



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 2002

No. 22

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 2002.

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

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

LEAVE NO VETERAN BEHIND WAITING FOR A MEDICAL APPOINTMENT

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, our President often proudly uses a very enthusiastic phrase committing our Nation to better education for our young people, "Let us leave no child behind," and rightly so. Children are the lifeblood of our Nation. But today, with all of the military commitments overseas, I propose another rallying cry, leave no veteran behind waiting to get a doctor's appointment.

Just as we must look ahead and nurture our children, we must look back in gratitude and take care of our veterans who have fought for freedom and democracy. Besides, investing in care for veterans is looking ahead, for timely veterans' benefits can serve as a powerful incentive in steering young people towards armed services careers.

Not a day goes by when I do not hear from a frustrated veteran who cannot get an appointment at a VA outpatient clinic or an inpatient VA bed. I suspect the same is true for most of my colleagues. For too long too few resources have been provided to the VA health care system, resulting in understaffed, underfunded facilities.

Last week Salvatore Stanzione, Assistant Executive Director of the Disabled American Veterans in Florida, presented to me some very disturbing trends. In my district and other parts of Florida, a wait of a year to see a primary care physician, and up to 16 months to see a specialist, is not unusual. Last Wednesday, Commander-in-Chief James Goldsmith of the Veterans of Foreign Wars shared that there are 37,000 veterans waiting for medical appointments in Florida. Intolerably, veterans are kept waiting for the most routine appointments, like diabetes or high cholesterol monitoring. If managed on a timely basis, these conditions are more comfortable to the veteran and less expensive to the American taxpayer.

Yesterday witnessed the bloodiest day of the Afghan War thus far. We mourn the nine American casualties of the downed Chinooks. In addition to those killed in battle, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld reported that "There have been a number of wounded." Thankfully, he relayed that "close to half of those are already back in the battle, and of the remainder, relatively few have life-threatening wounds."

Today we ask American sons and daughters to give their blood to ad-

vance liberty and to halt terrorism, but when tomorrow comes, we show our veterans a chair in the waiting room. Especially egregious is the long wait for those who served for a long period or sustained a service-connected disability.

A Federal budget, just like that of a household or business, always faces difficult economic choices. But a household must first pay its creditors and buy grocery before it buys artwork and entertainment. This is the most basic necessity of obligation. Just like a household, America ought to first meet its obligations to those whom it owes in exchange for their service.

To exacerbate matters, the government seems to shut the door on other options for health care accessibility. Alternatives have been proposed over the years on expanding VA health care options. We have debated Medicare subvention to little avail. This Thursday, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services will again consider resource sharing between the two agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the First District of Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER) knows this fight. He has not one single inpatient bed in his district. His veterans have to go to Biloxi, Mississippi, for hospitalization. Meanwhile, he has DOD facilities with available beds. Coordinating arrangements so that his veterans could use these DOD beds would solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, we are a wartime Congress, and the Nation is in an era of renewed appreciation of soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines. Defense briefs top the headlines, and the box office movies feature current episodes on the wars in Somalia and in Vietnam. Let us embrace this mood and opportunity and commit this Congress to providing the attention and resources to the health care needs of those who have served. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us leave

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.

H657

no child behind; but, similarly, let us leave no veteran behind waiting for a medical appointment.

SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, over the last 5 years in the House, initiated by the Republican majority, something which I supported, we took a series of votes on something called the Social Security lockbox. Originally, some of my colleagues on the Democratic side opposed this. They said it was a mere gimmick on the part of the Republican majority and an attempt to restrain the social spending of the Clinton administration, and the Republican majority had no intention of safeguarding those funds.

I did not believe that, and I voted for it. I said, it makes sense to me, with the retirement of the baby boom near upon us, we should safeguard those funds and be certain they are used only to pay the benefits for which they are intended by law.

Eight, ten times in the House of Representatives we voted for the lockbox, Social Security lockbox. Unfortunately, that was all superseded by a vote last March when tax cuts were voted on in the House, predicated on shaky economic assumptions that we would have huge and growing surpluses as far as the eye could see. So let us give the money back to the people. Of course, mostly to Americans who earn over \$383,000 a year and have estates worth more than \$5 million, but let us give it back. Over my objections and the objections of others, this rosy scenario was adopted. The Republican leadership said, do not worry, the Social Security lockbox will still be there.

Here we are a year later. The lockbox is crushed, robbed, torn open, and the President has proposed in his budget to spend \$1.5 trillion of the Social Security trust funds, those which were formerly intended to be placed in the lockbox, to fund tax cuts for the wealthy and other operations of the government over the next 10 years.

There is no more talk about a lockbox on the other side of the aisle with a Republican President who wants to give big tax cuts and gifts to the largest corporations and his friends. No, now they have got a new gimmick. What is it? Certificates. At taxpayer expense, we will send out to every person receiving Social Security, and, by the way, we no longer send them checks in the mail anymore because that is too expensive, but now for this special, one-time only offer, we will send out certificates to everybody currently receiving Social Security and their survivors and others receiving Social Security benefits, saying the

Social Security benefits which are being e-mailed to Americans' bank accounts, do not worry, they will keep coming. We will ensure that. These are the same people that gave us the lockbox. Now we are going to have certificates.

Mr. Speaker, how about this certificate? This is a real certificate, and this is what the majority in the House, the Republicans, have to get serious about honoring. This is an irrefutable obligation of the United States of America. Look to this line. "This bond is incontestable in the hands of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund. Bond is supported by the full faith and credit of the United States."

The United States has pledged the payment of the bond with respect to principal and interest. But in their rush to privatize Social Security and in their rush to give tax cuts to the most wealthy, they are questioning whether or not that will be honored. In fact, Secretary O'Neill, the Secretary of the Treasury, appointed by George Bush, the President, said that this is worthless. He said, starting in 2016, when we will have to draw on the interest on these bonds, that is worthless. That means he is questioning every investor in America and around the world who thinks that U.S. Treasury Bonds are the safest haven.

I believe they are. I do not believe Secretary O'Neill when he says it is worthless. I believe he and the President and the Republican leadership here are trying to rush Congress into a hasty privatization plan which will actually accelerate the problems of Social Security in another thrust to help a few people to the disadvantage of the many.

Social Security, if we honor these bonds, with the full faith and credit of the United States Government as it says right there, Social Security is totally 100 percent capable of paying 100 percent of the benefits through the year 2038. Starting in 2038, with conservative assumptions, not the rosy scenario that the Republican majority pushed through last year for the big tax cuts, but with conservative economic assumptions, it will have about a 25 to 27 percent problem. That is 73 percent of benefits could be paid forever after 2038.

So we have to address that problem, that 25 to 27 percent problem starting in 36 years. But we do not address it by further reducing the trust fund, giving them to the wealthy in tax cuts, or privatizing the system in a way that reduces trust fund income for Social Security, because then we have created an even bigger problem.

Mr. Speaker, that is the real agenda here. They want to go after Social Security. They have already broken open the lockbox; now watch for the crack-jack box top in the mail, the certificate that gives us a hollow promise.

PROTECT U.S. STEEL MANUFACTURERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am a strong advocate of free trade. As an original co-sponsor of Presidential Trade Promotion Authority, I fought on the floor of this very Chamber to give this President the ability to negotiate down trade barriers because I simply believe, as a Hoosier Member of this institution, that trade means jobs from automotive and manufactured exports to agricultural exports that we grow in such abundance in the heartland of Indiana.

But the reality is that, in the arena of worldwide steel, unfair trade practices and steel dumping have actually destroyed jobs in this country and impaired our national security.

Today we learned that President Bush has decided to impose selective tariffs of up to 30 percent on foreign steel imports using section 201 of the Trade Act. I rise today to commend the President on his decision to protect the American steel industry and, more than that, to lay the foundation to protect America's national security for generations to come.

The reality is America is recovering from a mild recession, and we must ensure that our Nation and our economy continues on a full path of recovery. A thriving steel industry will significantly aid in this task. However, the steel industry has been under increased pressure from unfairly subsidized imports of foreign steel. Foreign companies and governments have undermined our domestic industry through dumping practices and eroded our own ability to manufacture steel in this country.

In response to this problem, the International Trade Commission conducted an investigation and held hearings at which I had the privilege of testifying. The ITC unanimously found that low-priced imports have seriously injured domestic steel production in the United States. Every American should understand the steel industry has been facing years of unfair competition. These unfair trade practices have already caused over 30 bankruptcies in the steel industry and cost thousands of American jobs.

Steel production is the bedrock of a viable manufacturing base, but I also would add today that it is absolutely imperative to our national security. America must not become dependent on foreign steel, as we have become dependent on foreign oil.

□ 1245

The reality is, as the caskets are slowly lowered off the transport aircraft at Andrews Air Force Base today, the Chinooks, the Black Hawk helicopters, the rifles, the artillery that are being fired at this hour in the

mountains of eastern Afghanistan are made of steel, Mr. Speaker; and the ability of the United States of America to manufacture steel, merchantable steel, is at the very essence of our ability to provide for the common defense.

It also strengthens our economy. In Indiana, 30,000 families make their livelihood in the steel industry. Increased efficiency and technological innovation combined with our hard-working employees have made the steel industry the envy of the world. Yet our policies have been rewarding uncompetitive and destructive behavior. Domestic steel production is vital to the national interest; it is vital to strengthening our economy.

I commend the President of the United States today as we anticipate his decision, selective tariffs, using section 201 of the Trade Act. It is important that we support the steel industry in America long term and preserve our ability to produce the arsenal of democracy which gives the enemies of freedom pause and gives the friends of freedom hope all across the world.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Governors Association passed a resolution calling for action to prevent the brand-name drug industry from blocking access to lower-cost generic drugs. It turns out that the drug industry is cheating consumers out of literally billions of dollars in prescription drug savings by illegally and unethically keeping generic competitors off the market.

Shocking, is it not, that the drug industry would exploit loopholes in the law to make sure that American consumers continue to pay higher prices than necessary for lifesaving products? We are talking about the same industry that charges Americans two and three and four times what it charges in other countries. We are talking about an industry that pummels American consumers with ads on TV and in magazines and on radio promoting a handful of drugs that just happen to be some of the most expensive drugs on the market.

As a matter of fact, the drug industry's use of direct-to-consumer advertising to manipulate the public is just as insidious as the tricks the industry uses to keep generic competition off the market. The European Union does not permit direct-to-consumer advertising, neither does Japan nor Canada nor Israel. In fact, only one other country in the world, New Zealand, permits direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drugs. That is because this advertising skews health care towards the newest, most expensive drugs, regardless of whether these drugs are the

best alternative for patients and regardless of the impact on America's health care bill.

The industry claims it is doing consumers a favor, that direct-to-consumer advertising is a breakthrough in consumer education. In 2000, the drug industry advertised 1 percent of its 10,000 available prescription drugs. Ninety-five percent of all direct-to-consumer advertising was spent on just 50 of these 10,000 drugs. The drug industry claims its advertising is highly educational. Direct-to-consumer advertising is highly profitable, hardly highly educational.

Those 50 drugs I mentioned, the ones that were most heavily advertised in 2000, were responsible for half of the \$21 billion increase in prescription drug spending. And about those 50 drugs, they are not for 50 different conditions. Most of those drugs are simply copycat drugs.

We see ads for Vioxx and Celebrex, \$239 million worth, which are alternative treatments for the same condition, arthritis. We see ads for Claritin and Zyrtec and Allegra to the tune of \$227 million, all for the treatment of allergies. Billions of dollars are spent on ads for fewer than 30 health problems. American consumers pay for those ads when we shell out two and three and four times more than consumers in any other country in the world. We pay for those ads when the 50 most heavily advertised drugs account for half of the dramatic annual increase in spending.

Prescription drug inflation is fueling double-digit increases in health care premiums, it is pushing State budgets into the red, and it is forcing seniors into poverty. And behind it all are romantic images of allergy-free people digging in their gardens and playing with their puppies.

The drug industry has a chokehold on the United States. They charge Americans more than any other consumer; they manipulate American consumers with questionable TV and print ads; and they block access to affordable medicines, even though 70 million Americans, many of them seniors, do not have the benefit of insurance and are paying hundreds of dollars out of pocket.

So where is the Bush administration? Why is George Bush not outraged about this? Where is his administration? The administration does not like to be perceived as catering to large corporations at the expense of American consumers. The administration bristles at the notion that it turned to Enron and big oil when it formulated its energy policy. They do not like it when you point out that they turned to the chemical companies when writing their environmental policy, that they turned to the insurance companies when they wrote the Patients' Bill of Rights. And I am sure the administration would vehemently deny that their silence on prescription drug prices stems from their close ties to the drug industry. Well, the proof is in the pudding. This is a

litmus test in the next year what this body does about prescription drug prices, both for the President and for every Member of Congress. We report to the American public, not to the drug industry. If the President and the Congress do not break loose from the drug industry's chokehold and reign in that industry's unbridled greed, then American voters should send us all packing.

