security research leading to a doctorate degree by providing funding and other assistance, and by providing graduate students with research experience in government or industry related to the students' computer and network security studies.

(2) MERIT REVIEW.—Grants shall be provided under this subsection on a merit-reviewed competitive basis.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An institution of higher education shall use grant funds for the purposes of—

(A) providing fellowships to students who are citizens, nationals, or lawfully admitted permanent resident aliens of the United States and are pursuing research in computer or network security leading to a doctorate degree;

(B) paying tuition and fees for students receiving fellowships under subparagraph (A);

(C) establishing scientific internship programs for students receiving fellowships under subparagraph (A) in computer and network security at for-profit institutions or government laboratories; and

(D) other costs associated with the administration of the program.

(4) FELLOWSHIP AMOUNT.—Fellowships provided under paragraph (3)(A) shall be in the amount of \$25,000 per year, or the level of the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowships, whichever is greater, for up to 3 years.

(5) SELECTION PROCESS.—An institution of higher education seeking funding under this subsection shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

(A) the instructional program and research opportunities in computer and network security available to graduate students at the applicant's institution; and

(B) the internship program to be established, including the opportunities that will be made available to students for internships at for-profit institutions and government laboratories.

(6) REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—In evaluating the applications submitted under paragraph (5), the Director shall consider—

(A) the ability of the applicant to effectively carry out the proposed program;

(B) the quality of the applicant's existing research and education programs;

(C) the likelihood that the program will recruit increased numbers of students to pursue and earn doctorate degrees in computer and network security;

(D) the nature and quality of the internship program established through collaborations with government laboratories and for-profit institutions;

(E) the integration of internship opportunities into graduate students' research; and

(F) the relevance of the proposed program to current and future computer and network security needs.

(7) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation to carry out this subsection—

- (A) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;
- (B) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;
- (C) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;
- (D) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

(E) \$20,000,000 for fiscal year 2007.

(d) GRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS PROGRAM SUPPORT.—Computer and network security shall be included among the fields of specialization supported by the National Science Foundation's Graduate Research Fellowships program under section 10 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1869).

SEC. 6. CONSULTATION.

In carrying out sections 4 and 5, the Director shall consult with other Federal agencies.

SEC. 7. FOSTERING RESEARCH AND EDUCATION IN COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY.

Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) to take a leading role in fostering and supporting research and education activities to improve the security of networked information systems."

SEC. 8. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH PROGRAM.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology Act is amended—

(1) by moving section 22 to the end of the Act and redesignating it as section 32;

(2) by inserting after section 21 the following new section:

"RESEARCH PROGRAM ON SECURITY OF COMPUTER SYSTEMS

"SEC. 22. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish a program of assistance to institutions of higher education that enter into partnerships with for-profit entities to support research to improve the security of computer systems. The partnerships may also include government laboratories. The program shall—

"(1) include multidisciplinary, long-term, high-risk research;

"(2) include research directed toward addressing needs identified through the activities of the Computer System Security and Privacy Advisory Board under section 20(f); and

"(3) promote the development of a robust research community working at the leading edge of knowledge in subject areas relevant to the security of computer systems by providing support for graduate students, post-doctoral researchers, and senior researchers.

"(b) FELLOWSHIPS.—(1) The Director is authorized to establish a program to award post-doctoral research fellowships to individuals who are citizens, nationals, or lawfully admitted permanent resident aliens of the United States and are seeking research positions at institutions, including the Institute, engaged in research activities related to the security of computer systems, including the research areas described in section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act.

"(2) The Director is authorized to establish a program to award senior research fellowships to individuals seeking research positions at institutions, including the Institute, engaged in research activities related to the security of computer systems, including the research areas described in section 4(a)(1) of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. Senior research fellowships shall be made available for established researchers at institutions of higher education who seek to change research fields and pursue studies related to the security of computer systems.

"(3)(A) To be eligible for an award under this subsection, an individual shall submit

an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require.

“(B) Under this subsection, the Director is authorized to provide stipends for post-doctoral research fellowships at the level of the Institute’s Post Doctoral Research Fellowship Program and senior research fellowships at levels consistent with support for a faculty member in a sabbatical position.

“(C) AWARDS; APPLICATIONS.—The Director is authorized to award grants or cooperative agreements to institutions of higher education to carry out the program established under subsection (a). To be eligible for an award under this section, an institution of higher education shall submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require. The application shall include, at a minimum, a description of—

“(1) the number of graduate students anticipated to participate in the research project and the level of support to be provided to each;

“(2) the number of post-doctoral research positions included under the research project and the level of support to be provided to each;

“(3) the number of individuals, if any, intending to change research fields and pursue studies related to the security of computer systems to be included under the research project and the level of support to be provided to each; and

“(4) how the for-profit entities and any other partners will participate in developing and carrying out the research and education agenda of the partnership.

“(d) PROGRAM OPERATION.—(1) The program established under subsection (a) shall be managed by individuals who shall have both expertise in research related to the security of computer systems and knowledge of the vulnerabilities of existing computer systems. The Director shall designate such individuals as program managers.

“(2) Program managers designated under paragraph (1) may be new or existing employees of the Institute or individuals on assignment at the Institute under the Inter-governmental Personnel Act of 1970.

“(3) Program managers designated under paragraph (1) shall be responsible for—

“(A) establishing and publicizing the broad research goals for the program;

“(B) soliciting applications for specific research projects to address the goals developed under subparagraph (A);

“(C) selecting research projects for support under the program from among applications submitted to the Institute, following consideration of—

“(i) the novelty and scientific and technical merit of the proposed projects;

“(ii) the demonstrated capabilities of the individual or individuals submitting the applications to successfully carry out the proposed research;

“(iii) the impact the proposed projects will have on increasing the number of computer security researchers;

“(iv) the nature of the participation by for-profit entities and the extent to which the proposed projects address the concerns of industry; and

“(v) other criteria determined by the Director, based on information specified for inclusion in applications under subsection (c); and

“(D) monitoring the progress of research projects supported under the program.

“(e) REVIEW OF PROGRAM.—(1) The Director shall periodically review the portfolio of research awards monitored by each program manager designated in accordance with subsection (d). In conducting those reviews, the Director shall seek the advice of the Com-

puter System Security and Privacy Advisory Board, established under section 21, on the appropriateness of the research goals and on the quality and utility of research projects managed by program managers in accordance with subsection (d).

“(2) The Director shall also contract with the National Research Council for a comprehensive review of the program established under subsection (a) during the 5th year of the program. Such review shall include an assessment of the scientific quality of the research conducted, the relevance of the research results obtained to the goals of the program established under subsection (d)(3)(A), and the progress of the program in promoting the development of a substantial academic research community working at the leading edge of knowledge in the field. The Director shall submit to Congress a report on the results of the review under this paragraph no later than six years after the initiation of the program.

“(f) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) the term ‘computer system’ has the meaning given that term in section 20(d)(1); and

“(2) the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).”; and

(3) in section 20(d)(1)(B)(i) (15 U.S.C. 278g–3(d)(1)(B)(i)), by inserting “and computer networks” after “computers”.

#### SEC. 9. COMPUTER SECURITY REVIEW, PUBLIC MEETINGS, AND INFORMATION.

Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$1,060,000 for fiscal year 2003 and \$1,090,000 for fiscal year 2004 to enable the Computer System Security and Privacy Advisory Board, established by section 21, to identify emerging issues, including research needs, related to computer security, privacy, and cryptography and, as appropriate, to convene public meetings on those subjects, receive presentations, and publish reports, digests, and summaries for public distribution on those subjects.”.

#### SEC. 10. INTRAMUTUAL SECURITY RESEARCH.

Section 20 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g–3) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

“(d) As part of the research activities conducted in accordance with subsection (b)(4), the Institute shall—

“(1) conduct a research program to address emerging technologies associated with assembling a networked computer system from components while ensuring it maintains desired security properties;

“(2) carry out research and support standards development activities associated with improving the security of real-time computing and communications systems for use in process control; and

“(3) carry out multidisciplinary, long-term, high-risk research on ways to improve the security of computer systems.”.

#### SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the National Institute of Standards and Technology—

(1) for activities under section 22 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by section 8 of this Act—

(A) \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(B) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(C) \$55,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(D) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(E) \$85,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(F) such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2008 through 2012; and

(2) for activities under section 20(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act, as added by section 10 of this Act—

(A) \$6,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(B) \$6,200,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(C) \$6,400,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(D) \$6,600,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

(E) \$6,800,000 for fiscal year 2007.

#### SEC. 12. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES STUDY ON COMPUTER AND NETWORK SECURITY IN CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURES.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the vulnerabilities of the Nation’s network infrastructure and make recommendations for appropriate improvements. The National Research Council shall—

(1) review existing studies and associated data on the architectural, hardware, and software vulnerabilities and interdependencies in United States critical infrastructure networks;

(2) identify and assess gaps in technical capability for robust critical infrastructure network security, and make recommendations for research priorities and resource requirements; and

(3) review any and all other essential elements of computer and network security, including security of industrial process controls, to be determined in the conduct of the study.

(b) REPORT.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall transmit a report containing the results of the study and recommendations required by subsection (a) to the Congress not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) SECURITY.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall ensure that no information that is classified is included in any publicly released version of the report required by this section.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for the purposes of carrying out this section, \$700,000.

Mr. BOEHLERT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Cyber Security Research and Development Act, which will help the United States reduce its vulnerability to cyberattacks by terrorists and common criminals alike.

Cyber attacks may not bring the large scale death and destruction of attacks by biological or chemical agents or other weapons of mass destruction, but they are just as real a threat

to the American people. They hold the power to disrupt our way of life, harm people's personal interests, and cause tremendous losses for businesses.

Computers have become increasingly ubiquitous. More than half of all American use the Internet, with more than 2 million people going online for the first time each month. Computer-based technology powers the way we bank, the way we shop, and the way we exchange information. And, this makes nearly every American vulnerable to cyber threats.