It is as simple as that.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 23, 2002, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are going to increase the debt limit of the United States in the next several days. Already, the debt limit of the United States, set at \$5.95 trillion, is being apparently violated by having a debt greater than the debt limit set by the United States. I think we need a thorough discussion in this Chamber and in the Senate and certainly in the White House of how do we want to treat debt in the United States; how deep do we want to go in debt; how much, if you will, mortgage do we want to leave to our children and our grandchildren.

It seems that it is reasonable to live within our means, not to say that our spending today is so important that it justifies leaving a larger debt or a larger mortgage to our kids and our grandkids. If we want to spend money, then it is reasonable to say to the American people and be up-front with them that we are going to increase taxes and use those revenues for existing spending rather than, I suggest, hoodwinking the American people by increasing our borrowing. The borrowing is not as obvious as tax increases. Therefore, over the last 30 years, we have said we are going to borrow more and more as government gets larger and larger and, sadly, a lot of that borrowing has come from the trust funds.

Since 1983 when we last changed the Social Security system, and we changed it by increasing taxes and reducing benefits, we have had more revenue coming in from the Social Security tax, the so-called FICA tax, than was needed to pay out Social Security benefits. Just a footnote here to mention that Social Security is a system that is, and always has been, designed to tax current workers and use that money to pay current retirees. As the number of workers per retiree has diminished since we started the program in 1934, we have developed an obvious insolvency in the Social Security system.

I have heard some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle criticize some things the Republicans are doing. It is easy to demagogue this kind of program that so many seniors find so valuable. We now have over 50

percent of our seniors that depend on the money coming in from Social Security. So it scares the heck out of seniors when anybody suggests, that somebody is going to change Social Security.

Here are the facts: Social Security is going broke. Fifty years ago we had 40 workers for every one retiree. Today, there are three workers paying in their tax for every one retiree. The actuaries estimate that by 2025 there will be two workers paying in for every retiree. And by 2040 there will be one worker for each retiree. Can you imagine the taxes and the burden on that one worker, paying in Social Security, enough taxes to cover the Social Security benefits of one retiree? There is going to be a huge unfunded cost and the burden should not be placed on future taxpayers.

Look. Nobody is going to suggest that we stop our commitment of paying Social Security benefits. So this trust fund is only a booking record of the mandate to come up with the money, starting in 2014 or 2015 or 2016. The only way to come up with the money is to either increase taxes or reduce benefits or increase borrowing. Increasing borrowing is the most politically likely to put our kids even further in debt. It is going to cost a lot of money; there is now an unfunded liability of \$9 trillion in today's dollars of the benefits that are needed to pay Social Security benefits over the next 75 years over and above what is going to come in from the FICA tax. We need to deal with it but it depends on how we deal with it. Do you do nothing? And if you do nothing, the cost is going to be substantially greater than doing something and getting a better return on some of that money paid into Social Security.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the average retiree is going to get a 1.7 percent return on the money that they and their employer invested in Social Security. We can do better than that. There needs to be a transition to earn more for the program rather than demagoguing. Let us come up with ideas and suggestions rather than playing politics, because it is a program that is worth saving.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

From the blood-stained lintels, You, Almighty God, led the Jewish people through the doors of freedom to the desert. By the Spirit, Jesus was led into the desert to discover You in prayer and fasting.

Be with the Members of Congress and draw them into the emptiness of imagining and desire where You, our mysterious Lord, always siren Your people. Total dependency upon You, symbolized by the desert, either lifts one beyond present blindness or drowns one in the abandonment of spirit.

As You lead the leaders of this Nation and other nations forward, may the American people follow with all their struggling questions of faith. Bring peaceful agreement to the holy and ancient lands of the Middle East in Your own way, in Your own time, by Your own direction.

In You we place our trust, 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. CHABOT 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.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the bill on the Private Calendar.

NANCY B. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 392) for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

MARRIAGE AND SELF-ESTEEM

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of talk these days about self-esteem. We do not want children to have low self-esteem. Whole curricula are developed about how to increase children's self-esteem.

The truth is, marriage is one of the best mental health programs for children and adults. Children born or raised outside of marriage are more likely to suffer mental health problems, such as depression. Children whose parents are not married have lower school attendance, lower school performance.

Teenagers whose parents are divorced are also more likely to have problems with substance abuse than children whose parents are married.

Married adults are significantly less likely to suffer from the problems of alcoholism and depression than non-married adults.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a mental health expert, but it seems to me that encouraging healthy marriages is a whole lot cheaper and more effective than picking up the pieces of broken marriages after it is too late.

IT IS TIME TO STAND UP FOR AMERICAN JOBS AND AMERICAN STEEL

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

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is time to stand up for American families. It is time to stand up for American jobs. It is time to stand up in this country for American steel.

Already, 30 American steel companies have declared bankruptcy, and 47,000 American steelworkers have lost their jobs. Why has that happened? The International Trade Commission has determined that trade violations and steel dumping by foreign countries have caused these losses.

Tomorrow, the administration will decide what needs to be done to punish these foreign offenders. Apparently, the administration is considering an ineffective 30 percent tariff and total exemptions for a number of foreign countries. That simply will not work. Ask the domestic steel industry; ask the steelworkers.

Let us protect American jobs. A 40 percent tariff will protect our domestic industry and provide security to American families. We expect American families and American workers to work hard and to play by the rules. We should expect the same from our foreign trading partners.

HOW MANY TERRORIST OPPORTUNITIES WILL YUCCA MOUNTAIN PROVIDE?

(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, proponents of transporting 77,000 tons of

high-level nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain proclaim that terrorists will have a more difficult time committing an act of terrorism at one singular site as opposed to 131 commercial nuclear reactors around the country.

Nonsense. What this view does not take into account is how many opportunities terrorists will now be provided if this nuclear waste is transported through 43 States, past the homes, hospitals, and schools of over 123 million Americans. Seventy-seven thousand tons of nuclear waste will require at least 96,000 truck shipments over 3 decades, giving terrorists over 96,000 opportunities to target these shipments as the next act of heinous terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues to consider the safety and welfare of the 123 million Americans whose communities could be destroyed by transporting deadly nuclear waste throughout our entire country. Protect Americans from the next possible terrorist act. Stop Yucca Mountain.

IRAQ

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for President Bush in extending our war on terrorism to the countries that make up the axis of evil: Iran, Iraq, and North Korea. These countries have all been designated as state sponsors of terrorism, and all three are engaged in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Today, Iraq poses the most serious threat to America's national security. Iraq and Iran were engaged in a war from 1980 to 1988 which killed approximately 1 million people. Just 3 years after this war was over, in 1991, Iraq invaded Kuwait. Two years after the Gulf War in 1993, Iraq tried to assassinate President George H.W. Bush when he visited Kuwait.

Iraq has consistently destabilized the Middle East over the past 20 years and is trying to acquire weapons of mass destruction which can be used against America and our allies. We should work with our allies to finally bring peace, stability, and democracy to the people of Iraq.

We must also prevent other nations from undermining our efforts to bring about a stable, democratic government in Iraq. Mr. Speaker, I fully support President Bush's efforts to eradicate international terrorism, which threatens all free, democratic nations.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which

the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT A GOLD MEDAL ON BE- HALF OF CONGRESS TO FORMER PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN AND HIS WIFE NANCY REAGAN

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 305) permitting the use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 305

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on May 16, 2002, for a ceremony to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will each control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand up on behalf of awarding the Congressional Medal to former President Reagan and his wife, Nancy.

I had a long-standing personal relationship with President Reagan, having traveled in his campaign plane going back to the East in 1976. He was a remarkable human being who knew who he was and what he was about, and he left office exactly as he entered it. Uninflated by the trappings of power, he came to do some things, he did them, and then he left.

On the night before he announced his candidacy for President in October of 1975, he gave a speech at the 20th anniversary celebration of the National Review. It was a remarkably confident, uplifting, and humorous speech; but toward the end of that speech, he looked at the world as we see it, and it was not all pretty.

He quoted something written 40 years earlier, or so, by Whittaker Chambers, a former Communist and popular writer in the 1940s and '50s. He said, "It is idle to speak of saving western civilization because western civilization is already a wreck from within. That is why we can hope to do little more than snatch a fingernail from a saint on the rack, or a handful of ash from the fagots, and bury them secretly in the flower pot against that day ages hence

when a few men will dare to believe that there once was something else, that something else was thinkable; and that there are those who, at the dark moments, took loving care to preserve the tokens of hope and truth."

Reagan was looking at a very, very dark time in America. He went on to run for President, and he did not win. In some ways, it does not matter that he did not win in that race. The day after President Ford won the nomination in Kansas City, Ronald Reagan assembled the friendly troops that had followed him so ardently for the past year, and he told them that it was just the beginning, and that we would one day reach that shining city on the Hill.

Four years later, he ran for President again. It is valuable to remember what kind of circumstances the United States faced in 1980 as he ran for President. We have heard for the last 10 years that I have been here on this floor that the 1980s was a decade of greed and that he ran us into all kinds of debt. But let us lay some facts on the table. Facts, as it has been said, are stubborn things.

When Ronald Reagan ran for President, we had interest rates of 21 percent, we had home mortgages at 17 percent, inflation at 14 percent, and double-digit unemployment. He faced these challenges on that January day when he was sworn into office, and he listed them one after the other. Then he told the American people that we can conquer this, because, after all, we are Americans.

Over the next 10 years, not Ronald Reagan and not government policy, but the American people, changed the world with a cut in taxes to take the burden of paying for government off the backs of small businesses, the creators of jobs, with a significant reduction in regulations across the board. The American people, over the next 8 or 10 years, created 4 million businesses and nearly 20 million new jobs. The revenues to the Federal Government after reducing taxes doubled from \$519 billion in 1980 to \$1 trillion 54 billion in 1990.

The American people are a generous sort and also increased their contributions to strangers, people they have never met, through charities from \$48 billion in 1980 to around \$100 billion in 1990. It is now \$195 billion.

Ronald Reagan would be reluctant to take any credit for any of this. He set a tone. He set a tone for the United States, and they followed it. In the 4 years before he became President, from 1976 to 1980, communist influence had increased in 14 major areas around the world from Afghanistan to Zambia. When Ronald Reagan took office, he was facing probably the largest expansion of communist activity in the history of this past century.

As he left office, quietly, without bragging, without talking, communism was collapsing on its own. Shortly thereafter, the Berlin Wall fell, and the

whole idea of communism and socialism were both empirically and theoretically discredited. We now face expansions of freedom around the world.

He was an unassuming and decent man, and the American people saw that. They saw what he was, and they gave him two huge Presidential victories. But my favorite story about him was told by his friend of many, many years, Mike Deaver, who, while walking with Ronald Reagan on the streets of Manhattan in 1978, I believe it was, after he had run for President, and much of the world knew who he was from that campaign, he was walking down the street in Manhattan and saw someone inching toward him, wanting to get his autograph, thinking he knew who he was, but not sure.

Reagan, ever the polite gentleman, turned to him and put his hand out and said hello. The gentleman looked at Ronald Reagan and said, Could I get your autograph, Mr. Milland? Ronald Reagan signed "Ray Milland" and moved on. Mike Deaver said, why didn't you tell him who you were? Ronald Reagan said, I know who I am. He wanted to meet Ray Milland.

That is the kind of guy he was, the kind of President he was. He and Mrs. Reagan deserve to be honored with a Congressional Medal as a marvelous team in the history of this great country.

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

□ 1415

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution to authorize a ceremony to present a Congressional Gold Medal to former President Ronald Reagan and to Nancy Reagan. I regret that President Reagan will not be present for that ceremony.

H.R. 3591, enacted in the last Congress as Public Law 106-251, authorized presentation of this gold medal to our 40th President and our First Lady.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan was a strong leader, both substantively in terms of policy and symbolically in terms of the image he projected to the American people. He was a significant figure at a critical point in time in our history. Ronald Reagan was clearly an effective advocate for his views, and he retained the affection of the American people throughout his Presidency. President Reagan was skilled at representing the office of the Presidency as well as his policies. He was an individual, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has said, simple, unassuming, profound in some ways and a thoroughly decent human being.

I want to take this opportunity as well to salute Nancy Reagan his wife, an active First Lady and a devoted spouse both in the White House and in the difficult days since she has coped with the former President's tragic Alzheimer's disease. Nancy Reagan has been a tireless proponent of programs

to prevent alcohol and drug abuse as well.

Mr. Speaker, I may disagree with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) in terms of some of the policies and some of the reasons for what has happened in America. We will have those kind of differences appropriately. But what neither of us disagree on and what we both agree on is that Ronald Reagan is in fact a decent human being who cares greatly about his country, who cares about its people, who cares about freedom, and who cares about justice. He was a leader of significance, as I said earlier, a leader who made a difference, a leader who set before the world an image of freedom, a leader who was prepared to commit himself to the defense of freedom and, as a result, in my opinion, gave to those who would undermine freedom in the Kremlin and other places in the world second thoughts.