The Cyber Security Research and Development Act will reduce that vulnerability in two ways. First, it will improve our research efforts so that we can stop cyber terrorists before they strike. Too few of our most gifted minds are working on this area of research. The funding available in this bill will power partnerships between the government and academia to remedy this. Second, H.R. 3394 will improve our education programs so that average Americans can spot threats and react quickly.

As a member of the Science Committee, I heard the testimony of research experts who indicated how great the threat is and how much could be achieved to defeat it if we dedicated ourselves to this goal. That is why I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3394, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. This bill would strengthen our nation's ability to protect the critical infrastructure that supplies our water, keeps the electricity on in our homes, and ensures that our law enforcement officials have communication capabilities at all times.

San Antonio has been a leader in developing the type of technology and educational programs made possible under this bill. A growing partnership of educational, private enterprise and military expertise make San Antonio "Cyber City" USA.

The University of Texas at San Antonio has developed the Center for Infrastructure Assurance and Security to educate and train world-class information technology professionals. With a faculty drawn from both the private sector and the Air Force, this outstanding program will produce skilled graduates ready to meet the growing shortage of information technology professionals in the federal government and private sector. It will also serve as an educational program for mid-level professionals to improve their information technology job skills needed for their current job, or help them retrain in the information technology field.

San Antonio is also the home of the Information Technology and Assurance Academy, an innovative educational center devoted to talented 11th and 12th graders interested in information technology. The Academy will give these young minds an introduction to future career opportunities in the information and technology field. In addition to developing their interest in information technology, this program seeks to instill a sense of civic responsibility that will serve them and the community in which they live.

San Antonio has 45 private companies that have developed state-of-the-art information assurance technology. These companies lead the field in developing intrusion detection technology and providing vulnerability assessments for both the private sector and the government.

The military also has a world-class computer monitoring facility in San Antonio. The Air Force's computer emergency response team, located at Lackland Air Force Base, leads the DoD in intrusion technology, and helps protect Air Force computer systems, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, around the globe. This system helps ensure that the computer systems used by our Armed Forces to protect our nation are free from hackers, viruses and other forms of cyber terrorism.

This bill would provide the nation with needed resources to fight the war on cyber terrorism. Homeland security starts at the local level and this bill would allow communities throughout the United States to educate and train qualified information professionals in their community and encourage research that would give the government and private industry the tools to protect our nation's critical infrastructure.

Ms. HART. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3394, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act.

H.R. 3394, seeks to address the vulnerability of the computer systems and networks that have become part of all our daily lives. It is all too clear to us, that we must be proactive and defend these systems from simple hackers to coordinated terrorist attacks.

At hearings on cyber security last year in the Science Committee, we heard updates on research and development in that field. The news was sobering. The information we were provided was that too little research being conducted in this area, too few researchers were prepared to meet the needs of securing our systems, too few students going into fields relating to cyber security, and there was inadequate coordination between government, academia and industry. This must change and we have great resources in western Pennsylvania to help deliver these changes.

Carnegie Mellon University (CMU), just outside of my district, has been a leader in the field of cyber security. In 2001, the National Security Council named them as a "Center of Excellence in Security Education." Also, the CERT Coordination Center, a government-funded computer emergency-response team at CMU, helps to track the risks and frequencies of cyber crimes. According to the Center, there were 52,658 security breaches and attacks last year, up 50 percent from the previous year. The Center also got reports of 2,437 computer vulnerabilities, more than double the figures from the previous year. While having success with students in the field of cyber security, they, too, have expressed that deficiencies exist for cyber security. This includes the lack of undergraduates and graduates who can provide the necessary research.

The "Cyber Security Research and Development Act" provides help for these areas by making grants available under National Science Foundation (NSF) for: research in innovative computer and network security; establishment of Centers for Computer and Network Security research in partnership with other universities; enabling universities to offer fellowships; and research in industry and other opportunities for doctoral degrees. H.R. 3394 also provides grants to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) for: support for high-risk, cutting edge research by academics working with industry; and for the establishment of a fellowship to increase its

number of researchers in computer and network security.

This important legislation will provide us with the necessary investment in cyber security and needed support of existing resources, so that we are not without the necessary experts to protect our critical computer infrastructure from terrorist attacks.

□ 1130

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PICKERING) having assumed the chair, Mr. SUNUNU, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3394) to authorize funding for computer and network security research and development and research fellowship programs, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 343, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. 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 pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 3394 will be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 12, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Bishop	Cardin
Ackerman	Blumenauer	Carson (IN)
Aderholt	Blunt	Carson (OK)
Allen	Boehert	Castle
Andrews	Boehner	Chabot
Armey	Bonilla	Chambliss
Baca	Bonior	Clay
Bachus	Boozman	Clayton
Baird	Borski	Clement
Baker	Boswell	Clyburn
Baldacci	Boucher	Coble
Baldwin	Boyd	Combest
Ballenger	Brady (PA)	Condit
Barcia	Brady (TX)	Conyers
Barr	Brown (FL)	Cooksey
Barrett	Brown (OH)	Costello
Bartlett	Brown (SC)	Cox
Barton	Bryant	Coyne
Bass	Burr	Cramer
Becerra	Buyer	Crane
Bentsen	Callahan	Crenshaw
Bereuter	Calvert	Crowley
Berkley	Camp	Culberson
Berman	Cannon	Cummings
Berry	Cantor	Cunningham
Biggert	Capito	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Capps	Davis (FL)

Davis (IL) John  
 Davis, Jo Ann Johnson (CT)  
 Davis, Tom Johnson (IL)  
 Deal Johnson, E. B.  
 DeFazio Johnson, Sam  
 DeGette Jones (OH)  
 Delahunt Kanjorski  
 DeLauro Kaptur  
 DeLay Keller  
 DeMint Kelly  
 Deutsch Kennedy (MN)  
 Diaz-Balart Kennedy (RI)  
 Dicks Kerns  
 Dingell Kildee  
 Doggett Kilpatrick  
 Dooley Kind (WI)  
 Doolittle King (NY)  
 Doyle Kirk  
 Dreier Kleczka  
 Dunn Knollenberg  
 Edwards Kolbe  
 Ehlers Kucinich  
 Ehrlich LaFalce  
 Emerson LaHood  
 Engel Lampson  
 English Langevin  
 Eshoo Lantos  
 Etheridge Largent  
 Evans Larsen (WA)  
 Everett Larson (CT)  
 Farr Latham  
 Fattah LaTourette  
 Ferguson Leach  
 Filner Lee  
 Fletcher Levin  
 Foley Lewis (CA)  
 Forbes Lewis (GA)  
 Ford Lewis (KY)  
 Fossella Linder  
 Frank Lipinski  
 Frost LoBiondo  
 Gallegly Lofgren  
 Ganske Lowey  
 Gekas Lucas (KY)  
 Gephardt Lucas (OK)  
 Gibbons Lynch  
 Gilchrest Maloney (CT)  
 Gillmor Maloney (NY)  
 Gilman Manzullo  
 Gonzalez Markey  
 Goode Mascara  
 Goodlatte Matheson  
 Gordon Matsui  
 Goss McCarthy (MO)  
 Graham McCarthy (NY)  
 Granger McCollum  
 Graves McCrery  
 Green (TX) McGovern  
 Green (WI) McHugh  
 Greenwood McInnis  
 Grucci McIntyre  
 Gutierrez McKeon  
 Gutknecht McKinney  
 Hall (TX) McNulty  
 Hansen Meehan  
 Harman Meek (FL)  
 Hart Meeks (NY)  
 Hastings (FL) Menendez  
 Hastings (WA) Mica  
 Hayes Millender-  
 Hayworth McDonald  
 Herger Miller, Dan  
 Hill Miller, Gary  
 Hilliard Miller, George  
 Hinchey Miller, Jeff  
 Hinojosa Mink  
 Hobson Mollohan  
 Hoeffel Moore  
 Hoekstra Moran (KS)  
 Holden Moran (VA)  
 Holt Morella  
 Honda Murtha  
 Hooley Myrick  
 Horn Nadler  
 Hostettler Napolitano  
 Houghton Neal  
 Hoyer Nethercutt  
 Hulshof Ney  
 Hunter Northrup  
 Hyde Nussle  
 Inslee Oberstar  
 Isakson Oliver  
 Israel Ortiz  
 Issa Osborne  
 Istook Ose  
 Jackson (IL) Otter  
 Jackson-Lee Owens  
 (TX) Oxley  
 Jenkins Pallone

Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Phelps  
 Pickering  
 Platts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Rush  
 Ryan (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shows  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 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  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez

Visclosky  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Watkins (OK)  
 Watson (CA)  
 Watt (NC)

Watts (OK)  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Wicker

Wilson (NM)  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)

Clement  
 Clyburn  
 Coble  
 Collins  
 Combest  
 Condit  
 Cooksey  
 Cox  
 Coyne  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Culberson  
 Cummings  
 Cunningham  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis (FL)  
 Davis (IL)  
 Davis, Jo Ann  
 Davis, Tom  
 Deal  
 DeGette  
 Delahunt  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 DeMint  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Ferguson  
 Flake  
 Fletcher  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Ford  
 Fossella  
 Frank  
 Frost  
 Ganske  
 Gekas  
 Gephardt  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode  
 Goodlatte  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Green (TX)  
 Green (WI)  
 Greenwood  
 Grucci  
 Gutierrez  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hansen  
 Harman  
 Hart  
 Hastings (FL)  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Herger  
 Hill  
 Hilliard  
 Hinchey  
 Hinojosa  
 Hobson  
 Hoeffel  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Honda  
 Hooley  
 Horn  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter

Akin  
 Collins  
 Duncan  
 Flake  
 Blagojevich  
 Bono  
 Burton  
 Capuano  
 Cubin  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hastert

Hefley  
 Jones (NC)  
 Kingston  
 Norwood  
 Hilleary  
 Jefferson  
 Luther  
 McDermott  
 Obey  
 Pitts  
 Riley  
 Roukema

Paul  
 Royce  
 Schaffer  
 Tancredo  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Shaw  
 Slaughter  
 Solis  
 Traficant  
 Waters  
 Whitfield

NAYS—12

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1152

Messrs. AKIN, HEFLEY and NORWOOD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 13 on February 7, 2002, the voting machine malfunctioned and did not record my vote. Had it registered my vote, I would have voted “yea.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PICKERING). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

The question is on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal of the last day’s proceedings.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 363, noes 33, answered “present” 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

AYES—363

Abercrombie  
 Ackerman  
 Akin  
 Allen  
 Andrews  
 Arney  
 Baca  
 Bachus  
 Baker  
 Baldacci  
 Baldwin  
 Ballenger  
 Barcia  
 Barr  
 Barrett  
 Bartlett  
 Barton  
 Bass  
 Becerra  
 Bentsen

Bereuter  
 Berkley  
 Berman  
 Berry  
 Biggert  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt  
 Boehlert  
 Boehner  
 Bonilla  
 Bonior  
 Boozman  
 Borski  
 Boswell  
 Boucher  
 Boyd  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brown (FL)

Brown (OH)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Bryant  
 Burr  
 Buyer  
 Callahan  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Cannon  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Capps  
 Cardin  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carson (OK)  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Clay  
 Clayton

Pastor  
 Paul  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Pence  
 Peterson (PA)  
 Petri  
 Phelps  
 Pickering  
 Platts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Putnam  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Rehberg  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rogers (MI)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Rothman  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Ryan (KS)  
 Sabo  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Schiff  
 Schrock  
 Schrenk  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sessions  
 Shadegg  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shows  
 Shuster  
 Simmons  
 Simpson  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Solis  
 Souder  
 Spratt  
 Stearns  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Tauscher  
 Tauzin  
 Thomas  
 Thoms  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiahrt  
 Tiberi  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Watkins (OK)  
 Watson (CA)  
 Watt (NC)  
 Ose  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)

Hyde  
 Inslee  
 Isakson  
 Israel  
 Issa  
 Istook  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jenkins

Wicker	Wolf	Young (AK)
Wilson (NM)	Woolsey	Young (FL)
Wilson (SC)	Wynn	

## NOES—33

Aderholt	Johnson, E. B.	Stark
Baird	Kennedy (MN)	Stenholm
Brady (PA)	Larsen (WA)	Strickland
Costello	Latham	Tanner
Crane	LoBiondo	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
English	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Schaffer	Weller
Hefley	Scott	Wu

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

## NOT VOTING—38

Blagojevich	Hoekstra	Roukema
Bono	Jefferson	Ryan (WI)
Burton	Kingston	Schakowsky
Capuano	Linder	Shaw
Conyers	Lucas (OK)	Slaughter
Cubin	Luther	Smith (MI)
Everett	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (NC)
Frelinghuysen	McCollum	Terry
Galleghy	McDermott	Traficant
Gutierrez	Obey	Waters
Hall (OH)	Pallone	Wexler
Hastert	Pitts	Whitfield
Hilleary	Riley	

□ 1205

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 14, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 12, H. Res. 343, on Agreeing to the Resolution, Providing for consideration of H.R. 3394, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 13, H.R. 3394, the Cyber Security Research and Development Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

I was also unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 14, Approving the Journal of the House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington, DC today because I was participating at a conference hosted by the International Justice Mission (IJM).

As a result, I was not able to vote today. Had I been able to vote, I would have recorded the following: On rollcall vote No. 12, I would have voted "yea"; on rollcall vote No. 13, I would have voted "yea"; on rollcall vote No. 14, I would have voted "aye."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 12, 13, and 14. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 12, 13, and 14.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to a scheduling conflict, I was unable to be

present during the following votes that were held on February 7, 2002. Had I been here, I would have voted "aye" on the Journal vote, "aye" on H. Res. 343, and "aye" on H.R. 3394.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-358) on the resolution (H. Res. 344) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman 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, February 12, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock 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.

At 5:30 p.m. the House will take up the rule providing for consideration of campaign finance reform legislation. That vote, along with suspension votes, will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, the House will take up campaign finance reform legislation throughout the day. The rule under which the measure will be considered provides for 1 hour of general debate and for debate on amendments that could total 10 hours. Therefore, I would advise Members that a late night is possible on Wednesday, and votes are still possible on Thursday, if necessary, to complete consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the following week will be the Presidents Day district work period. However, I do want to take this opportunity to notify our Members that I have scheduled H.R. 1542, the Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act of 2001, for consideration in the House the following week on Wednesday, February 27.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to seek some clarification. We are pleased to see that campaign finance reform will be on the floor next week and look for-

ward to a vigorous debate on cleaning up our failed system. Just to clarify, we will vote on the rule on Tuesday night. Will we be debating the rule before the votes on the suspensions?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, yes. We would expect the debate on the rule to begin at 5:30 p.m.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for his reiteration of that.

Now, we are planning to complete final passage on campaign finance reform on Wednesday, or go over until Thursday, if necessary?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman again is correct. We hope we can complete that work on Wednesday night. I think the Members should be prepared to work on that bill on Thursday.

Ms. PELOSI. If we complete action on campaign finance reform on Wednesday, will there be any votes on Thursday?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, if we complete our work on Wednesday night, we would probably want to start our district work period on Thursday and get Members home a day early.

Ms. PELOSI. Therefore, one would infer from the gentleman's remarks that even if we complete campaign finance reform on Thursday, there would be no other business that day?

Mr. ARMEY. That is correct.

Ms. PELOSI. If we go into Thursday.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentlewoman would yield further, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has just reminded me that Thursday is Valentine's Day, and, given his many romantic interests, he needs the entire day to deliver valentines.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, finally, as the distinguished majority leader knows, we are in an economic recession, and millions of workers have lost their jobs. The Senate has completed action on 13 weeks of extended benefits for these workers. When will the majority schedule that bill for House consideration?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the inquiry, and I understand her concern about all the difficulties people have being out of work. That, of course, is why we have sent two real economic stimulus bills that really would have created real jobs for thousands of American citizens, and we really are disappointed that the Senate, under Senator DASCHLE's leadership, could do nothing but send back the benefit extensions. We have that under consideration.

It is still the continuing hope of many of us that perhaps we might send back something that would actually, in fact, do something to help people go back to work, and that perhaps with Senator DASCHLE's meager beginning in this area, he might be able to bring more substantive legislation to his body.

So I cannot at this point give a definitive answer.

It is our hope that we could perhaps build on this little beginning from the other body and achieve some substantive legislative results in this very important area of public policy.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to respond to the gentleman about the actions in the Senate, but it is my understanding that the House rules forbid us from addressing any individual in the Senate or in the manner it was brought up here. Is that not correct, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is the gentlewoman making a parliamentary inquiry?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The rules of the House prevent Members from characterizing either action or inaction by a Senator or by the other body.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the Speaker for that clarification.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the majority leader, I think that if the package he was talking about that was this job creation package is the one that gave \$250 million back to Enron retroactively, then I think the public will understand why that is something that was unacceptable in a bipartisan way in this body.

I hope that we will be able to find bipartisan relief for those who have been caught in this recession, and the very least that we can do before we go off on a 13-day break is to complete action on 13 weeks of extended benefits for the workers, as the other body has done. I urge the majority to consider doing that next week before we leave.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. My final response would be that if indeed it was the volition of this body to do only the very least we could do, we would, in fact, take up the very least that was done by the other body. But it is our hope we can improve on that and actually do something that would be of real value in the real lives of really unemployed American citizens. We do not believe that we should content ourselves with doing only the very least we can do.

So we will try, in fact, to do something more, put together a bill that could be beneficial in people's lives, and hope that the other body could find some way to deal with it in a manner that would look something like legislative effectiveness.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it may seem the least that we can do, but if you are out of work, these 13 weeks extended benefits make all the difference in the world. I agree, we should be doing much more.

In a matter of hours, maybe 72, of the tragedy in New York, we bailed out the airlines. That was important, it was necessary, and we had to do that. We did it with a promise, though, that relief for the workers in those industries would be on the way soon. Now we are months later, indeed into a new year, a new session of Congress, and we still do

not see action on behalf of the workers who lost their jobs, while we put billions in relief for the industry.

I further urge what may seem like the least, I am not talking about this as the total package, but as an absolute emergency measure for these families caught in this recession, I continue to urge the majority to take up the Senate bill ASAP, certainly before we go out on a 13-day break.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his information on the schedule.

□ 1215

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY,  
FEBRUARY 12, 2002

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, February 8, 2002, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). 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.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CON-  
SIDERATION OF H.R. 1542, INTER-  
NET FREEDOM AND BROADBAND  
DEPLOYMENT ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today, a "Dear Colleague" letter was sent to all Members notifying them of an amendment filing deadline of 4:00 p.m., Monday, February 25, for Members wishing to offer amendments to H.R. 1542, the Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act of 2001, which the distinguished majority leader just mentioned.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment by 4 p.m. on Monday, February 25, to the Committee on Rules upstairs in room H-312 in the Capitol.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which is available on the Web sites of both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Rules.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that

their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with Rules of the House.

SUPPORT HATE CRIMES  
LEGISLATION

(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, because of Enron hearings regarding the situation dealing with the Enron collapse, I will not be able to join my colleagues in advocating for a very important legislative initiative. I am here to enthusiastically support the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) as we look to pass the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2002, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Just this week we had an individual in my community who may have been viewed as being different and was murdered, and we are still looking to determine who killed Hugo Cesar Barajas and how he was killed, because he was different and because he had a different lifestyle. We must believe in everyone and support human dignity. I have asked for this to be investigated as a hate crime.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is imperative. We must pass this legislation now to provide dignity to all in this Nation.