In the final analysis, I am convinced that Gorbachev, the leader of Soviet Union, looked at his people and said, Ronald Reagan, the Congress, the American people are prepared to pay the price of defending freedom and are not going to let it go by default. We cannot compete, I am sure Gorbachev said, with a President, a Congress and a people with such resolve. As a result, I think, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has pointed out, shortly after the Reagan Presidency, communism was certainly in retreat, the Iron Curtain came down, the Berlin Wall, which he asked to be torn down, in fact was torn down.

So although during the course of his Presidency I differed on some policies and, frankly, agreed on others, but what we all can agree on is that this was an American who served his country well, an American who gave of himself, of his philosophy, of his intellect, of his devotion to country. Americans and America and, indeed, the world benefitted by that contribution.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to rise with my friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), in support of this most appropriate use of the rotunda of the Capitol of the United States.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for allowing me the time today to appear and present a few remarks on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 50th wedding anniversary of former President and First Lady Ronald and Nancy Reagan, a half a century of commitment not just to themselves and to each other but a commitment to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today we plan for another milestone, the Congressional Gold Medal ceremony for this distinguished couple.

In the 106th Congress I, along with my good friend and colleague, the gen-

tlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), introduced legislation to award the Reagans the highest honor that Congress can bestow, the Congressional Gold Medal. Ronald and Nancy Reagan have dedicated their lives to promoting national pride and bettering the quality of life for every American. Certainly the Congressional Gold Medal is a fitting tribute to their enduring commitment to public service.

Recently, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 305 to authorize the use of the Capitol Rotunda for their Congressional Gold Medal award ceremony to be held on May 16 of this year.

The Reagans have stood as leaders and icons in our Nation's history for years. A popular two-term governor and later as President of the United States, Ronald Reagan was dedicated to encouraging economic growth, recognizing the value of hard work and sparking hope and pride among all Americans. He believed that everyone can rise as high and as far as their abilities will take them. This principle became a guiding creed of Reagan's Presidency as he successfully turned the tide of public cynicism and sparked a national renewal of faith and hope. He fulfilled his pledge to restore the great confident roar of American progress, growth and optimism; and Americans once again believed in the good old-fashioned American dream.

Always standing by his side, President Reagan's wife, Nancy, served as a gracious First Lady and a distinguished leader in her own right. Perhaps her most notable and longest-lasting achievement was her "Just Say No" campaign aimed at preventing alcohol and drug abuse among our youth.

Even today, Mrs. Reagan continues to be an active public leader as a champion for increasing funding for research on Alzheimer's disease.

Together, the Reagans have dedicated much of their lives to our Nation. Their leadership and service extended well beyond President Reagan's tenure in office.

It has been an honor for me to lead the effort of awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to this deserving couple.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution which will allow for the Congressional Gold Medal ceremony to occur here, in the People's House, our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN).

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of this resolution to allow the use of the Capitol to honor President and Mrs. Reagan.

I so much appreciate hearing the words of our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who was eloquent in his description of how this President was able to bring hope to this country and work across the aisle to achieve great things for the United States.

Two years ago the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and I sponsored a bill that awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to President Reagan and his wife and his long-time supporter, Mrs. Nancy Reagan. That bill, as the gentleman from Nevada told us, was passed in both houses; and it was signed by the President. With passage of today's resolution we will have the privilege to present our Nation's highest award to Mrs. Reagan this May in the Capitol Rotunda.

President Reagan delivered his second inaugural address in the Rotunda. I well remember that day because it was about one degree above zero and they actually canceled the parade to be held that day for the inauguration of the President. So President Reagan went ahead with his inaugural address, but he moved it to the Rotunda, so that has significance to us. In that address he personified our country as hopeful, big-hearted, idealistic, daring, decent and fair. Those are the exact words I would use to describe President Reagan himself.

Together, the President and the First Lady dedicated their lives to lifting the American spirit and bettering the quality of life for all Americans.

I continue and I know so many people also continue to be inspired by President Reagan's ideals of lowering the tax burden on individual working Americans, of strengthening families, limiting the control of government and achieving peace through strength here for our United States.

In the early 1980s President Reagan's policy and leadership lifted us out of a terrible economic situation. I well remember the record unemployment, the 21 percent interest rates, the double-digit inflation that we lived through during that time. He stated in his campaign that he would bring America back, and he did.

As we all know, the First Lady has been very instrumental in every Presidency. This is especially true of First Lady Nancy Reagan who traveled tirelessly around this Nation promoting her Just Say No campaign in order to stop substance abuse among young people. She knew she was not elected to office. She was not elected to office and yet she put to the best use the clout that she had as First Lady of this Nation to make what I believe was a lasting impact on our Nation's youth.

President and Mrs. Reagan believed in the promise of the American dream. In an era of growing cynicism, they worked in their own upbeat and hopeful ways to make America a place where everybody can rise as high and as far as their ability will take them.

My best wishes go out to President and Mrs. Reagan who have just celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary. Although he has withdrawn from public life and we will be here forever to remember his accomplishments, his wife will come to receive this honor in the Rotunda on May 16. We will be there to greet her, to thank her for her

constant support of this great man and the wonderful activities she herself initiated on behalf of our Nation's youth. We will never forget their achievements.

Now it is time for us to honor these two individuals and to say thank you to our Nation's most magnificent President and his First Lady, Nancy Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), and I thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) for introducing House Concurrent Resolution 305, and I subscribe to everything that the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) thereafter has said and the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) has said.

President Reagan was an unusually great President of this country. He lowered the burden of taxation on Americans. He in a large measure was solely responsible through his policies and his tenacity for bringing down the Berlin Wall and ending the Cold War. He was a leader of great proportion. But I rise for a different reason, not just to repeat the same.

It is really appropriate that we use the Rotunda to present this award to Nancy Reagan, and it is because she and the President are still achieving great things for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I lost my mother 4 years ago to Alzheimer's, and I have the greatest of regard for the caregivers of America who today deal with the care and the tragedy of that disease that afflicts their loved ones. I am so proud of the President, President Reagan, in the way he, in such a dignified manner, let the American people know of his debilitating disease; and he met it with the same positive influence that he met every challenge, no matter how great it was, in his life.

As President of the United States, he did wonderful things for our country. As First Lady, Nancy Reagan did wonderful things for our country. And when the Gold Medal is presented, it will be for all the positive accomplishments that he made. But at this time in their lives it also recognizes a couple who are a shining beacon to millions of Americans whose loved ones have been confronted with Alzheimer's, who, as caregivers, give every moment of their day to make the life of their loved one as easy as possible.

So on the 50th anniversary of their marriage, on their recognition of the accomplishments as First Lady and the President, it is also appropriate that we point out to the American people that even today, as a past President and a past First Lady, Ronald Reagan and Nancy Reagan continue to be a beacon to the American people in their handling of the most difficult of diseases in the latter years of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me time, and I urge the support of House Concurrent Resolution 305.

□ 1430

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to urge all of our colleagues to support this resolution in honor of President and Mrs. Reagan.

Mr. Speaker, I said much about President Reagan in the opening of this conversation about his life, and let me close by honoring Mrs. Reagan. President Reagan said for many years that his life started 50 years ago yesterday, that was the day he married Nancy Reagan. She has been a full partner in all of his successes, of which there are many.

It is often the partner, the spouse, that does a lot of the work, while the person up front gets a lot of the credit. She was there from day one, 50 years ago yesterday. She deserves this tribute just as does he. I look forward to their coming here on May 16 to receive this tribute.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 305, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF COLLECTION OF MEMORIAL TRIBUTES MADE IN HONOR OF THE LATE GERALD SOLOMON

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 338) authorizing the printing as a House document of a collection of memorial tributes made in honor of the late Gerald Solomon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 338

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF COLLECTION OF STATEMENTS IN TRIBUTE TO GERALD SOLOMON.

A collection of statements made in tribute to the late Gerald Solomon, together with

related materials, shall be printed as a House document under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, with illustrations and suitable binding.

SEC. 2. NUMBER OF COPIES.

The number of copies of the document printed under section 1 shall be the lesser of—

(1) 114 casebound copies, of which 50 copies shall be provided to the family of the late Gerald Solomon, 1 copy shall be provided to each Senator from the State of New York, and 2 copies shall be provided to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York; or

(2) such number of casebound copies as does not exceed a total production and printing cost of \$25,525, with distribution to be allocated in the same proportion as described in paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER).

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

Mr. Speaker, Jerry Solomon was my friend. He was my leader when I came here. He was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules. He was a tough partisan, but he was fair.

Jerry served 20 years in this body before retiring and then dying shortly thereafter. He was born in 1930 in Florida and grew up in the northern regions of upstate New York. He attended St. Lawrence University and was a Marine through and through. He spent 8½ years in active and reserve duty, and was one of the proud recipients of the Iron Mike Award given by Marines to Marines.

He was married to Freda, a high school sweetheart and a sweetheart on her own. They have five children and six grandchildren. They had a marvelous relationship, where Jerry got all the credit and Freda did much of the work, much like, I am afraid to say, in my family. She was a marvelous partner for him and the two of them had a great relationship for many years.

In 1995, Jerry became the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and I was given the opportunity to serve with him on the Committee on Rules. He was a strong leader for our cause and a fair one. He was tough and fair, and you cannot say much more about a politician than that. You appreciate their toughness, but you expect their fairness.

He was outspoken on veterans issues. I recall one day him saying that he was the ranking member, and if he had stayed back on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, he would have been its chairman. And one day he said he would rather, frankly, serve as the Committee on Veterans' Affairs Chair than the Committee on Rules Chair. He thought so much of our veterans, and he fought for them unstintingly through a 20-year career in this body.

His proudest moment was in 1988 when President Reagan signed into law "Solomon's Bill" to elevate the Vet-

erans Administration to a full cabinet level Department. This work won him wide praise from veterans groups over the years.

Jerry was laid to rest with military honors this past year in Saratoga National Cemetery. He was the driving force behind the creation of that cemetery and helped secure the money to buy the land for the cemetery. In 1998, the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY) introduced a bill to name the Saratoga National Cemetery in honor of Gerald Solomon. The bill had 88 cosponsors. However, some of the bureaucrats in the Department of Veterans Affairs were concerned because nothing like that had ever been done. After finding out, Jerry asked his colleague from New York to withdraw the bill because he did not want any controversy associated with the cemetery.

On December 4, 2001, this House passed a measure that did, in fact, name the national cemetery in Saratoga as the Gerald B.H. Solomon National Cemetery. It was signed into law on January 24, 2002.

Those of us who watched him in his work as the chairman of the Committee on Rules recall him standing right at that microphone, with his big expanded file that said Solomon on the front, which held his whole world worth of information and detail on all the issues that he fought for and cared for through all the years. He was the Chair of the National Defense Task Force, he was a congressional adviser to the United Nations Session on Disarmament, he was a representative to the North Atlantic Assembly, Chair of the Political Foreign Affairs Committee, Chair of the House NATO Observer Group and the U.S. Task Force on POWs and MIAs.

During the 1980s, Jerry was one of 13 House Members who served on President Reagan's group of congressional advisers and four generals for foreign policy, national defense, and budgetary initiatives. I was privileged to introduce him at a breakfast one day, and those who knew him would appreciate when I said, "This man has devoted his life to insurance agents, milk producers, and Ronald Reagan, and not necessarily in that order."

He was a firm and staunch fighter for what he believed in. He could always be counted on. He was a great American, an important and dedicated member of this body, and I urge the passage of this resolution on his behalf.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the concurrent resolution.

I was pleased to serve with Jerry Solomon during 18 years of my service here in the House that we overlapped. He was a passionate advocate of the positions he held. He was a Marine, in the best tradition of the United States Marines, of which he was a member until the day he died. He was a fighter for

the issues that he believed in, but he was also a friend.

He had a good word for almost all on this floor and even in passion and anger he could turn to you with a smile and with a wink and say, we differed on this issue but we serve the American public, and we shall do so together.

It was enjoyable to serve with Jerry Solomon. It was appropriate that the bill, of which the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) spoke, was passed, because Jerry was such a fighter, not only for that facility but for veterans generally. And he was a strong supporter of Ronald Reagan, whom we just set aside a time to honor.

So I am pleased to rise on behalf of this measure and urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 338, this resolution on behalf of the printing of the remarks in honor of Jerry Solomon.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 338.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENO RONCALIO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3789) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, as the "Teno Roncalio Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3789

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

SECTION 1. TENO RONCALIO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, shall be known and designated as the "Teno Roncalio Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Teno Roncalio Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3789.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3789, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, as the Teno Roncalio Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Roncalio was a native of Rock Springs, Wyoming, and has been a distinguished public servant for the majority of his life. He enlisted in the United States Army in 1941 and served as an infantryman in Europe, Sicily, and North Africa. After graduating from the University of Wyoming, he practiced law in Cheyenne. Mr. Roncalio represented Wyoming in this House from 1965 until 1967 and from 1971 until 1979, and I urge adoption of H.R. 3789.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS), in the consideration of H.R. 3789, which names, as she has pointed out, a postal facility after Congressman Roncalio.

I am sure that the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) will speak of Mr. Roncalio. It is interesting that the gentlewoman and Congressman Roncalio were of different parties, but represent a State that has a distinction of having a representative who really is like a United States Senator, in that they are elected statewide.

Mr. Roncalio was an outstanding member of this House, ran for the United States Senate unsuccessfully, but the people of Wyoming did not want to lose his service and reelected him for another three terms to the House of Representatives.

So we on this side of the aisle are very pleased to join the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the subcommittee and full committee in supporting this appropriate recognition of his service to Wyoming and his service to the country.

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

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), the distinguished sponsor of H.R. 3789.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, the legislation that is before us today des-

ignates the United States Post Office in Rock Springs, Wyoming, in honor of Mr. Teno Roncalio.

Mr. Roncalio is one of those exceptional individuals who has spent his entire life serving the public and serving the people of the great State of Wyoming. It is an honor and a privilege for me to be able to present this legislation on his behalf today.

Mr. Roncalio, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) stated, is a Democrat. He is from the other party than I belong to, but it never mattered to him when he was dealing with his constituents whether they were Republicans or Democrats. He represented Wyoming in the noblest of ways, in the most sincere of ways.

He is a native son of a small town in Wyoming known as Rock Springs, which is in the southwest corner of the State. It is along the Union Pacific Railroad that connected the East and the West and helped develop the West. This is where he grew up, where he attended high school, and spent most of his youth.

□ 1445

He later went on to graduate from the University of Wyoming.

As a decorated World War II veteran, he was awarded the Silver Star for Gallantry in Action and was named to the United States Army Officer Candidates Hall of Fame.

After serving in the military, Mr. Roncalio continued on with his public service, this time in loyal service to the State of Wyoming as a U.S. Representative in this very body. He served five terms, during which time he successfully brought Wyoming's concerns to the attention of this Nation, and he did so with great strength of heart and compassion.

As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) stated, Wyoming does have but one representative in the United States House of Representatives, so that representative has to work harder and be more passionate because we have all the issues that every other congressman has, plus issues that are unique to Wyoming as a rural State, being the lowest populated State. Mr. Roncalio was passionate in his love for the people of Wyoming.

When he served in Congress, it was a time in history when groundbreaking legislation was being adopted, such as the Voting Rights Act, the Civil Rights Act and the dawning of Medicare and Medicaid.

While he was in Congress, he worked diligently to boost Wyoming's share of mineral royalties, which is a driving force in our State's economy to this day. He also sponsored legislation establishing a number of recreational areas in the State, including Flaming Gorge, Big Horn Canyon, and the Fossil Butte Monument. His contribution to environmental concerns and preserving the beauty and history of Wyoming cannot be overlooked.

After leaving Congress in 1978, Teno returned to his native Wyoming where

he resumed his law practice. He continues to live in the State to this day.

Please join me in acknowledging his great dedication to public service, to the State of Wyoming, to the Nation, and to all of the people that he loved.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3789.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 6 p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 275, SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING HUNTING SEASONS FOR MIGRATORY DOVES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-364) on the resolution (H. Res. 353) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) expressing the sense of the Congress that hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to hunt such birds, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-365) on the resolution (H. Res. 354) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Boards of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on the motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT A GOLD MEDAL ON BEHALF OF CONGRESS TO FORMER PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN AND HIS WIFE NANCY REAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 305, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 305, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 0, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie	Blunt	Chabot
Ackerman	Boehlert	Chambliss
Aderholt	Bonilla	Clay
Akin	Bonior	Clayton
Allen	Bono	Clement
Andrews	Boozman	Clyburn
Army	Boswell	Coble
Baca	Boucher	Collins
Bachus	Boyd	Combest
Baird	Brady (PA)	Conyers
Baker	Brady (TX)	Cooksey
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Costello
Baldwin	Brown (OH)	Cox
Ballenger	Brown (SC)	Coyne
Barcia	Bryant	Cramer
Barr	Burr	Crane
Barrett	Burton	Crenshaw
Bartlett	Buyer	Crowley
Barton	Camp	Culberson
Bass	Cannon	Cummings
Bereuter	Cantor	Cunningham
Berkley	Capito	Davis (CA)
Berman	Capps	Davis (FL)
Berry	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Biggart	Cardin	Davis, Jo Ann
Bilirakis	Carson (IN)	Deal
Bishop	Carson (OK)	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Castle	DeGette

Delahunt	Kanjorski	Platts
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pomeroy
DeLay	Keller	Portman
DeMint	Kelly	Price (NC)
Deutsch	Kennedy (MN)	Pryce (OH)
Diaz-Balart	Kennedy (RI)	Putnam
Dicks	Kerns	Quinn
Dingell	Kildee	Radanovich
Doggett	Kind (WI)	Rahall
Dreier	King (NY)	Ramstad
Duncan	Kirk	Rangel
Dunn	Kleczka	Regula
Edwards	Knollenberg	Rehberg
Ehlers	Kolbe	Reyes
Ehrlich	Kucinich	Riley
Emerson	LaFalce	Rivers
Engel	LaHood	Rodriguez
English	Lampson	Roemer
Eshoo	Langevin	Rogers (KY)
Etheridge	Lantos	Rogers (MI)
Evans	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher
Everett	Larson (CT)	Ross
Farr	Latham	Rothman
Fattah	LaTourette	Roukema
Ferguson	Leach	Royce
Flake	Levin	Rush
Fletcher	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Foley	Lewis (GA)	Ryun (KS)
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Sabo
Ford	Linder	Sanders
Fossella	Lipinski	Sandlin
Frank	LoBiondo	Sawyer
Frelinghuysen	Lowe	Saxton
Frost	Lucas (KY)	Schaffer
Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Schakowsky
Ganske	Luther	Schiff
Gekas	Lynch	Schrock
Gephardt	Maloney (CT)	Scott
Gibbons	Maloney (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Serrano
Gillmor	Markey	Sessions
Gilman	Mascara	Shadegg
Gonzalez	Matheson	Shaw
Goode	Matsui	Shays
Goodlatte	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Sherwood
Goss	McCollum	Shimkus
Graham	McCrery	Shows
Granger	McDermott	Shuster
Graves	McGovern	Simmons
Green (TX)	McHugh	Simpson
Green (WI)	McInnis	Skeen
Greenwood	McIntyre	Skelton
Grucci	McKinney	Slaughter
Gutierrez	McNulty	Smith (MI)
Gutknecht	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)	Smith (TX)
Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Hansen	Menendez	Snyder
Harman	Mica	Souder
Hart	Miller, Dan	Spratt
Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Stark
Hastings (WA)	Miller, George	Stearns
Hayes	Miller, Jeff	Stenholm
Hayworth	Mink	Strickland
Hefley	Mollohan	Stump
Heger	Moore	Stupak
Hill	Moran (KS)	Sullivan
Hilliard	Moran (VA)	Sununu
Hinchee	Morella	Sweeney
Hinojosa	Myrick	Tancredo
Hobson	Nadler	Tanner
Hoeffel	Neal	Tauscher
Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Holden	Ney	Taylor (MS)
Holt	Northup	Terry
Honda	Norwood	Thomas
Armey	Nussle	Thompson (CA)
Baca	Hooley	Thompson (MS)
Bachus	Horn	Thornberry
Baird	Hostettler	Thune
Baker	Houghton	Thurman
Baldacci	Hoyer	Tiahrt
Baldwin	Hulshof	Ose
Ballenger	Hyde	Otter
Barcia	Insee	Owens
Barr	Isakson	Oxley
Barrett	Israel	Pallone
Bartlett	Issa	Pascarell
Barton	Istook	Pastor
Bass	Camp	Paul
Bereuter	Cannon	Payne
Berkley	Cantor	Pelosi
Berman	Capito	Pence
Berry	Capps	Peterson (MN)
Biggart	Capuano	Peterson (PA)
Bilirakis	Cardin	Petri
Bishop	Carson (IN)	Phelps
Blumenauer	Carson (OK)	Pickering
	Castle	Pitts
	DeGette	
	Jones (NC)	
	Jones (OH)	

Weiner	Wicker	Wu
Weldon (FL)	Wilson (NM)	Wynn
Weller	Wilson (SC)	Young (AK)
Whitfield	Wolf	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—42

Becerra	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bentsen	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Blagojevich	John	Sanchez
Boehner	Kilpatrick	Solis
Borski	Kingston	Taylor (NC)
Callahan	Lee	Trafficant
Calvert	Lofgren	Waters
Condit	McKeon	Watson (CA)
Cubin	Millender-	Watts (OK)
Davis, Tom	McDonald	Waxman
Dooley	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Doolittle	Napolitano	Wexler
Doyle	Olver	Woolsey
Filner	Pombo	
Hilleary	Reynolds	

□ 1829

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District, I was unavoidably detained on, Tuesday, March 5. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 47—H. Con. Res. 305, permitting use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a gold medal on behalf of Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 47 (H. Con. Res. 305) I was conducting official business in my San Diego California district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 47 on March 5, 2002 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1830

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE SALT LAKE 2002 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my home State of Utah for hosting, in the words of NBC sportscaster Dick Ebersol, "far and away the most successful Olympics, summer or winter, in the history of the games." The State of Utah and their citizens were introduced to the world, and boy did they ever shine in the eyes of their national and international visitors. Never in the history of the Olympics has there been such a spirit of volunteerism exhibited by the host community. Visitors from around the world were duly impressed by the helpfulness and congeniality of the locals.

Salt Lake City, Utah, in the words of a Washington Post writer, is the "nice" capital of the world.

Mr. Speaker, not only did my home State shine in its hosting of the Winter Olympics, U.S. Olympians took home an unprecedented number of medals, 34 in all, placing a close second to Germany with 35 medals. The previous U.S. record for winter games was 13 medals. I commend our U.S. Olympic team for their tremendous showing. Furthermore, since the horrendous attacks on our country on September 11, United States citizens and the international community as a whole approached the 2002 Winter Olympic games with some trepidation. Thanks to the united efforts of thousands of Federal, State, local law enforcement and National Guard personnel, the Olympic games went off without a single incident.

Unfortunately, some in the press viewed the Olympics as a prime opportunity to take potshots at my home State and the predominant religion. Gladly, they were loudly renounced by our international visitors. Even the editors of their papers were compelled to apologize for their off-color remarks.

To the gentleman who writes for the Denver Post who took a shot at the State of Utah and then later apologized, he said that our areas out there were for beginners. He has never gone down Grizzly. Grizzly is where the downhill is and Grizzly has a sign up there that says: "Know your limitations. If you can't make this, take your skis, get on the gondola and go back down."

I used to ski, Mr. Speaker; but as I look at that, it is a 77 percent drop. You are doing 85 miles an hour in 300 feet. I have talked to a lot of the Olympians who said, "That's the best men's downhill in the world." To Mr. Paige from the Denver Post who has a perfect right under the first amendment to blast all of us, I have talked to the president and owner of Snowbasin. He said, "I have two tickets for Mr. Paige." We invite Mr. Paige to come to this beginners hill and for him to go straight down that hill. We do not want any of this back and forth stuff. We want a heckbent for election straight on down.

I am sure the local TV people would find it very interesting to watch him do it, and we would love to have Mr. Paige come out. We offer him those free tickets to come out and see it.

Mr. Speaker, I did not realize the custom is to ring a cow bell during the Olympics and cow bells were ringing everywhere. It was a wonderful experience for America. It reenergized us. We could see something we felt good about. It was emotional. The opening ceremony was wonderful. The closing ceremony was tremendous. The Olympians were great. I cannot think of a better Olympics that ever occurred. I agree with all the people who said that this was the best one ever.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a full and fair debate on Social Security. Three months ago, the President's commission issued a report. It called for sweeping changes to the Social Security system. It called for the creation of private accounts. It called for three plans to meet these goals. Then last week, in a speech to the Cato Institute, the majority leader urged a debate on this issue. He urged us to reform Social Security. He urged us to privatize Social Security. And the President of the United States argued the same in speeches also delivered last week. Yet in Congress, Republicans are refusing to have that full and fair debate on their schemes of privatization. Do they have something to hide?

We hear that soon we are going to get a proposal to send certificates out to seniors, at a cost of \$14 million, that tells them that if you are over the age of 62, your benefits will never be cut. The first question is, What if you are under 62? What should they assume? We are also told that CRS and other agencies have said that there is no legal effect to this document. It is not anything that anybody can rely on. Jo Anne Barnhart, the Social Security commissioner, suggests that the plan would drain millions of dollars from the administration's fund and alarm seniors who did not get their certificates. I could not agree with her more. The certificate idea is a political exercise that will squander taxpayer time and taxpayer money. It will create confusion. And it is an insult to seniors who put their faith and trust in Social Security.

We do not need a secret plan on Social Security. We do not want people to go into the voting booth and elect candidates next fall who say, "Oh, I'm going to guarantee your Social Security benefits," and then turn around the day after the election and cut their benefits in some scheme of privatization.

I am not afraid to stand on this floor and fight for my beliefs. I say to my Republican colleagues, in the words of the old hymn, "be not afraid." That hymn says that if you believe in something and you care about it, you ought to go ahead without fear. I want a debate on this issue before the election, not after the election. If Republicans fail to put Social Security on the floor, I intend to mount a discharge petition to bring up the Presidential commission's plans so that we can have a full and free debate, the House of Representatives at its best.