HONORING DALE THOMPSON FOR  
TEN YEARS OF SERVING THE  
COMMUNITY OF FORT BAPTIST  
CHURCH IN FORT SMITH, ARKAN-  
SAS

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Member of the Northwest Arkansas community, Pastor Dale Thompson.

Dale Thompson is in the beginning of his 10th year of service at the First Baptist Church in Fort Smith, Arkansas. At the age of 15, Dale began preaching and was ordained to the gospel ministry in 1971 after graduating from Oklahoma Baptist University. While serving his first pastorate, Dale continued his studies and received his masters of Biblical Arts from Luther Rice University.

Dale has been helping people for the past 25 years as a pastor in Arkansas and Oklahoma; and since 1974, he has ministered at churches in the third district of Arkansas. He has served as a member of the executive board of the Arkansas State Convention and is the

past president of the Pastors Conference of the Arkansas Board of Trustees of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Wake Forest, North Carolina.

Dale is currently serving the community as the pastor of the 6,000-member First Baptist Church in Fort Smith. Since his tenure at the church began 10 years ago, the church has grown by 2,451 members. This number is sure to continue to grow as long as Pastor Thompson remains actively involved in his community.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for allowing me the opportunity to honor Dale Thompson. He is a committed servant and deserves our praise.

#### 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.

#### H.R. 1343, THE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage the Republican leadership to bring the Conyers bill, H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act, to the House floor. Congress must take action against crimes that are motivated by hate. That is why I organized these speeches today to promote H.R. 1343. I appreciate all of my colleagues who have taken their precious time to come down to the House floor to join in on this discussion.

Hate crime offenses are more serious than comparable crimes that do not involve prejudice, because they are intended to intimidate an entire group. These crimes have a particularly damaging effect on victims, their families, and the communities they are part of. Victims oftentimes feel powerless, isolated, depressed and suspicious. Fear is another pervasive victim response, fear for their personal safety and for the safety of their families.

Family members share some of the long-term effects of hate crime victims. They may feel guilty for not protecting their family member who has been victimized. Like those actually targeted by the hate crimes, families may feel isolated or helpless. Their effectiveness on the job or at home or in school is also affected. When the perpetrator is arrested and convicted, but not given a full consideration and a harsh penalty, families actually lose faith in the justice system. Light sentencing may also cause further disillusionment.

In addition to the psychological effects hate crimes have on families, Mr. Speaker, there are particular concerns

as well depending on the crime and there may be repair bills or medical bills or funeral expenses. Trials and court appearances can prolong the grieving process, as can parole hearings. If there is media coverage of a hate crime, a family may find itself dealing publicly with intensely personal issues.

Currently, the Justice Department's civil rights division lists nine killings across the country as possible hate crimes in revenge for the terrorist attacks on September 11. Many families of post-September 11 murder victims believe that police are reluctant to recognize and pursue hate crimes, which is a complaint that African American victims have made for years. These outcries from victims and their families signal that hate crimes need to be taken more seriously.

It is unbelievable that Congress has yet to pass significant legislation that will strengthen and expand hate crimes law. And it is unbelievable that when there is a bill already crafted that would elevate hate crimes law that Congress has the opportunity to debate, it has not been brought to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Conyers Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Protection Act because it would offer real solutions by strengthening existing Federal hate crimes law. This legislation allows the United States Department of Justice to assist in local prosecutions, as well as investigate and prosecute cases in which violence occurs because of the victim's sexual orientation, disability, or gender. H.R. 1343 would also eliminate obstacles to Federal involvement in many cases of assault or murder based on race or religion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is too important to ignore as families across our country continue to fall victim to hate crimes. We have over 200 bipartisan Members of the House of Representatives who have signed on to H.R. 1343, and we ask the leadership to bring this issue before the House to show American families that hate crimes are taken seriously.

This Congress has a responsibility to fight against hate and this bill will provide that commitment. I look forward to hearing the rest of my colleagues on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GANSKE 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 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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas 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 Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BRINGING TO HOUSE FLOOR H.R. 1343, THE LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I will not take my 5 minutes, but I will yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. Speaker, the Conyers-Woolsey hate crimes bill is approaching that critical mass where we will soon have the 218 votes. This Special Order is generated to pick up the last dozen or so cosponsors that we would like to have to have the bill brought forward as quickly as possible.

The Members will recall that there has been hate crimes legislation since 1968, and what we do is take away some of the restrictions which would prevent us from bringing in Federal jurisdiction to aid local law enforcement. This bill does not supplant the law enforcement at the local level. We assist them and work in a cooperative spirit with them.

Particularly, we take away the existing Federal jurisdictional requirements that a Federal act is impeded upon as a result of the incident. For example, voting, interstate commerce, or some other Federal nexus is required to trigger the bill under its current legal status. What we do is to say for crimes of gender, sex, sexual orientation, we remove a Federal requirement because a hate crime is a hate crime whether there is a Federal nexus or not.

Many States have hate crimes legislation, except for the fact that 21 of them are admittedly very weak. Five States have none at all. What we are doing is in the wake of September 11, what we are doing is saying that there has been a dramatic increase of hate crimes activity. The lawyers on the Committee on the Judiciary have discovered with the Council for Islamic Relations that there are nearly 1,500 reported cases, frequently of people who were mistaken to be of Arab descent and were not, but they were clearly crimes that would fall into this category that we find so offensive.

So what we are saying is now is the time as we move forward in a democratic way under a semi-war circumstance that we make these final improvements to the bill, and we are hoping that it can be done as expeditiously as possible.

My thanks to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), for her indefatigable efforts in this; and I am very proud that she is working with us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

□ 1230

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for his leadership on this issue. We certainly appreciate his leadership and sponsorship of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. Consideration of this bill is long overdue, and its passage is absolutely critical. I urge the House Republican leadership to allow the bill to come to the floor for a vote.

H.R. 1343 gives law enforcement officers at all levels of government the tools they need to deal with these terrible acts of hate-based violence. This legislation also sends a message to the world that crimes committed against people because of who they are or what they believe are particularly evil and particularly offensive and will not be tolerated in this country.

These types of crimes are committed not just against individuals, not just against a single person, but against society and against all Americans. These crimes are not only meant to hurt the unfortunate individual who falls victim to such acts, but they are also meant to intimidate, harass, and menace others who were not directly attacked.

A few years ago a man filled with hate shot up a Jewish community center in Los Angeles, wounding children and teachers in a place that was supposed to be a protective sanctuary for children. Following his capture the man said he had shot at those children because he wanted to send a message. He said he wanted to send a wake-up call to America to kill Jews.

By passing this bill we will be rejecting such messages and committing the full measure of our justice system to ending such hateful violence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman's time has expired.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) exercise the time now that he had under his own name in his own right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would be the Chair's normal course to go to the Republican side of the aisle; but if there is no objection, the gentleman is on the list for 5 minutes.

Is there an objection to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) to have his 5 minutes right now?

There was no objection.

#### HATE CRIMES PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill also honors the memory of James Byrd, who was horribly dragged to his death behind a pickup truck simply because his killers did not like the color of his skin. It honors Matthew Shepherd, who was beaten and tied to a fence post and left to die in near freezing weather because he was gay. It honors not only the victims of high-profile crimes, it honors the thousands of people whose lives have been scarred by similar acts of hate and violence.

Hate crimes legislation is not a partisan issue. It is not about political posturing. It is not about us versus them. This is an issue that transcends politics.

I urge the House leadership to allow a vote on this important measure, and I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1343.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of H.R. 1343, the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act. I am so pleased to see that this issue is coming up to the forefront here nationally.

In California we worked long and hard and had a task force that looked at hate crimes up and down the State. We compiled valuable information that assists law enforcement in identifying hate crimes and enforcing the law.

The events of September 11 have continued to demonstrate the destructive power of hate to tear apart the unity of an entire Nation. In the wake of the terrorist attacks, the Arab American Anti-Discrimination Committee has investigated, documented and referred to Federal authorities over 500 instances. Moreover, the Council on American-Islamic Relations has compiled over 1,400 complaints of hate attacks directed against American Muslims. This is a 51 percent increase in reported crimes.

These instances include the murders of a Muslim Pakistani store owner in Dallas, Texas, and an Indian American gas station owner in Mesa, Arizona, where a suspect was arrested shouting, "I stand for America all the way."

The Department of Justice, however, has opened only approximately 250 investigations of hate crimes directed against institutions or people who appeared to be Arab or Middle Easterners. September 11 and the Arab American situation only represents the tip of a proverbial iceberg.

Hate crimes against any group regardless of race, color or creed should not be tolerated in our great American democratic society. As the James Byrd and the Matthew Shepherd tragedies

demonstrate, not only can the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes strain the resources of State and local law enforcement agencies, but social unrest is even more of a drain on the fabric of our society.

Current law limits Federal jurisdiction over hate crimes to federally protected activities such as voting and does not permit Federal involvement in a range of cases involving crimes motivated by bias against the victim's sexual orientation, gender or disabilities. This loophole is particularly significant given the fact that five States have no hate crime laws on the books, and another 21 States have extremely weak hate crimes laws.

H.R. 1343 will remove these hurdles so the Federal Government will no longer be handicapped in its efforts to assist in the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

#### KLAMATH BASIN TRAGEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, each of us remembers last summer's dramatic national headlines about the several Federal biologists who turned off 100 percent of the water to hundreds of family farmers in the Klamath Basin of northern California and southern Oregon and shut down an entire community.

This week the National Academy of Sciences, perhaps the most highly respected scientific body in this country, has concluded, quote, "There was no scientific or technical information to justify that decision." Let me repeat that statement, Mr. Speaker. There was no scientific or technical information to justify the decision that stripped 1,500 family farmers of their livelihoods, drove a community of 70,000 to the brink of economic collapse, and caused irreparable social harm and changed the lives of thousands of people forever.