I think it is essential. Social Security is at the heart of our retirement security system. Thanks to Social Security, millions of Americans avoid poverty. They have lived their lives free from fear. People with disabilities and surviving family members have put

food on the table because of Social Security. They have roofs over their heads. For 67 years, Social Security has been there for the people of this country when they have needed it.

My mother is 94 years old. She lives in an independent-living facility in St. Louis, and about half the costs of that facility every month come from her Social Security. You better believe she cares about Social Security. And you better believe I care about Social Security. And you better believe that millions of Americans care about Social Security. And you better believe that there are millions of people out there who care about Social Security and are concerned and rightly concerned about secret Republican plans to wait until after the election to put forward plans that will cut their benefits.

We are not talking about an academic exercise here. We are talking about people's lives and what happens to them every month. We are talking about the biggest changes in the program that the President has proposed in the history of the program. We are talking about a sea change in the way this program works. The Republican Party has always sought to weaken Social Security. In 1935, they voted against it. In 1964, they wanted to make it voluntary. And in 1994, Representative ARMEY appeared on national television admitting that "I would never have created Social Security."

Today, the Republican slogan seems to be, "Save Social Security last, not first." In today's New York Times, Paul Krugman is dead on. His argument is that Social Security has never been a simple pension fund. It really, he says, is a social contract. Each generation pays taxes that support the previous generation's retirement and expects to receive the same treatment from the next generation. Republicans propose to allow younger workers to place their payroll taxes in private accounts, in effect to break this ongoing contract, in Krugman's words.

He says, we are left with two options: make room for the trillions diverted into private accounts by slashing baby boomer benefits, or use money from other, unidentified sources to replace the diverted funds. The Republican plan makes promises that sound too good to be true, because they are too good to be true. According to Krugman, private accounts will create a financing crisis requiring sharp benefit cuts or large infusions of money from unspecified sources, or both.

Republicans say privatization will not cost a dime. The Social Security actuaries say it will drain \$20 trillion from the budget. Republicans say privatization will strengthen people's retirement security. Tell that to the employees at Enron. They cannot even pay the cost of health care for their kids. Republicans say that 40 years of neglect have permanently damaged Social Security's financial health, in the words of Majority Leader ARMEY. Bob

Ball, an expert on the subject, calls this statement flat out untrue.

Our challenge is to strengthen Social Security into the future. We need to honor our commitments. We need to strengthen the trust funds. We need to save Social Security first. America had a golden opportunity about 15 months ago. Fifteen months ago, we could have passed tax cuts to promote long-term economic growth while paying down the national debt and investing in Social Security for Americans everywhere. Republicans rejected our approach. Today, the President's budget breaks pledges by both parties. Both parties promised to safeguard the trust funds. The President's budget invades them for the next 10 years. It drains \$1.5 trillion from the trust funds, and plans proposed by his commission fail to explain how we will pay for privatization. And they will lead to cuts in benefits for seniors, even for individuals opting out of private accounts.

This is not a debate about numbers. It is a debate in the end about our values. What is the value we place on Social Security? Our values call for understanding that Social Security will be solvent for the next 36 years, at a minimum. Our values call for recognizing that people have faith and trust and confidence in our most respected program. Our values call for realizing that Social Security offers economic security not just to seniors but to widows, disabled Americans, and children of parents who die before the age of 65. Our values call for keeping our intergenerational contract and commitment in the 21st century.

□ 1845

Our values call for keeping our word to the seniors of this country. Our values call for investing in Social Security today, not tearing it down as baby-boomers retire a few years from now.

I urge Republicans, be not afraid. Let us get about having a real debate before the voters speak in November of this year. Let us get about the task of saving Social Security first and today.

BREAKING THE CONTRACT

(By Paul Krugman)

If converting Social Security to a system of private retirement accounts is such a good idea, why can't advocates of that conversion try, just once, to make their case without insisting that 1+1=4?

Last week George W. Bush did it again, contrasting Social Security benefits with what retiring workers would have if they had invested all the Social Security taxes in the stock market instead. As an article in *The Times* pointed out, this was a misleading scenario even on its own terms; financial planners strongly advise against investing solely in stocks, and a diversified retirement account wouldn't have risen nearly as much in the 1990's bull market.

But there's something much more serious wrong with Mr. Bush's story. Indeed, the latest remarks perfectly illustrate how he uses bogus comparisons to make private accounts sound like a much better idea than they really are. For by emphasizing what today's 65-year-olds could have done if they hadn't paid Social Security taxes, Mr. Bush has for-

gotten something rather important. Without those taxes, who would have paid for their parents' benefits?

The point is that when touting its plan to privatize Social Security, the Bush administration conveniently fails to mention the system's existing obligations, the debt it owes to older Americans. As with so many other administration proposals, private accounts are being sold with deceptive advertising.

The truth—which Mr. Bush's economists understand perfectly well—is that Social Security has never been run like a simple pension fund. It's really a social contract: each generation pays taxes that support the previous generation's retirement, and expects to receive the same treatment from the next generation.

You may believe that Franklin Roosevelt should never have created this system in the first place. I disagree, but in any case Social Security exists, and older Americans have upheld their end of the bargain. In particular, baby boomers have spent their working years paying quite high payroll taxes, which were used mainly to support their elders, and only secondarily to help Social Security build up a financial reserve. And they expect to be supported in their turn.

Mr. Bush proposes to allow younger workers to place their payroll taxes in private accounts—in effect, to break this ongoing contract. But then what happens to older workers, who have already paid their dues?

There are only two possibilities. One is default: make room for the trillions diverted into private accounts by slashing the baby boomers' benefits. The other is to buy the baby boomers out—that is, to use money from other sources to replace the diverted funds.

Those really are the only alternatives. Last year the special commission on reform of Social Security, which was charged with producing a plan for private accounts, came to an ignominious end—it issued a deliberately confusing report, then slunk quietly out of town. But wade through its menu of options, and you'll find that in the end the commission grudgingly rediscovered the obvious: Private accounts won't "save" Social Security. On the contrary, they will create a financing crisis, requiring sharp benefit cuts, large infusions of money from unspecified outside sources, or both.

But nervous Republican members of Congress want to send all Social Security recipients a letter (at government expense, of course) assuring them that their benefits will never be cut. And now that the magic budget surplus has turned back into a pumpkin, the government is in no position to infuse new money into Social Security—on the contrary, the government at large is now borrowing from Social Security at a furious pace.

So why is the Bush administration reviving its push for private accounts right now? Did it really learn nothing from the implosion of the reform commission? I doubt it; the administration's economists aren't fools, though loyalty often requires that they pretend otherwise.

A more likely interpretation is that this is entirely cynical. War frenzy is subsiding, the Bush domestic agenda is stalled, and early indications for the November election aren't as good as Karl Rove expected. So it's fantasy time: tantalize the public with visions of sugarplums, then blame Democrats for snatching the goodies away. And it doesn't matter that the numbers don't add up, because the plan will never be tested by reality.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CELEBRATING THE 167TH BIRTHDAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight to talk about a special day that happened last Saturday in Texas. March 2, 2002, marked the 167th birthday of the Republic of Texas.

Long ago on that date, in 1836, 54 delegates representing settlements across Texas gathered for the Constitutional Convention of 1836 in the small Village of Washington-on-the-Brazos.

From the beginning, it was an event marked by haste and urgency. The army forces of Mexico under General Santa Anna were closing in on the defenders in the Alamo. On March 2nd, the day after the opening of the convention, the delegates declared the independence of Texas from Mexico.

Within days of that announcement, on March 6th, the Alamo would fall. This was the first in a chain of defeats for the small Texas Army which would, nevertheless, emerge victorious at the battle of San Jacinto, 6 weeks later, on April 21.

Mr. Speaker, what those brave Texans were fighting for is the same thing we are fighting for today. Up to the point when they gathered at Washington-on-the-Brazos, it was simply to restore the Mexican Republic and the constitution of 1824, which had been suspended by General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna. This constitution had granted all citizens and subjects of Mexico basic human rights.

On the night of March 1, however, a group of five men stayed up late at night drafting the document that would be approved the next day by the full convention. This document, which echoed the lines of its American counterpart, was the Texas Declaration of Independence.

It started off in much the same way as ours, with the words, "When a government has ceased to protect the lives, liberty and property of the people." It spoke of the numerous injustices inflicted upon the settlers of the state then known as Coahuila y Tejas: the elimination of the state's legislative body; the denial of religious freedom; the elimination of civil justice system; and the confiscation of firearms, this last one being the most intolerable, particularly among Texans.

Finally, it stated that, because the injustices of Santa Anna's government, Texans were severing their connection with the Mexican nation and declaring themselves a free, sovereign and independent republic, fully invested with

all the rights and attributes that belonged to independent nations and a declaration that they “fiercely and confidently” committed their decision to “the Supreme Arbiter of the destiny of nations.”

Over the next 2 weeks, a constitution was drafted and an interim government was formed, despite daily reports from the front detailing the collapse of the Alamo and the subsequent advance of the Mexican army through Texas.

On March 17, 1836, the government was forced to flee Washington-on-the-Brazos on the news of the approach of Santa Anna. Just over a month later, independence was secured in the form of a victory over that same army by General Sam Houston, a delegate at that very convention, and his courageous fighters at the battle of San Jacinto.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind folks from my neighboring State of Tennessee that Sam Houston, along with another Texas hero, Davy Crockett, served in this Congress representing the State of Tennessee. In fact, I have told my colleagues from Tennessee that sometimes the best of Tennessee immigrated to Texas in the 1830s.

From that point on, Texas was firmly established in the community of nations, and for 10 years she stood as an independent nation, until President James K. Polk signed the treaty admitting Texas to the United States in 1845.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, March 2nd, was celebrated throughout Texas. But, again, as we are a Nation at war now, I hope that this Congress and the whole country realize that we did not start this country just yesterday. We have a tradition in our Nation of freedom, and that freedom not only started with our own independence in the 1700s but it started with the Texas independence in 1836, and that is why we celebrate Texas Independence Day.

WORKING TOGETHER TO FIX SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments on Social Security, a very important program.

A couple speakers ago, the minority leader suggested that the President and Republicans come up with their Social Security proposal, I suspect so that it could be criticized.

I would hope that the minority leader and the Democrats would come up with their solution for Social Security. To pretend that there is no problem and nothing needs to be changed is not facing up to the fact that the Social Security system is going to run out of money.

Social Security started in 1934. It was predicated on the fact that there would be an increasing number of workers paying their taxes into Social Security

that is used to pay benefits for existing retirees. I think that point needs to be stressed, that it is now and always has been a system where existing workers pay their taxes and that tax money goes out to existing retirees.

Back in 1940, there were 38 workers paying in their Social Security tax for every one retiree. Today, there are three workers paying in their Social Security tax for every retiree. The suggestion by the actuaries is that by 2025 there will only be two workers paying in their Social Security tax for every retiree. It will be very expensive for those workers.

So what Congress and the President have done in the past, every time that we are short of money we have increased the taxes on workers and reduced benefits. Let us not put ourselves in that predicament again.

One way to do it is not to suggest that this is just up to the President of the United States. This is the Congress. This is the House of Representatives. We should be working together on both sides of the aisle to look at the problem with a program that has been so successful and so important since it was instigated in 1934.

The way we accomplish something to solve this problem is facing up to the fact that it is insolvent; the fact that there is an unfunded liability, according to the actuaries, of \$9 trillion right now; that the money in the trust fund right now, money that the government has borrowed from the surplus coming in from Social Security and spent on other programs or other responsibilities of the General fund, is now \$1.2 trillion, again compared to the \$9 trillion unfunded liability. We would have to come up with \$9 trillion today and invest it to accommodate what we are going to be short over the next 75 years in terms of meeting current-day promises on Social Security payments.

The average retiree today is receiving a return of 1.7 percent interest on the money they and their employer put into Social Security. We can do better than that.

Nobody is talking about privatizing Social Security. None of the proposals suggest that government is not going to be ultimately responsible for paying those Social Security benefits. But the way to accomplish this, the way to move ahead, is not by demagoguery. I know it is tempting in an election year to try to put down and scold and scare seniors that one party is better than the other.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me say that I would hope both the Democrats, the minority leader and the majority party in this House and the same with the Senate work together to come up with proposals to solve the problem, rather than demagoguing it.

PAKISTAN'S INTER-SERVICES INTELLIGENCE—ISI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to express my serious concerns regarding Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence, or ISI. It is important to highlight the history, work and intentions of the ISI in light of the unfortunate murder of Daniel Pearl and in light of the current fight against global terrorism.

The ISI not only has ties to Omar Sheik, the prime suspect in the murder of Daniel Pearl, but the ISI has also fostered deep connections with Islamic militant groups, particularly Jaish-e-Muhammad, operating throughout Kashmir.