All of this was done, Mr. Speaker, because the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service biologists merely theorized that withholding water deliveries would benefit the fish. There were no certain facts to back up those theories. There was no hard evidence, no historical proof, only guesswork. In fact, the historical proof told them the opposite, but they consciously chose to ignore it. And the steps they said had to be taken, the Academy's report tells us, are probably harmful.

How could the Academy have reached such a vastly different conclusion? Because, Mr. Speaker, the Klamath Basin tragedy is nothing short of scientific sabotage. The radical environmentalists have hijacked the Endangered Species Act, a well-meaning species protection measure, and are using it as a political tool, a bludgeon against rural Americans to advance a radical political agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I am an environmentalist. The ranchers in my district of northern California are environmentalists. Klamath Basin farmers are environmentalists. In fact, one could not find a group of people who have worked harder to preserve the environment for fish, for birds, and for wildlife refuges in their area. No one knows the land better. No one cares for it more than those who depend upon it for their survival.

Americans should be outraged. We do not have to sacrifice the well-being of our citizens to protect species in this country. It does not have to be an either-or proposition. You see, through fish screens, improvements to water quality, and other common-sense steps, we could have found a solution that would have enabled Klamath Basin fish and farmers to get well together without callously taking 100 percent of their water away from these communities.

The dirty truth is the radical environmentalists do not want balance, and species protection is not necessarily their goal. They want to bankrupt farmers and other rural Americans because they want the water and they want the land, and they are misusing the Endangered Species Act to that eminently destructive end.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to plead with my colleagues that they take a hard look at how the Endangered Species Act is being used as a political tool, and to recognize that it is no longer working as a species protective tool. Many of us have long observed this happening.

This week's National Academy of Sciences study lends incredible proof for the Nation to see. Our farmers must be made whole for the economic losses that they have sustained. The administration must act immediately to ensure full water deliveries. We must also demand updates in the law that will guarantee that future species decisions will be solidly grounded in fact, just by sound science, tested and supported by available evidence. Only then will we be able to truly protect the environment and ensure that American citizens are protected from the calculated misuse of the law.

#### UTAH WELCOMES THE WINTER OLYMPICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the 2002 Winter Olympic Games will officially begin. Tomorrow the world will be welcome to Utah. Visitors from across the globe will quickly discover that they have arrived at the most beautiful and diverse of the 50 States.

People will be thrilled by the snow-capped rugged mountains, the rustic lands and the greatest snow on Earth. Utah will welcome the world with its

beauty, its charm and its unique warmth and personality. It will not take long for visitors to witness the kindness, hospitality and common decency that are the hallmarks of the great people of the State of Utah.

There will be artistic demonstrations, performances and opportunities for all who participate to learn about the great heritage of the West. Utah will welcome the world with its values.

Preparing for the Olympic Games has not been a short-term task. Individuals in Utah have devoted years to anticipating and planning for this time. And the manner in which they have prepared is demonstrative of their spirit. In Utah, record numbers of individual citizens will serve as Olympic volunteers. Doctors and nurses will donate their time to be first responders in case of illness or injury. Active citizens will greet athletes at the airport, be on hand to provide directions, and ensure a smooth and successful Olympic Games.

For the first time in Olympic history, Salt Lake City has developed a plan to ensure that its neediest populations are served during the Olympics. For example, each evening volunteers will pick up surplus food from Olympic venues and deliver it to the Utah Food Bank from which it will be available to families and the elderly. Utah will welcome the world with its tradition of service.

Throughout all the planning there has been a focus on safety and security. With Federal support and volunteers from surrounding States, Utah's courageous law enforcement personnel will ensure the greatest level of safety possible during the Olympic Games. Utah will welcome the world with its preparation and security.

□ 1245

In every preparation, the Olympic efforts have not been accomplished by one individual. They have taken the sacrifice and dedication of all the citizens of Utah, but in the end, they will not be Utah's games. They will be America's games.

It will be the triumph of our Nation that in the face of great tribulation we did not shrink; we did not fear to go forward in the effort. We demonstrated great courage by pressing on and opening our hearts and our country to the world. America will welcome the world with its unity and resolve.

As the Winter Olympic Games for 2002 have taken on a particular significance as a symbol of global unity and peace, the moral value of the games has become apparent. In order to protect the value and integrity of such international competitions, and of amateur athletics in general, we must not allow the practices like the use of performance-enhancing substances to tarnish the spirit of such significant events. We should expect, in fact we should demand, that Olympic athletes, that all athletes, compete free of performance-enhancing substances.

For sports to meet this standard, there must be a fair testing process. In the year 2000, the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse's National Commission on Sports and Substance Abuse published a report on the practice of doping in Olympic sports. The report says there has been no independent and accountable organization with the authority to create and administer a truly effective antidoping program, and recent data has shown that doping is occurring in increasing rates among our youth.

This report made several specific recommendations to address the practice of doping, and these included mustering the political will to demand a drug-free Olympics; ensuring that an independent authority exists and standards are set for testing practices; researching the long-term health consequences of performance-enhancing substances, with particular emphasis on youth; improving the cost effectiveness of testing; and conducting non-competition testing to develop baselines and generate valid and reliable tests.

Several of those steps have already been implemented.

In year 2000, the U.S. Olympic Committee established the U.S. Anti-Doping Agency as a result of criticism that drug testing and rules enforcement needed to be completely independent of the Olympic committee, and the antidoping agency was designated as the official antidoping agency for Olympic sport.

Another recommendation of the commission has already been implemented by the Salt Lake Olympic Committee, the concept of "Athlete Testing Passports." But more must be done.

For there to be fair, dope-free competition, there must be a fair, reliable and valid method to test for banned substances. Without a fair method of testing, athletes and the public cannot have confidence in the fairness of the competition itself. Much is at stake if the practices of doping are not curtailed.

There is the symbolic value of the Olympics, there is the examples we are setting for our youth, and finally there is the actual health of our youth. That is why I introduced legislation this week that would implement many of the other recommendations of the committee's report.

My bill, the Fair Play in Sport Act, would invest additional resources in developing more valid and reliable tests and conduct more extensive research into the long-term health aspects.

I certainly encourage people's support of this bill. We look forward to welcoming the world to Utah with the Olympic games.

#### ELIMINATING INCOME TAX ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order

of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I introduced a piece of legislation that would have the result of eliminating income taxes on unemployment compensation benefits. Since 1986 that had been a part of the tax structure of our country, that even those who have lost their jobs and have received and started to receive unemployment compensation benefits would have had to include those benefits in their gross income for tax purposes.

My bill would eliminate that from now on. Actually the bill would call for elimination of tax on unemployment benefits starting retroactively to January of 2001 so that the entire tax year of 2001 would be one in which there would be no income tax applicable to unemployment compensation benefits. This has the happy circumstance and coincidence of also covering all the people who lost their jobs after September 11, and we know what happened to the economy as a result of that terror jolt that happened across the world.

So here we have a prospect of eliminating a vexatious tax, and it has some admirable consequences. Number one, it fits in perfectly with President Bush's first announced support of extending unemployment compensation, which is going to occur, we are sure.

Secondly, it comports with his desire to cut taxes as an economic stimulus tool. So here we have perhaps just a modest number of dollars that will remain in the pockets of our unemployed; but that in itself, that modest amount, can act as additional wherewithal for an unemployed person to use for his family, so that the tax cut that is employed also acts as an economic stimulus. So we have the best of all worlds.

The bill standing by itself, I aim to make a subject of a "Dear Colleague" to entertain as many cosponsors as possible; but I have a larger scenario in mind. The other body has passed, we believe, an unemployment compensation extension of 13 weeks to the current system of unemployment comp. When that reaches the House, I aim to add or try to add my bill as an amendment to the extension of unemployment benefits and thus be able to complete the entire issue in one fell swoop.

This unemployment compensation benefit tax cut, as I want to call it, should meet with approval from every sector of our economy and from our employer base and from our IRS operatives as well. This will be one way that some of the paperwork in which they are engaged can be eliminated and proper credit be given to unemployment compensation benefits.

One other note, Mr. Speaker. If this should not pass and become law before April 15, it means that the tax returns filed for the year 2001 would not be able to include credit for the taxes paid by unemployed people on their benefits.

We have the pure understanding that if it passes after April 15 the individuals who can benefit from this could file an amended return; and thus we are sure that whatever reduction in their tax would be applicable for the year 2001 would be garnered by them whether it is passed before April 15 or after April 15.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the House to join with me in this effort to rid the unemployed from a vexatious and unfair tax. It is simply unfair and wrong to continue the practice of taxing unemployment compensation benefits.

#### STIMULATING THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, dealing with the slumping economy will prove every bit as challenging to the Congress as fighting terrorism. No one challenges the need to protect American citizens from further terrorist attacks, but there is much debate throughout the country as to how it should be done and whether personal liberty here at home must be sacrificed.

Many are convinced that our efforts overseas might escalate the crisis and actually precipitate more violence. A growing number of Americans are becoming concerned that our efforts to preserve security will result in the unnecessary sacrifice of that which we have pledged to protect, our constitutionally protected liberty.

A similar conflict also exists once government attempts to legislate an end to a recession. In the 1970s, wage and price controls were used to suppress price inflation and to help the economy without realizing the futility of such a policy. Not only did it not work, the economy was greatly harmed. Legislation per se is not necessarily harmful; but if it reflects bad policy, it is.

The policy of wage and price controls makes things worse and represents a serious violation of people's rights. Today, we hear from strong advocates of higher taxation, increased spending, higher budget deficits, tougher regulations, bailouts and all kinds of subsidies and support programs as tools to restore economic growth. The Federal Reserve recognized early on the severity of the problems, and over the past year lowered short-term interest rates in an unprecedented 11 times, dropping the Fed funds rate from 6½ percent to 1¾.

This has not helped, and none of these other suggestions can solve the economic problems we face either. Some may temporarily help a part of the economy, but the solution to restoring growth lies not in more government but less. It is precisely too much government and especially manipulation of credit by the Federal Reserve

that precipitated the economic downturn in the first place.