In the 1980s, Pakistan assisted Afghanistan in fighting off Soviet invasion. During these years, the ISI grew into the role of Pakistan's strongest political agency on foreign policy. It was also during this time that the ISI developed and nurtured strong relationships with Islamic militants in Afghanistan and Kashmir.

Ties between the ISI and Afghan militants grew stronger, and this gave rise to the Taliban. The ties between the Taliban and the ISI remained strong for years, and to this day there are deep connections between the Pakistani ISI and what is left of the Taliban.

Ties between the ISI and Islamic militants in Kashmir grew stronger as well, and, in fact, the ISI, until very recently, had a Kashmir desk, headed by Brigadier Abdullah, which was responsible for militant insurgency into India's state of Jammu and Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to expand on the deep, nefarious connections between the ISI in light of Daniel Pearl's murder and recent terrorist events throughout the world. There have been reports that Brigadier Abdullah, formerly of the ISI, has aided Omar Sheik in his travels between Afghanistan and Pakistan and has perhaps provided further support to both Omar Sheik and another individual, Maulana Azhar.

Omar Sheik and Maulana Azhar worked to form Jaish-e-Muhammad, an Islamic militant group that continues to operate throughout Kashmir and is the primary group blamed for the October attack on the Jammu and Kashmir State assembly. Jaish has received support from the ISI and particularly Brigadier Abdullah.

Both Sheikh and Azhar served in prison together in India in 1999, when they were freed after the hijacking of an Indian Airlines flight that landed in Kandahar, Afghanistan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that this flight was hijacked by the method of knives and box cutters and that weapons were not available to the hijackers until the plane landed in Kandahar. Furthermore, it was after their release that both Sheikh and Azhar formed Jaish and operated terrorist activities in Kashmir while in Pakistan and Afghanistan and with the help of the Pakistani ISI.

Azhar was arrested in December, 2001. However, Sheikh continued his mission of kidnapping and terrorism in hopes of Jihad; and, until the murder of Daniel Pearl, Sheikh was living freely in Pakistan. If it was not for the support of current or former officials of the Pakistani ISI, Sheikh may not have been able to succeed in his mission until this point in time and may not have succeeded in the kidnapping and tragic murder of Daniel Pearl.

It is clear that the ties between the ISI and both the Taliban and militant groups in Kashmir are deep. General Musharraf has taken it upon himself to arrest Azhar, arrest Sheikh, remove Brigadier Abdullah from the ISI and crack down on terrorists. However, more work needs to be done if Pakistan wants to take serious steps in breaking ties with the Taliban and Islamic militant groups operating in Kashmir and defusing tensions with India due to the terrorist attack on the Indian Parliament.

Although the ties between Pakistani intelligence officials and terrorists are clear, there is still much left to be investigated and publicized. Mr. Speaker, we need to approach the ISI with criticism and we need to approach Pakistan with great caution. U.S.-Pakistan ties have become closer as a result of our war in Afghanistan. However, I cannot urge us enough to proceed with caution.

The terrorist networks operating in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Kashmir

are not isolated and, in fact, have significant ties to al Qaeda.

HONORING PROJECT HOME SAFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON of Indiana) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to give special honor to Project Home Safe and their latest firearm safety initiative, although I do it under the shadow of yet another child's death caused by the reckless use of a firearm.

Yesterday, in Albuquerque, New Mexico, a 4-year-old boy shot and killed an 18-month-old girl with his father's handgun while the two of them were watching a movie. Another young innocent life ended. Congress has refused to enact common-sense legislation to prevent these kinds of senseless acts.

As part of the National Shooting Sports Foundation, Project Home Safe represents one of the largest and most diverse trade associations in America. Since September last year, Project Home Safe has toured 16 States and visited over 300 communities, distributing hundreds of thousands of firearm safety devices in an effort to improve and preserve the lives of our children.

□ 1900

This month, they reached the great State of Indiana. In conjunction with our Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Joe Kernan, Project HomeSafe

launched a 35-day tour of Indiana, during which they will distribute 40,000 gun safety devices across the State. I want to commend the Department of Justice for providing the \$5 million grant to enable this kind of activity.

From March 1 to April 4, Project HomeSafe will be working with the Indiana State Police to help distribute the trigger locks at Wal-Mart lots and K-Mart lots across the State. Indiana residents can receive a free firearm safety kit that includes a cable-style gun lock and a safety brochure detailing the safe storage of firearms.

To reinforce Project HomeSafe's safety messages, the firearms safety tour will travel through Indiana visiting 29 communities, using a 16-foot mobile classroom truck designed to provide safety education at the community level. Indiana residents will be able to pick up their firearms safety kit, watch a safety video, and view a display of the safe storage equipment. A safety tour coordinator will also be available to answer any questions.

Indiana's children will be able to visit the mobile classroom and will be encouraged to take the Project HomeSafe Pledge, which is a pledge presented to parents by children to show their commitment to safe firearms. Having already visited Indianapolis and Bloomington, the Project HomeSafe tour will visit many other cities, and I would like to insert those in the RECORD for the edification of people.

PROJECT HOMESAFE INDIANA TOUR SCHEDULE, MARCH 1–APRIL 4

Day and date	City	Time	Venue
Wednesday, 3/6/2002	Columbus	10:00–12:00	Wal-Mart, 1149 North National Rd.
Wednesday, 3/6/2002	Jeffersonville	3:00–5:00	Kmart, 2960 Hwy. 62.
Thursday, 3/7/2002	New Albany	10:00–4:00	Kmart, 3525 Grantline Road.
Friday, 3/8/2002	Evansville	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 4551 University Drive.
Saturday, 3/9/2002	Evansville	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 401, N. Burkhardt Road.
Sunday, 3/10/2002	Vincennes	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 650 Kimmel Road.
Monday, 3/11/2002	Terre Haute	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 5555 U.S. Hwy. #41.
Tuesday, 3/12/2002	Carmel	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 2001 East 151 Street.
Wednesday, 3/13/2002	Lafayette	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 4205 Commerce Drive.
Thursday, 3/14/2002	West Lafayette	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 2801 Northwestern Dr.
Friday, 3/15/2002	Hammond	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 1828 165th Street.
Saturday, 3/16/2002	Hammond	10:00–5:00	Big Kmart, 7925 Indianapolis Blvd.
Sunday, 3/17/2002	East Chicago	10:00–5:00	TBD.
Monday, 3/18/2002	Gary	10:00–5:00	TBD
Tuesday, 3/19/2002	Merrillville	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 2936 East 79th Avenue.
Wednesday, 3/20/2002	Valparaiso	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 2400 Morthland Drive.
Thursday, 3/21/2002	Portage	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 6087 U.S. Hwy. 6.
Friday, 3/22/2002	Michigan City	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 4301 South Franklin St.
Saturday, 3/23/2002	South Bend	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 3701 Portage Road.
Sunday, 3/24/2002	South Bend	10:00–5:00	Big Kmart, 4850 Western Ave. W.
Monday, 3/25/2002	Mishawaka	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 316 Indian Ridge Road.
Tuesday, 3/26/2002	Elkhart	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 175 Country Road #6 W.
Wednesday, 3/27/2002	Goshen	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 2304 Lincolnway East.
Thursday, 3/28/2002	Fort Wayne	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 5311 Coldwater Road.
Friday, 3/29/2002	Fort Wayne	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 1710 Apple Glen Blvd.
Saturday, 3/30/2002	Marion	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 3240 Southwestern.
Sunday, 3/31/2002	Kokomo	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 1920 E. Markland Ave.
Monday, 4/1/2002	Anderson	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 4420 Scatterfield Road.
Tuesday, 4/2/2002	Muncie	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 4801 W. Clara Lane.
Wednesday, 4/3/2002	New Castle	10:00–5:00	Wal-Mart, 709 S. Memorial Drive
Thursday, 4/4/2002	Indianapolis	11:00	State Capitol, Wrap-up Press Conference.

I am extremely proud of my own home State of Indiana in that it is one of only 18 States participating in this program, but the education of both children and parents about firearm safety is still lacking across the Nation.

A couple of weeks ago, a young man walked into a school in Indianapolis, Indiana, attempting to kill some 13 students. He lamented that the gun that he planned to use had a safety de-

vice on it that had already been inserted by his father and he was unable to follow through on his threat. Sadly, guns continue to be exempt from Federal oversight, and consumer protection laws continue to be tougher on toy guns than real guns.

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage Congress to pay attention to the senseless and early deaths of our children and take some immediate measures to counteract the early demise of our

children. Safety devices can prevent unintentional firearm death and injury. Every unintentional shooting involving children could have been prevented by a child-proof gun safety device.

COMPROMISE RESULTS IN SELL-OUT OF IRON ORE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the

House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor tonight to talk about President Bush's proposed remedies on steel imports. Unfortunately, for those of us who represent iron ore miners in northern Minnesota and northern Michigan, the remedy proposed by the President today does little to help us.

We must look back to December of last year in which the ITC, the International Trade Commission, by a six to nothing vote said illegal steel, steel products, slab steel, was being dumped in this country to the great harm of the U.S. steel industry. With slab steel, that replaces iron ore pellets. In order to make steel, we need a raw product like iron ore pellets or slab steel.

In order to corner the market, foreign countries have been dumping slab steel in this country at exorbitant amounts since 1998. Every time slab steel comes into our country, it hurts our iron ore miners. In fact, up in my district, the Empire Mine has just shut down. Over 800 workers have been laid off and all the managerial and administrative people have been laid off.

So we were hoping today that President Bush would give us a strong steel remedy. We asked for 40 percent over 4 years, as allowable under U.S. law. Although the report was put forth today, and some in the media have called the tariff and quota on imported steel a compromise, I believe the iron ore industry may have been sacrificed in making that compromise. We in the iron ore industry have basically been sold out.

The ITC, the International Trade Commission, caught nations cheating under import pricing; and as I said earlier, by a six to nothing vote, they agreed those imports were hurting the domestic steel and the iron ore industry.

If we take a look at what the President did today, he said we will allow 5.4 million tons of imported slabs to come into the United States, but we will not count Mexico or Canadian slab steel coming into the United States. So basically, we are at about 7 million tons a year. That is exactly what they are importing right now. So therefore, the remedy does nothing for those of us who have been harmed over the last 4 years by illegal imports. Because this import level of 7 million for slab steel has already caused mines to shut down and layoffs in northern Michigan and elsewhere, we have really won nothing with the President's proposed remedy.

If we take a look at it, Mexico has been used more than once by countries throughout the world as an export platform. By that I mean to get around the President's proposals today, his remedies today, other countries can export their product to Mexico, and then from Mexico it will come into the United States. Mexico, as I said earlier, the President made an exemption for them as to steel products. Therefore,

any country who wants to get around the new trade remedies proposed by the President will just ship their product to Mexico, it suddenly becomes a Mexican product, and it comes into the United States, it comes into the United States as not being part of the quota put forth by the Bush administration.

If we take a look at it, and in fact, one of the recent articles that appeared right after the President made his recommendation was from the California Steel Institute. They said, "We are pleased that the President recognized that slabs are different from finished products and excluded slab from the tariff measure imposed on finished steel products." Those who use slabs already recognize that the President did nothing to stop or stem the tide of illegal slabs into this country. The vice-chair of the ITC was quoted today in explaining their treatment of slab, and said that it wanted "to avoid causing harm to domestic steel producers that have legitimate needs to continue to import slabs." The vice-chair, Deanna Okun, added that a tariff on slab "would have a potentially severe impact on the members of the domestic industry that need a reliable source of slab." Reliable source.

The iron ore industry in my district has been there for over 150 years. One cannot get much more reliable than men and women going day in and day out, working in the iron ore mines for 150 years to provide America with the basic raw material it needs to produce steel, being iron ore pellets.

The California Steel Institute went on to say, "We fought hard to convince the U.S. Government to treat slabs separately from finished steel. As a raw material that is virtually nonexistent in the U.S. market, slab is fundamentally different from finished steel products such as hot bands and plate." Yes, it is different, because those of us in this country use iron ore as opposed to cheap imported slabs.

I should note that the California Steel Institute that I have been commenting on here tonight, 50 percent is owned by CBRD, a Brazilian iron ore company, and the other 50 percent is owned by a Japanese company. So while California steel industries are talking about how they have no remedy or how the slab remedy proposed by the President does not hurt them, they are already foreign owned. They will use Mexico as an export platform, and they will just sidestep these proposed remedies.

The California steel industry and others who have used slab steel realize that the President's remedy is nothing, and slab was not hurt. In fact, they are pleased with the remedy the President put forth. We in the iron ore industry and those who represent iron ore miners are not pleased. Iron mines are as reliable as the day is long. The miners have been there for us through all the world wars. They are loyal, hard-working Americans; and now they have just basically been exported out of this country.

I previously passed an amendment last year, a "melted and poured" amendment, which basically says that any steel used in the United States defense industry must be from steel that is melted and poured here in the United States. I will be offering this amendment again in the next 30 to 60 days on the supplemental appropriation bill; and every possible piece of legislation that it is germane to, I will be offering this amendment. I and others who represent iron ore miners will not give up, we will not sell out, we will not be shortchanged, and we will not shortchange our miners. We plan to be here day in and day out to continue to stand up for our iron ore miners.

OIL DEPENDENCE IS MAGNET FOR CONFLICT

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our thoughts and prayers this evening are with the men and women in our Armed Forces who serve America's cause on the front lines in Afghanistan, fighting one front in the war against terrorism. We await their prompt return, and we extend our deepest sympathies to the families of our fallen soldiers. As we prosecute the war against terrorism, we must take affirmative steps as a Nation to drain the swamp of hatred and violence in central Asia and the Middle East, in Indonesia, Africa, and Central America.

But the real dimension of our mission must be clear. Even as our troops carry out their dangerous assignments in the four corners of our world, the Bush administration is pushing a plan for \$98 million in outlays for military equipment to protect not democratic values, but an oil pipeline in Colombia. This aspect of the Bush administration foreign policy should serve to focus our attention on the urgent need for the United States to wean itself from a dangerous addiction to foreign oil. In fact, that historic addiction to Saudi oil, to Kuwaiti oil, to Iraqi oil, to Colombian oil, to Nigerian oil, lies on the basis of the repressive regimes whose dissidents strike out now against our country. It is an addiction that distorts our foreign policy, that drains our national wealth and demands treatment.

The treatment on the home front for that oil addiction is restoring fuel independence, energy independence for America again, and one of the most promising sources is biofuels.

I would like to submit for the RECORD this evening a simply magnificent article in foreign affairs called "The New Petroleum," written by a Member of the other body, RICHARD G. LUGAR and former CIA Director R. James Woolsey. The first sentence of this article reads: "Oil is a magnet for conflict." And it talks about well over two-thirds of the world's remaining oil reserves lie in the Middle East and becoming more and more precious as this

century and millennium proceed. But then it talks about ethanol always being there as an alternative to gasoline, but never really being taken seriously, because until now, it has only been possible to produce ethanol from a tiny portion of the corn plant, the edible portions.

But recent breakthroughs in genetic engineering and processing of new biocatalysts have made possible something called "cellulosic biomass," literally using every scrap of organic material on the face of the Earth, including this country's waste material put into our landfills, to spawn an entire new industry for our country and, indeed, countries of the world. If the hundreds of billions of dollars that now flow into a few coffers of a few nations were to flow instead to the millions of people who till the world's fields, most countries would see substantial national security, economic, and environmental benefits.

It talks about genetically engineered biocatalysts and advancing processing technologies that can make a transition from fossil fuels to biofuels affordable, and would not the world's security picture change dramatically. U.S. diplomacy and policies in the Middle East could be guided by a respect for democracy, rather than a need to protect oil supplies and accommodate oil-producing regimes, all of which are undemocratic.

It talks about cellulosic ethanol, radically improving the outlook for rural areas around the world, and how the nearly \$70 billion spent annually for imported oil representing nearly half of the U.S. trade deficit, and would it not be better to spend those dollars here at home producing new jobs based on new fuels production for our own people and the world. It talks about how renewable fuels will actually reduce greenhouse gases around the world, and it talks about how these technologies are even better than the battery-powered technologies that are being developed and the various nuclear technologies that are being promoted by the Bush administration, which have spent plutonium, for which there is no real safe answer.

□ 1915

It talks about ethanol's economic viability as a result of these new technologies coming online with biocatalysts and new genetic engineering and the tremendous difference it will make in the price per gallon. The current efficiency of ethanol processing is somewhat analogous to that of petroleum refining in the early part of the 20th century, when after the invention of thermal cracking, it made possible a major share of the petroleum molecule for gasoline production. We are at the dawn, at the dawn of the biofuels age. We only need to see it.

Dartmouth engineering professor Lee Lynd talks about using only some of our Nation's agricultural and forest residues to produce a minimum of 8

percent of replacement for gasoline. And then take a look at much of the land idled across the country, and many of the forests, where there is residue on the ground, harvesting that, using that, using all the corn stalks that are being thrown away, all of the cotton hulls that are being thrown away, using those organics to produce fuel, and replacing a minimum of 25 percent additional.

So we would add the 8 percent, add the 25 percent, and we are moving to well over nearly 40 percent already of replacing what we currently are required to fuel with gasoline.

I include for the RECORD this really incredible article; again, "The New Petroleum in Foreign Affairs," by Senator LUGAR and R. James Woolsey. It is the future. Please take a look at it.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE NEW PETROLEUM

(By Richard G. Lugar and R. James Woolsey)

WHY CHANGE?

Oil is a magnet for conflict. The problem is simple—everyone needs energy, but the sources of the world's transportation fuel are concentrated in relatively few countries. Well over two-thirds of the world's remaining oil reserves lie in the Middle East (including the Caspian basin), leaving the rest of the world dependent on the region's collection of predators and vulnerable autocrats. This unwelcome dependence keeps U.S. military forces tied to the Persian Gulf, forces foreign policy compromises, and sinks many developing nations into staggering debt as they struggle to pay for expensive dollar-denominated oil with lower-priced commodities and agricultural products. In addition, oil causes environmental conflict. The possibility that greenhouse gases will lead to catastrophic climate change is substantially increased by the 40 million barrels of oil burned every day by vehicles.

Ethanol has always provided an alternative to gasoline. In terms of environmental impact and fuel efficiency, its advantages over gasoline substantially outweigh its few disadvantages. But until now it has only been practical to produce ethanol from a tiny portion of plant life—the edible parts of corn or other feed grains. Corn prices have fluctuated around \$100 a ton in the last few years, ranging from half to double that amount. Ethanol has thus been too expensive to represent anything but a small, subsidized niche of the transportation fuel market. In spite of recent reductions in the expense of ethanol processing, the final product still costs roughly a dollar a gallon, or about double today's wholesale price of gasoline.

Recent and prospective breakthroughs in genetic engineering and processing, however, are radically changing the viability of ethanol as a transportation fuel. New biocatalysts—genetically engineered enzymes, yeasts, and bacteria—are making it possible to use virtually any plant or plant product (known as cellulosic biomass) to produce ethanol. This may decisively reduce cost—to the point where petroleum products would face vigorous competition.

The best analogy to this potential cost reduction is the cracking of the petroleum molecule in the early twentieth century. This let an increasingly large share of petroleum be used in producing high-performance gasoline, thus reducing waste and lowering cost enough that gasoline could fuel this century's automotive revolution. Genetically engineered biocatalysts and new processing techniques can similarly make it pos-

sible to utilize most plant matter, rather than a tiny fraction thereof, as fuel. Cellulosic biomass is extremely plentiful. As it comes to be used to produce competitively priced ethanol, it will democratize the world's fuel market. If the hundreds of billions of dollars that now flow into a few coffers in a few nations were to flow instead to the millions of people who till the world's fields, most countries would see substantial national security, economic, and environmental benefits.

PAYING FOR ROGUES

Energy is vital to a country's security and material well-being. A state unable to provide its people with adequate energy supplies or desiring added leverage over other people often resort to force. Consider Saddam Hussein's 1990 invasion of Kuwait, driven by his desire to control more of the world's oil reserves, and the international response to this threat. The underlying goal of the U.N. force, which included 500,000 American troops, was to ensure continued and unfettered access to petroleum.

Oil permeates every aspect of our lives, so even minor price increases have devastating impacts. The most difficult challenge for planners, policymakers, and alternative-energy advocates is the transportation sector, which accounts for over 60 percent of U.S. oil demand. The massive infrastructure developed to support gasoline-powered cars is particularly resistant to modifications. It precludes rapid change to alternative transportation systems and makes America highly vulnerable to a break in oil supplies. During a war or embargo, moving quickly to mass transit or to fuel-cell or battery-powered automobiles would be impossible.

For most countries, excluding only those few that will be the next century's oil suppliers, the future portends growing indebtedness, driven by increasingly expensive oil imports. New demand for oil will be filled largely by the Middle East, meaning a transfer of more than \$1 trillion over the next 15 years to the unstable states of the Persian Gulf alone—on top of the \$90 billion they received in 1996.

Dependence on the Middle East entails the risk of a repeat of the international crises of 1973, 1979, and 1990—or worse. This growing reliance on Middle Eastern oil not only adds to that region's disproportionate leverage but provides the resources with which rogue nations support international terrorism and develop weapons of mass destruction and the ballistic missiles to carry them. Iraqi vx nerve gas and Iranian medium-range missiles show how such regimes can convert oil revenues into extensive and sophisticated armament programs.

IS OIL RUNNING OUT?

Optimists about world oil reserves, such as the Department of Energy, are getting increasingly lonely. The International Energy Agency now says that world production outside the Middle Eastern Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) will peak in 1999 and world production overall will peak between 2010 and 2020. This projection is supported by influential recent articles in *Science* and *Scientific American*. Some knowledgeable academic and industry voices put the date that world production will peak even sooner—within the next five or six years.

The optimists who project large reserve quantities of over one trillion barrels tend to base their numbers on one of three things: inclusion of heavy oil and tar sands, the exploitation of which will entail huge economic and environmental costs; puffery by OPEC nations lobbying for higher production quotas within the cartel; or assumptions about new drilling technologies that may accelerate production but are unlikely to expand reserves.

Once production peaks, even though exhaustion of world reserves will still be many years away, prices will begin to rise sharply. This trend will be exacerbated by increased demand in the developing world. As Daniel Yergin, Dennis Eklof, and Jefferson Edwards pointed out in these pages ("Fueling Asia's Recovery," March/April 1998), even assuming a substantial recession, increased Asian needs alone will add enough demand by 2010 (9 million barrels per day) to more than equal Saudi Arabia's current daily production.

The nations of the Middle East will be ready to exploit the trend of rising demand and shrinking supply. The Gulf states control nearly two-thirds of the world's reserves; the states bordering the Caspian Sea have another several percent. Barring some unforeseen discoveries, the Middle East will control something approaching three-quarters of the world's oil in the coming century.

A WHOLE NEW WORLD

If genetically engineered biocatalyst and advanced processing technologies can make a transition from fossil fuels to biofuels affordable, the world's security picture could be different in many ways. It would be impossible to form a cartel that would control the production, manufacturing, and marketing of ethanol fuel. U.S. diplomacy and policies in the Middle East could be guided more by a respect for democracy than by a need to protect oil supplies and accommodate oil-producing regimes. Our intrusive military presence in the region could be reduced, both ameliorating anti-American tensions and making U.S. involvement in a Middle Eastern war less likely. Other states would also reap benefits. Ukraine, rich in fertile land, would be less likely to be dominated over time by oil-rich Russia. China would feel less pressure to befriend Iran and Iraq or build a big navy to secure the oil of the South China Sea. The ability of oil-exporting countries to shape events would be increasingly limited.

The recent report by the President's Committee of Advisers on Science and Technology (PCAST) predicted that U.S. oil imports will approximately double between 1996 and 2030, from 8.5 million barrels per day, at a cost of \$64 billion, to nearly 16 million barrels per day, at a cost of \$120 billion. They estimated, however, that with concentrated efforts in fundamental energy research and investment in renewable fuel technologies, this could be reduced to 6 million barrels per day in 2030. The report concluded, "A plausible argument can be made that the security of the United States is at least as likely to be imperiled in the first half of the next century by the consequences of inadequacies in the energy options available to the world as by inadequacies in the capabilities of U.S. weapons systems. It is striking that the Federal government spends about 20 times more B&D money on the latter problem than on the former."

FUEL FARMERS

Cellulosic ethanol would radically improve the outlook for rural areas all over the world. Farmers could produce a cash crop by simply collecting agricultural wastes or harvesting grasses or crops natural to their region. Agricultural nations with little to no petroleum reserves would begin to see economic stability and prosperity as they steadily reduced massive payments for oil imports. Even more striking would be redistribution of resources that would occur if farmers and foresters produced much of the world's transportation fuel. We know from the positive results of micro-credit institutions and other such programs that even small increases in income can be a major boost to a subsistence-level family's pros-

pects. If family income is a few hundred dollars a year, earning an extra \$50-\$100 by gathering and selling agricultural residues to a cellulosic ethanol plant could mean a much improved life. Such added income can buy a few used sewing machines to start a business or a few animals to breed and sell. It can begin to replace despondency with hope.

There are likely to be even larger effects on rural development if biomass ethanol production can lead a shift toward using plant matter of other products as well, such as biochemicals and electrical energy. The cleanliness of renewable fuel technologies makes them particularly attractive to countries that lack a sophisticated infrastructure or network of regulatory controls. At least some facilities that process carbohydrates should lend themselves to being simplified and sized to meet the needs of remote communities. If such towns can produce their own fuel, some of their fertilizers, and electricity, they will be far better positioned to make their way out of poverty and to move toward democracy and free enterprise. Local economic development can promote political stability and security where poverty now produces hopelessness and conflict.

A major strength of the new technologies for fermenting cellulosic biomass is the prospect that almost any type of plant, tree, or agricultural waste can be used as a source of fuel. This high degree of flexibility allows for the use of local crops that will enrich the soil, prevent erosion, and improve local environmental conditions.