Increasing that which caused the recession cannot possibly at the same time be the solution. The magnitude of the distortions of the 1990s brought on by artificially low interest rates orchestrated by the Fed on top of 30 years of operating with a fiat currency worldwide suggests that this slow down will not abort quickly. The Japanese economy has been in a slump for over 10 years and shows no signs of recovery.

The world economies are more integrated than ever before. When they are growing, it is a benefit to all; but in a contraction, globalism based on fiat money and an international government assures that most economies will be dragged down together. Evidence is abundant that most countries of the world are feeling the pressure of a weakening economy.

Many of our political and economic leaders have been preaching that more consumer spending can revitalize the economy. This admonition, of course, fails to address the reality of a record high \$7.5 trillion, and rising, consumer debt. "Today a party, tomorrow an economic hangover" has essentially been our philosophy for decades; but there is always a limit to deficit spending, whether it is private or governmental, and the short-term benefits must always be paid for in one form or another later on.

Those who felt and acted wealthy in holding the dot-com and Enron stocks were brought back to Earth with a shattering correction. There is a lot more of this type of correction yet to come in the financial sector. In recessions, to remain solvent consumers ought to tighten the belts, pay off debt and save. In a free market, this would lower interest rates to once again make investments attractive.

The confusing aspect of today's economy is that consumers and even businesses continue profligate borrowing in spite of the problems on the horizon. Interest rates, instead of rising, are pushed dramatically downward by the Federal Reserve creating massive amounts of new credit. This new credit, according to economic law, must in time push the value of the dollar down and general prices up. When this happens and the dollar is threatened on exchange markets, the cost of living is pushed sharply upward. The Central Bank is then forced then to raise interest rates, as they did in 1979, when the rates hit 21 percent.

Even before any need to tighten, interest rates may rise or not fall as expected. This has just happened in the year 2001. Even with Fed fund rates at 40-year lows, the 10- and 30-year rates have not fallen accordingly. Many corporate bond rates have stayed high, and credit card rates have stayed in double digits. This happens because the market discounts for debt quality and future depreciation of the dollar.

The Fed cannot control these rates, and they cannot control where the new

credit they create goes. This means that resorting to or trusting in the Fed to bail out the economy and accommodate a congressional spending is foolhardy and dangerous. This policy has led to a record default for U.S. corporate bonds, and worldwide \$110 billion of bonds were defaulted on last year.

Monetary inflation is the chief cause of recessions. Therefore, we must never expect that this same policy will reverse the economic dislocations it has caused. For over a year the Fed has been massively inflating the money supply, and there is no evidence that it has done much good. This continuous influx of new credit, instead, delays the correction that must inevitably come, the liquidation of bad debt and the reduction of overcapacity.

This is something Japan has not accomplished in 12 years of interest rates of around 1 percent. The market must be left to eliminate the misdirected investments and allow the sound investments to survive.

□ 1300

There are other policies that will assist in a recovery that the Congress could implement: all taxes ought to be lowered, government spending should be reduced, controls of labor costs should be removed, and onerous regulations should be reduced or eliminated. We should not expect any of this to happen unless the people and the Congress decide that free market capitalism and sound money are preferable to a welfare state and fiat money.

Whether this downturn is the one that will force that major decision upon us is not known, but eventually we will have to make it. Welfareism and our expanding growing foreign commitments, financed seductively through credit creation by the Fed, are not viable options. Transferring wealth to achieve a modicum of economic equality and assuring the role and assuming the role of world policemen, while ignoring economic laws regarding money and credit, must lead to economic distortions and a lower standard of living for most citizens. In the process, dependency on the government develops and Congress attempts to solve all the problems with a much more visible hand than ADAM SMITH recommended.

The police efforts overseas and the effort to solve the social and economic problems here at home cannot be carried out without undermining the freedoms that we all profess to care about. Sadly lacking in the Congress is a conviction that free markets, that is, truly free markets, and sound money can provide the highest standard of living for the greatest number of people. Instead, we operate with a system that compromises free markets and causes economic injury to a growing number of people while rewarding special interests and steadily undermining the principles of liberty.

Unfortunately, the policy of monetary inflation is most harmful to the

poor and the middle class, especially in the early stages. Since rejecting the current system and endorsing economic freedom diminishes the power and influence of politicians, it is difficult to get political support for such a program. The necessary changes will only come when the American people wake up to the reality and insist that the Congress pursue only those goals permitted under the Constitution.

Instead of moving in the direction of freer markets, the more problems the Western countries face, the more government programs are demanded. If one looks at Europe, the United States, or even Japan, as their economies weaken, government involvement in the economy increases. But in China and Russia, where the horrible conditions that communism caused, ironically made those two countries move toward freer markets when they encountered serious problems. Even the central banks of these two countries today are accumulating gold, while Western central banks are selling.

The reason for this is that the conventional wisdom of the West's political and economic leaders is that there is a third way that is best, or an alternative to the extremes of too much freedom, laissez-faire capitalism, and too little freedom, authoritarianism, socialism, and communism. But this is a myth. One can only justify intervention in the market on principle or against it.

There is always the hope that government will be prudent and limit its intrusion in the economy with low taxes, minimal regulations, a little inflation, and only a few special interest favors. Yet the record is clear. Any sign of distress prompts government action for any and every conceivable problem. Since each action by the government not only fails in its attempt to solve the problem it addresses, it creates several new problems in addition while prompting even more government intervention.

Here in the United States, we have seen the process at work for several decades with steady growth in the size and scope of the Federal bureaucracy and the corresponding reduction of our personal liberties. This principle also applies to overseas intervention. One episode of meddling in the affairs of other nations leads to several new problems, requiring even more of our attention and funding. This system leads to a huge bureaucratic government manipulated by politicians and generates an army of special interests that flood the system with money and demands. To achieve and maintain political power in Washington, these powerful special interests must be satisfied.

This is a well-known problem and prompts some serious-minded and well-intentioned Members to want to legislate campaign finance reforms. But the reforms proposed would actually make the whole mess worse. They would regulate access to the Members of Con-

gress and dictate how private money is spent in campaigns. This merely curtails liberty while ignoring the real problem: a government that ignores the Constitution naturally passes out largess.

Even under today's conditions, where money talks in Washington, if enough Members would just refuse either to accept or be influenced by the special interests, government favors would no longer be up for sale. Since politicians are far from perfect, the solution is having a government of limited size acting strictly within the framework of the Constitution. No matter how strictly campaign finance laws are written, they will do only harm if the rule of law is not restored and if Congress refuses to stop being manipulated by the special interests.

Most people recognize the horrible mess that Washington is and how campaign money and lobbyists influence the system. But the reforms proposed only deal with the symptoms and not the cause. There is a sharp disagreement in what to do about it, but no one denies the existence of the problem. It is just hard for most to acknowledge that the welfare state is out of control and should not be in existence anyway. Therefore, they misdirect our attention toward campaign finance reform, rather than deal with the real problem.

Very few in Washington, however, recognize the dire consequences to economic prosperity that welfareism, warfarism, and inflationism cause. Most believe that the occasional recession can be easily handled by government programs and a Federal Reserve policy designed to stimulate growth. It has happened many times already and almost everyone believes that in a few months our economy and stock market will be roaring once again.

This is where I disagree. Every recession in the last 30 years, since the dollar became a purely fiat currency, has ended after a significant correction and resumption of all the bad policies that caused the recession in the first place. Each rebound required more spending, more debt, and easy credit than the previous recovery did. And with each cycle the government got bigger and more intrusive.

Bigger government with more monetary debasement and deficit spending means a steady erosion of the free market and personal freedoms. This is not tolerated because the people enjoy or even endorse higher taxes, more regulations and fewer freedoms. It is tolerated because most people believe that their financial and economic security is the responsibility of the government. They believe they are better off with government assistance in facilitating the free market, having been taught for decades that it is necessary for government to put a human face on capitalism.

Extreme capitalism, that is, freedom, we have been told, is just as dangerous as extreme socialism. As long as this belief prevails, our system will continue in its inexorable march towards

fascist-type socialism. However, support for today's policies is built on the fallacy that material wealth and general prosperity are best achieved with this third way: interventionism, while avoiding the dangers of communism and socialism. This is coupled with the firm conviction that the sacrifice of freedom will be minimal and limited and that the very rich can be adequately taxed and regulated to help the poor.

This is a fallacy because more freedom will be lost than is expected and the productivity of the market will suffer more than anticipated. Once this realization occurs, it will suddenly be discovered that the apparent wealth of the Nation is a lot less than calculated. An economy that depends on ever-increasing rates of monetary inflation will appear much healthier and the people much richer than is the actual case. Owners of the dot-com companies or the Enron stocks know what it is like to feel rich one day and very poor the next.

This is not a unique experience, but one that should be expected and is predictable. Countries that inflate their currencies must adjust their values periodically with sudden devaluations which destroy the pseudowealth of the middle class and the poor. The wealthy, more often than not, can protect themselves from the sudden shocks to the monetary system. However, they cannot protect from the insidious loss of liberty that accompanies these adjustments, and eventually everyone suffers.

Our dollar system is quite similar to the Argentine and Mexico peso systems that periodically make sudden and painful adjustments. But ours is different in one respect because the dollar is accepted as the reserve currency of the world, the paper gold of the world financial system. This gives us license to inflate, that is, steal, for longer periods of time. And we can avoid sudden and sharp devaluations since the world's currencies are defined by our dollar.

But this does not permit the ultimate devaluation that will bring a significant increase in the cost of living to all Americans but hurt the poor and the middle class the most. This special status of the dollar only makes the problem of the illusion of wealth much worse. Since our bubble can last a lot longer due to our perceived military and economic strength, it appears that our wealth is much greater than it actually is. Because of our unique position as the economic powerhouse of the world, we are able to borrow more than anyone else. Foreigners loan us exorbitant sums as our current account deficits soar out of sight.

The U.S. now has a foreign debt of over \$2 trillion. Perceptions and illusions and easy credit allow our consumers to spend even in recessions, by rolling up even more debt in a time when market forces are saying that borrowing should decrease and the debt

burden lessen. Our corporations follow the same pattern, keeping afloat with more borrowing.

Ideas regarding the national debt have been transformed. Presidents Jefferson and Jackson despised government debt and warned against it. Likewise, both detested central banking, which they knew inevitably would be used to liquidate the real debt through the mischievous process of monetary debasement.

Today, few decry the debt, except for the purpose of political demagoguery when convenient. The concern about deficits expressed by liberal big spenders does not merit credibility. But even conservative spenders now are less likely to decry deficits, and some actually praise them. Just recently, the Conservative Institute for Policy Innovation announced in a national press release, "National debt can lead to a growing economy and it produces steady long-term growth, greater security and a higher standard of living."

This would not be so bad if it came from a typical Keynesian think tank; but this is the growing conventional wisdom of many conservatives whose goal it is to generate government revenues, painlessly, of course, not to drastically shrink the size of government and restore personal liberty. What they fail to recognize, once they lose interest in shrinking the size of government, is that government borrowing always takes money from productive enterprises while placing these funds in the hands of politicians whose prime job is to serve special interests.

Deficits are a political expedience that also forces the Federal Reserve to inflate the currency while reducing in real terms the debt owed by the government by depreciating the value of the currency. Those who would belittle the critics of the deficit and national debt are merely supporting a system of big government, whether it is welfare or warfare or both.

Debt per se is not the only issue. It is also because the debt always encourages the growth in the size of government, allowing it to be seductively financed through inflation or borrowing, is what makes it so bad. Just because it is less painful at first and payment is delayed, we should not be tempted to endorse this process. If liberty is our goal and minimal government a benefit to a sound economy, we must always reject debt and deficits as a legitimate tool for improving the economy and the welfare of the greatest number of people. The principle of authoritarian government is endorsement whenever deficits are legitimized. All those who love liberty must reject the notion that deficits and debt perform a useful function.

It is possible this recession may end in a few months, as the optimists predict. But if it does, other problems are only delayed. The fundamental correction will still be necessary to preserve the productivity of a market economy. If we do not change our ways, the fi-

ancial bubble will just go back to inflating again. The big correction, like that which Argentina is now experiencing, with rapid disappearance of paper wealth, will eventually hit our economy. The longer the delay, the bigger will be the bust and greater the threat to our freedoms and institutions.

Since we are moving toward the big correction, we are going to see a lot more wealth removed from our balance sheets and our retirement accounts. The rampant price inflation that results will erode the purchasing power of all fixed-income retirement funds, like Social Security, and mean a lower standard of living for most people. The routine government response of increasing benefits for living expenses and medical care will never keep up with the needs or the demands. Eventually, we will have to give up and a new economic system will have to be devised, as occurred in the Soviet system after 1989.

Wealth, the product of labor, investment, and savings, can never be substituted by government spending or by a central bank that creates new money out of thin air. Governments can only give things they first take from someone else. Printing money only diminishes the value of each monetary unit. Neither can create wealth. Both can destroy it.

The dilemma is that early on, and sometimes for many years, as we have experienced, transferring wealth and printing money seems to help more than it hurts. That is because the wealth is not real and the trust funds, like Social Security, hold no actual wealth. A pension fund with dot-coms and Enron stock hold no wealth either. Unfortunately, the stocks and bonds remaining are worth a lot less than most people realize.

□ 1315

The Social Security System depends on the value of the dollar and on future taxation. The Fed can create unlimited amounts of money that Congress needs, and Congress can raise taxes as it wants, but this policy guarantees that the dollar cannot maintain its purchasing power, and that there will not be enough young people to tax in the future. Increasing benefits under these circumstances can only be done at the expense of the dollar. Catching up with the current system of money and transfer payments is equivalent to a person on a treadmill who expects to get to the next town. It does not work.

The economic loss is bad enough, but whether it is fighting the war on terrorism, acting as the world's policeman or solving the problems of vanishing wealth, the real insult will come from the freedoms we lose. These freedoms, vital to production and wealth formation, are necessary and represent what the American dream is all about. They are what made us the richest Nation in all of history, but this we will lose if Congress is not careful with what it does in the coming months.

Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, the knowledge that we are now vulnerable from outside attacks is shared by all Americans. The danger is clear and present, and everybody wants something done about it. There is, however, no unanimity as to the cause of the attacks, who is responsible, and what has to be done. The President has been given congressional authority to use force against "those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States."

A large majority of Americans are quite satisfied that his efforts have been carried out with due diligence, but a growing number of Americans are becoming aware that antiterrorist efforts both at home and abroad will have unintended consequences that few anticipated, and that in time will not be beneficial to U.S. security and will undermine our liberties here at home. Let me name a few potential dangers we face.

Number one, there is a danger that the definition of terrorism will become so vague and broad that almost any act internationally or domestically will qualify. If our response in Afghanistan becomes the standard for all countries in their retaliation, negotiated settlements of conflicts will become a thing of the past; acts of terror occurring on a regular basis around the world, whether involving Northern Ireland and Britain, India and Pakistan, the Palestinians and Israel, Turkey and Greece, or many other places. Traditionally, the United States has always urged restraint and negotiations. This approach may end if our response in Afghanistan sets the standard.

Number 2. Another danger is that the administration may take it upon itself to broadly and incorrectly interpret H.J. Res. 64, the resolution granting authority to the President to use force to retaliate against only those responsible for the recent attacks launched against the United States. Congress did not authorize force against all terrorist attacks throughout the world if the individuals involved were not directly involved in the September 11 attacks. It would be incorrect and dangerous to use this authority to suppress uprising throughout the world. This authority cannot be used to initiate an all-out attack on Iraq or any other nation we might find displeasing, but that did not participate in the September 11 attacks.

Number 3. An imprecise definition of who is or who is not a terrorist may be used to justify massively expanding our military might around the world. For every accused terrorist, there will be a declared freedom fighter. To always know the difference is more than one can expect. Our record in the past 50 years for choosing the right side in many conflicts is poor, to say the least. Many times there is no right side from the viewpoint of American security, and our unnecessary entanglements have turned out to be the greatest threat to our security.

Number 4. There is a risk that our massive deployment of troops in many countries of the world may contribute to a greater conflict. We are today in the middle of a dangerous situation between Pakistan and India over Kashmir, both of whom possess nuclear weapons, and both of whom we generally finance. Exposing ourselves to such risk, while spending endless sums supporting both sides, makes no sense.

Number 5. Our pervasive military presence may well encourage alliances that would have been unheard of a few years ago. Now that we have committed ourselves internationally to destroying Afghanistan and rebuilding it, with a promise that we will be there for a long time, might encourage closer military alliances between Russia and China, and even others like Pakistan, Iran and Iraq, and even Saudi Arabia, countries all nervous about our military permanency in this region. Control of Caspian Sea oil is not a forgotten item for these countries, and it will not be gracefully conceded to United States oil interests. If these alliances develop, even U.S. control of the Persian Gulf oil could be challenged as well.

Number 6. Limits exist on how extensive our foreign commitments should be. It is difficult to be everywhere at one time, especially if hostilities break out in more than one place. For instance, if we were to commit our troops to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, and Iran were to decide to help Iraq at the same time the North Koreans were to decide to make a move, our capacity to wage war in both places would be limited. Already we are short of bombs from the current Afghanistan war. We had to quit flying sorties over our own cities due to costs, while depending on NATO planes to provide AWACS cover of U.S. territory. In addition, our financial resources are not unlimited, and any significant change in the value of the dollar as well as our rapidly growing deficits could play a significant role in our ability to pay our bills.

Number 7. In the area of personal liberty, we face some real dangers. Throughout our history, starting with the Civil War, our liberties have been curtailed, and the Constitution has been flaunted. Although our government continued to grow with each crisis, many of the liberties curtailed during wartime were restored. War was precise and declared, and when the war was over, there was a desire to return to normalcy.

With the current war on terrorism, there is no end in sight, and there is no precise enemy. We have been forewarned that this fight will go on for a long time. This means that a return to normalcy after the sacrifices that we are making with our freedoms is not likely. The implementation of a national ID card, national surveillance, easy-to-get search warrants and loss of financial and medical privacy will be permanent. If this trend continues, the

Constitution will become a much weaker document.

Number 8. A danger exists that the United States is becoming a police state. Just a few decades ago, this would have become unimaginable. As originally designed, in the American Republic, police powers were to be the prerogative of the States, and the military was not to be involved. Unfortunately today most Americans welcome the use of military troops to police our public places, especially the airports. Each before September 11, more than 80,000 armed Federal bureaucrats patrolled the countryside checking for violations of Federal laws and regulations. That number since September 11 has increased by nearly 50 percent, and it will not shrink. Military takeover of homeland security looks certain. Can freedom and prosperity survive if the police state continues to expand? I doubt it. It never has before in all of history, and this is a threat that Congress should not ignore.

Number 9. There is a danger that personal privacy will be a thing of the past. Even before September 11, there were attacks on the privacy of all Americans for good reasons, or so it was argued. The attacks included plans for national ID cards, a national medical data bank, and know-your-customer-type banking regulations. The need for enforcement powers for the DEA and IRS routinely prompted laws that violated the fourth amendment. The current crisis has emboldened those who already were anxious to impose restrictions on the American people. With drug and tax laws, and now with antiterrorist legislation sailing through Congress, true privacy enjoyed by a free people is fast becoming something that we will only read about in our textbooks. Reversing this trend will not be easy.

Number 10. Flying commercial airlines will continue to be a hassle and dangerous. Even travel by other means will require close scrutiny by all levels of government in the name of providing security. Unfortunately, the restrictions and rules on travel on all American citizens will do little, if anything, to prevent another terrorist attack.

Number 11. The economic ramifications of our war on terrorism are difficult to ascertain, but could be quite significant. Although the recession was obviously not caused by the attacks, the additional money spent and the effect of all regulations cannot help the recovery. When one adds up the domestic costs, the military costs and the costs of our new regulations, we can be certain that deficits are going to grow significantly, and the Federal Reserve will be required to further pursue a dangerous monetary policy of inflation. This policy will result in higher rather than lower interest rates, a weak dollar, and certainly rising prices. The danger of our economy spinning out of control should not be lightly dismissed.

Number 12. In this crisis, as in all crises, the special interests are motivated

to increase their demands. It is a convenient excuse to push for the benefits they were already looking for. Domestically this includes everyone from the airlines to the unions, insurance companies, travel agents, State and local governments, and anyone who can justify a related need. It is difficult for the military-industrial complex to hide their glee with their new contracts for weapons and related technology. Instead of the events precipitating a patriotic fervor for liberty, we see enthusiasm for big government, more spending, more dependency, greater deficits, and military confrontations that are unrelated to the problems of terrorism. We are supposed to be fighting terrorism to protect our freedoms, but if we are not careful, we will lose our freedoms and precipitate more terrorist attacks.

Lastly, not much empathy is being expressed for members of the Taliban that we now hold as prisoners. The antipathy is easily understood. It is not just as a Nation we should set a good example under the rules of the Geneva Convention, but if we treat the Taliban prisoners inhumanely, there is the danger it will be surely used as an excuse to treat American prisoners in the same manner in the future. This certainly is true when we use torture to extract information, which is now being advised. Not only does that reflect on our own society as a free Nation, but torture notoriously rarely generates reliable information. This danger should not be ignored. Besides, we have nothing to gain by mistreating prisoners who have no knowledge of the September 11 attacks. The idea that those captured are terrorists responsible for the September 11 attacks begs an obvious question.

Mr. Speaker, many realists who see the world as it really is and who recognize the dilemma we face in the United States to preserve our freedoms in this time of crisis are despondent and pessimistic, believing little can be done to reverse the tide against freedom. Others who share the same concern are confident that efforts to preserve the true spirit of the Constitution can be successful. Maybe next month or next year or at some later date, I am convinced in time the love of liberty can be rejuvenated. Once it is recognized that government has no guarantee of future successes, promoting dependency and security can quickly lose its allure.

□ 1330

The Roman poet, Horace, 2,000 years ago spoke of adversity: "Adversity has the effect of eliciting talents which in times of prosperity would have lain dormant." Since I believe we will be a lot less prosperous in the not-too-distant future, we will have plenty of opportunity to elicit the talents of many Americans.

Leonard Read, one of the greatest champions of liberty in the 20th century, advised optimism:

"In every society there are persons who have the intelligence to figure out the requirements of liberty and the character to walk in its ways. This is a scattered fellowship of individuals—mostly unknown to you and me—bound together by a love of ideas and a hunger to know the plain truth of things."

Mr. Read was convinced that this remnant would rise to the occasion and do the necessary things to restore virtue and excellence to a people who had lost their way. Liberty would prevail.

Let us be convinced that there is not enough hate or anger to silence the cries for liberty or to extinguish the flame of truth and justice. We must have faith that those who now are apathetic, anxious for security at all costs, forgetful of the true spirit of American liberty, and neglectful of the Constitution, will rise to the task and respond accordingly.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. JEFFERSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. LUTHER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for February 5 and the balance of the week on account of family matters.

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for February 5 and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

#### 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:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHESON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLAY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GANSKE, for 5 minutes, February 14.

Mr. HERGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1274. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide programs for the prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of stroke; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1275. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for public access defibrillation programs and public access defibrillation demonstration projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 8, 2002, 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:

5407. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Current and Future Spectrum Use by the Energy, Water, and Railroad Industries"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5408. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Newberry and Simpsonville, South Carolina) [MM Docket No. 01-110, RM-9927, RM-10336] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5409. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Burgin and Science Hill, Kentucky) [MM Docket No. 00-173, RM-9964, RM-10328] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5410. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (McConnelsville, Ohio) [MM Docket No. 00-172, RM-9963] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5411. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Sabinal, Texas) [MM Docket No. 01-187, RM-10174] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5412. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau,

Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Ancillary or Supplementary Use of Digital Television Capacity by Noncommercial Licensees [MM Docket No. 98-203] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5413. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Brightwood, Madras, Prineville and Bend, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 00-87, RM-9870, RM-9961] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5414. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Clinton and Oliver Springs, Tennessee) [MM Docket No. 00-195, RM-9973, RM-10193, RM-10194] received January 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5415. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5416. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5417. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Human Resources and Education, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5418. A letter from the Associate Administrator for Human Resources and Education, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5419. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of National Drug Control Policy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5420. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Fireworks Displays, Patapsco River, Baltimore, Maryland [CGD05-00-046] (RIN: 2115-AE46) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5421. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Fore River Bridge Repairs—Weymouth, Massachusetts [CGD01-01-223] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5422. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Port Huene Harbor, Ventura County, California [COTP Los Angeles-Long Beach 01-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5423. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone and Anchor-

age Regulations; Chicago Harbor, Chicago, Illinois [CGD09-01-153] (RIN: 2115-AA97 and 2115-AA98) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5424. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security zone and Anchorage Regulations; Lake Michigan, Navy Pier, Chicago Harbor, Chicago, Illinois [CGD09-01-139] (RIN: 2115-AA97 and 2115-AA98) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5425. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30274; Amdt. No. 2074] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5426. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30275; Amdt. No. 2075] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5427. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30282; Amdt. No. 2081] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5428. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30281; Amdt. No. 2080] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5429. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30284; Amdt. No. 2083] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5430. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30283; Amdt. No. 2082] received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5431. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Repair Stations [Docket No. FAA-1999-5836; Amendment Nos. 91-269, 121-286, 135-82, 145-27, and SFAR 36-7] (RIN: 2120-AC38) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5432. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone; Seabrook Nuclear Power Plant, Seabrook, New Hampshire [CGD01-01-207] (RIN 2115-AA97) received February 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## 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. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 344. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform (Rept. 107-358). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 3692. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that individual account plans protect workers by limiting the amount of employer stock each worker may hold and encouraging diversification of investment of plan assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 3693. A bill to prevent accountants from providing non-audit services to audit clients; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself,

Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GILCHRIST, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HORN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MICA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BAKER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THUNE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BERRY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KERNS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. OTTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

H.R. 3694. A bill to provide for highway infrastructure investment at the guaranteed funding level contained in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3695. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and intensify programs with respect to research and related activities concerning elder falls; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3696. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reimburse MedicareChoice plans located in the same metropolitan statistical area the same payment rate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3697. A bill to conduct a study regarding the improvement of pier safety standards in navigable waters; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3698. A bill to amend the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 to provide for the liquidation of blocked assets of terrorists and terrorist organizations in order to reimburse the Treasury for the compensation of claimants; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, 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. CRENSHAW (for himself and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3699. A bill to revise certain grants for continuum of care assistance for homeless individual and families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3700. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 5130 West North Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Lenora Stewart Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a temporary ex-offender low-income housing credit to encourage the provision of housing, job training, and other essential services to ex-offenders through a structured living environment designed to assist the ex-offenders in becoming self-sufficient; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 3702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for increasing employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 3703. A bill to authorize the President to distribute liquidated assets frozen pursuant to Executive Order 13224 and similar Executive orders to the victims and surviving family members of the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, and to certain other charitable funds established as a result of those attacks; to the Committee on International Relations, 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. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for credit card interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 3705. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require the Secretary of the Interior to use the best sound science available in implementing the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 3706. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide a public right-to-know for landowners in implementing the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. POMBO:

H.R. 3707. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to improve protection for endangered species habitats; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. BOSWELL):

H.R. 3708. A bill to continue the Department of Agriculture program that promotes the use of certain agricultural commodities to produce bioenergy and to expand the program to include animal fats, animal by-products, and oils as eligible agricultural commodities under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 3709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that only after-tax contributions may be made to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund and that taxpayers may designate contributions for a particular national political party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. KIND (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island):

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding democratic reform and the protection of human rights in Laos; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. KIND, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H. Con. Res. 319. Concurrent resolution honoring Henry Reuss, former United States Representative from Wisconsin, and extending the condolences of Congress on his death; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HYDE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. REYES, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding Scleroderma; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution supporting the efforts of the United Nations to formulate a comprehensive convention on international terrorism and urging the President to continue work in cooperation with all interested members of the United Nations to formulate such a convention; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PITTS:

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent 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.

By Mr. STARK:

H. Res. 345. A resolution condemning all acts of discrimination and violence and supporting the No Room for Racism campaign; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 200: Mr. GRUCCI.

H.R. 476: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 580: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 786: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 818: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 822: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 902: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1044: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1116: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1212: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 1220: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 1262: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 1543: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 1556: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1586: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1723: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1782: Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1795: Mr. COBLE, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, and Mr. GEKAS.

H.R. 1822: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1825: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2163: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2173: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 2610: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2629: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2635: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.

H.R. 2674: Mr. KIND, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. WATSON of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FILNER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 2799: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2820: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3017: Ms. BALDWIN and Ms. HART.

H.R. 3041: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3113: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 3244: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 3333: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 3337: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 3342: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3351: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. THUNE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 3358: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3389: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3424: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3478: Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 3482: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GRUCCI, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3501: Mr. WU.

H.R. 3550: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3552: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3563: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3569: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 3615: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 3624: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GRUCCI, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3684: Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 3686: Mr. TERRY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. PAYNE.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Con. Res. 316: Mr. PENCE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Res. 115: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SABO.

H. Res. 120: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H. Res. 225: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H. Res. 302: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 325: Mr. FRANK.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—  
ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 4, by Mr. RANDY “DUKE” CUNNINGHAM on House Resolution 271: Ken Bentsen.