Finally, as recession and devaluations overseas move the American balance-of-payments deficit from the 1998 level—\$1 billion every two days—toward nearly \$1 billion every day, there will be increased calls for protectionism. The best way to avoid the mistakes of the 1930s is to have a solid economic reason for increasing U.S. production of commodities new bought abroad. The nearly \$70 billion spent annually for imported oil represents about 40 percent of the current U.S. trade deficit, and every \$1 billion of oil imports that is replaced by domestically produced ethanol creates 10,000–20,000 American jobs.

EASY BEING GREEN

To be politically and economically acceptable, changes in fuel must be understood by the American public to be affordable and not disruptive. Most other countries require the same tough criteria—U.S. difficulties in convincing developing nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions are directly related to the cost and the damage this would have on their development plans. But if one of the most effective ways to reduce greenhouse emissions also produced an improved balance-of-payments deficit and opportunities for rural development, economic benefits would suddenly far exceed the costs. The political acceptability of reducing emissions changes substantially when the economics change. A shift to biomass fuels stands out as an excellent way to introduce an environmentally friendly energy technology that has a chance of both enjoying widespread political and economic support and having a decisive impact on the risk of climate change.

Renewable fuels produced from plants are an outstanding way to substantially reduce greenhouse gases. Although burning ethanol releases carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, it is essentially the same carbon dioxide that was fixed by photosynthesis when the plants grew. Burning fossil fuels, on the other hand, releases carbon dioxide that otherwise would have stayed trapped beneath the earth.

If one looks at the complete life cycle of the production and use of ethanol derived

from feed gains, the only addition of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere results from the use of fossil fuel products in planting, chemical fertilizing, harvesting, and processing. But this fossil fuel use can be substantial—up to seven gallons of oil may be needed to produce eight gallons of ethanol. When ethanol is produced from cellulosic biomass, however, relatively little tilling or cultivation is required, reducing the energy inputs. It takes only about one gallon of oil to produce seven of ethanol. There is a virtual consensus among scientists: when considered as part of a complete cycle of growth, fermentation, and combustion, the use of cellulosic ethanol as a fuel, once optimized, will contribute essentially no net carbon dioxide to the atmosphere.

According to a 1997 study done by five laboratories of the U.S. Department of Energy, a vehicle powered by biomass ethanol emits well under one percent of the carbon dioxide emitted by one powered by gasoline. More surprising, however, is that ethanol produced from biomass emits only about one percent of the carbon dioxide emitted by battery-powered vehicles, since the electricity for those is commonly produced by burning fossil fuels at another location. Although local air quality is improved, total carbon dioxide emissions are not curtailed; they are merely exported—for example, from Los Angeles to the Four Corners. Unless the electricity to charge the car's batteries is produced by renewable fuels or nuclear power, electric vehicles are only 20 to 40 percent better as carbon dioxide emitters than gasoline-powered cars. Biomass ethanol beats both by a factor of about 100, fundamentally changing the global-warming debate.

FRINGE BENEFITS

Cellulosic ethanol is the only alternative fuel that requires, at most, very modest changes to vehicles and the transportation infrastructure. One need not spend money retooling Detroit, nor spend years awaiting the gradual replacement of older vehicles by those with new technology. Nor does one need to modify or construct pipelines and storage tanks to hold hydrogen as an alternate to petroleum. This compatibility with today's infrastructure saves billions of dollars and not just years, but decades. Moreover, there is nothing incompatible between using ethanol now in internal combustion engines and using it later in more efficient power systems, such as hybrids or fuel cells.

Essentially all automobiles currently on the road can use fuel containing up to ten percent ethanol. But strict fuel economy standards have encouraged the development and production of flexible fuel vehicles (FFVS) that can use up to 85 percent ethanol. FFVS are already in dealers' showrooms, containing (at no added cost to the consumer) the minor engine modifications—a computer chip in the fuel system and a fuel line made out of slightly different material—that make large-scale ethanol use possible. Even pure ethanol vehicles are quite practical. Brazil has 3.6 million on the road.

Corn ethanol will continue to serve an important role as ethanol production shifts to cellulosic biomass. Commercialization of corn ethanol has provided a base of industrial experience, talented people, and infrastructure from which a much larger cellulosic ethanol industry may be launched. For corn farmers, biomass is no threat; it will probably be a boon. Indeed, there is likely to be a continuing, perhaps even an expanding, market for corn ethanol because of the value of its byproducts, such as animal feed. In general, the transition from corn to cellulosic biomass and from a few producers to many is likely to expand opportunities for American farmers.

BIOENGINEERED BUGS

Ethanol's economic viability depends on making it cheaper to produce. This can be achieved by making it out of cellulosic biomass, which includes essentially anything that grows or has grown: agricultural and forest residues, prairie grass, kudzu, waste wood, used paper products, even much of urban waste. Last year, about 95 percent of the ethanol produced in the United States came from corn. But agricultural residues and other wastes have low or even negative cost—some you are paid to haul away—while crops like prairie grass cost only a few tens of dollars a ton. This represents a substantial savings in the raw material used in ethanol and puts it within the range of oil, even inexpensive Persian Gulf oil.

Only recently have scientists developed the means to convert cellulosic biomass efficiently into ethanol. The edible portions of corn and other grains easily ferment into ethanol because of their chemical make-up. Most biomass, however, consists of more recalcitrant hemicellulose and cellulose, requiring both the breaking up of these two fibers as well as the fermenting of both five- and six-carbon sugars. This all happens in nature, but two parts of it—fermenting five-carbon sugars and breaking up cellulose quickly—are technically challenging. The first is now done by genetically engineered microorganisms; this tool and other new techniques are now being brought to bear on the second problem.

How far along are these developments? The current efficiency of ethanol processing is somewhat analogous to that of petroleum refining in the early 1900s: after the invention of thermal cracking made it possible to use a major share of the petroleum molecule for gasoline production but before the invention of catalytic cracking opened up an even larger share of petroleum to exploitation. In short, we have come a long way, but still have some inventing to do. The new, genetically engineered microorganisms have already taken us far toward the fermentation of ethanol from a wide range of plant material, laying the groundwork for reductions in processing costs as well.

The new microorganisms, combined with other improvements in processing, fundamentally change the equation for considering ethanol a major transportation fuel. According to a recent study by Dartmouth engineering professor Lee Lynd, utilizing only some of the nation's agricultural and forest residues, with no additional land use, could supply over 15 billion gallons of ethanol a year—more than ten times the amount now produced from corn, and enough to replace around eight percent of the nation's gasoline. (Not all residues would be used, of course, since some must be left for long-term fertility.) Lynd also calculated that taking a little over half of the 60 million acres of cropland historically idled by federal programs for conservation and other purposes, and using for ethanol production the mown grasses with which much of this acreage is ordinarily planted, would produce enough ethanol to fulfill around 25 percent of the country's annual gasoline needs. These calculations use current automobile mileage. Lynd notes that further mileage improvements, achieved through a shift to hybrids or fuel cells, could obviate the need for gasoline entirely, without taking land from food crops or nonagricultural uses. The coproduction of animal feed and biomass residues from alfalfa and witchgrass is especially promising. There is, in short, no basis for the argument that America does not have the land to produce enough ethanol to make a very large dent in U.S. gasoline consumption.

Biofuels must be produced in ways that enhance overall environmental quality. Sound land-use policies certainly must be followed, to protect wildlife habitat and address other environmental concerns. But professional land-use techniques should readily accomplish this. Alternative fuels are often seen as an unpalatable necessity representing a retrenched standard of living, forced upon us in an age of limits. The opposite may be true. Utilization of renewable fuels will make it possible for us to continue enjoying the freedom afforded by private cars, even as the production of petroleum begins to decline.

THE RIGHT STUFF?

Early this century, Henry Ford expected that ethanol, not gasoline, would be the fuel of choice for automobiles. His reasons are evident. The two fuels can be compared by examining three basic parameters—energy content, octane, and vapor pressure. Pure ethanol contains 69 percent of the energy of gasoline. A lower energy content translates into fewer miles to the gallon; in order to travel the same range, about a 30 percent larger fuel tank is needed (as is used in Brazil). Many scientists believe that optimizing engines for ethanol use will largely compensate for this difference, in part because ethanol is a simple combination of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen. It is vastly less complex than gasoline, which means that fine-tuning an engine to squeeze very last drop of energy from ethanol is potentially easier.

Octane is the measure of a fuel's ability to oxidize hydrogen and carbon molecules within a fraction of a second. When the reaction is not simultaneous, "engine knock" and inefficient combustion result. Ethanol has an octane rating 15 percent higher than gasoline's. In the 1920s ethanol was briefly considered as a large-scale additive to gasoline to stop the knocking of the new higher compression engines. However, to the detriment of public health, ethanol lost out to highly toxic tetraethyl lead, for three reasons: in contrast to ethanol, only a small amount of lead was needed as an additive; some were concerned that corn-derived ethanol would compete for land and threaten the feed grains market; and since Prohibition was in effect, many were also worried about the security problems associated with maintaining large volumes of what is essentially 200-proof vodka. Ethanol's ability to be an effective fuel, however, was never an issue.

A third important fuel measurement is vapor pressure, or how readily a liquid evaporates. A fuel's vapor pressure is directly lined to the quantity of vehicle emissions, since over 40 percent of automobile emissions result from evaporation, not tailpipe emissions. Substituting ethanol for gasoline in any amount reduces tailpipe emissions and thus reduces urban smog. Pure ethanol, and any gasoline-ethanol mixture that is more than 22 percent ethanol, has a lower vapor pressure than gasoline and would therefore reduce the amount of evaporative emissions.

Somewhat confusingly, however, blends of ethanol and current gasoline have a slightly higher vapor pressure than pure gasoline when the mixture contains less than 22 percent ethanol, because of the unique mixing properties of the liquids. Some studies show that low-level blends of ethanol and gasoline (like gasohol, which is ten percent ethanol) can actually worsen local air pollution, especially the formation of low-level ozone. Consequently, in cities in the Northeast and California, proposals to encourage the use of ethanol blends have often fallen on deaf ears. Some environmentalists see them as camouflaged subsidies for Midwestern corn growers at the expense of the cities.

But although low-level ethanol blends present complex issues, blends with more than 22 percent ethanol—which can be used in FFVs—do not have the vaporization problem. Moreover, with different approaches to refining and blending gasoline, a solution to the vaporization problem may well exist even at mixtures below 22 percent. Finally, ETBE—an oxygenate made from ethanol that improves gasoline combustion—improves air quality both in tailpipe emissions and vaporization, although its use means the fuel contains five to ten percent ethanol.

Choosing to use cellulosic ethanol is not a choice to forsake more advanced automobile propulsion technologies, such as hybrids and fuel cells. Ethanol is compatible with both. Jeffrey Bentley, vice president of Arthur D. Little, Inc., a company recently honored by the U.S. government for its novel fuel-cell technology, stated that "ethanol provides higher efficiencies, fewer emissions, and better performance than other fuel sources, including gasoline. . . . Where ethanol is available, it will be the fuel of choice by consumers." As both hybrids and fuel cells continue to improve, automobiles powered by them may dramatically reduce air pollution. Ethanol's compatibility with both makes moving toward cellulosic ethanol as a transportation fuel much more desirable.

If government policies promote FFVS, moreover, a large fleet of ethanol-compatible vehicles will be available much earlier than would otherwise have been feasible. This is because FFVS can burn gasoline now but can use cellulosic ethanol as it becomes available. Introducing FFVS into the national fleet differs radically in timing from other changes in transportation. Even if an ideal hybrid or fuel-cell vehicle came on the market, the slow rate of turnover in the nation's cars would mean that it would be many years before its introduction would make a dent in overall fuel use. But moving now to substantially increase the number of FFVS being produced would create the capability to shift to cellulosic ethanol as soon as it is available at attractive prices.

In addition, insofar as U.S. security and environmental concerns are more with the consumption of problem-causing petroleum fuel than with fuel in general, substituting cellulosic ethanol for gasoline improves relevant "mileage" radically, even in internal combustion engines. For example, an average automobile gets approximately 17 miles per gallon and is driven approximately 14,000 miles per year, thus using 825 gallons of gasoline annually. Suppose that same automobile were an FFV using a mixed fuel containing 85 percent cellulosic ethanol. Because of ethanol's lower energy content, it would use about 1,105 gallons of fuel, but only 165 would be gasoline. Such a vehicle could be said to be getting, in a sense, over 80 miles per gallon—of national-security-risk-increasing, carbon-dioxide-producing gasoline.

The one remaining barrier to widespread replacement of gasoline with ethanol is production cost. Relying on feed grains makes this cost comparatively high and volatile, since corn is subject to the caroming behavior of feed markets. In 1995, its price of \$100 a ton nearly doubled, forcing a sharp curtailment in ethanol production. A partial shift to biomass should circumvent such instabilities. Over the past 15 years, the cost of producing a gallon of ethanol has been cut in half, to just over \$1 a gallon wholesale. If, as predicted, the new biocatalysts, low and steady raw material costs, and improved processing let costs fall another 50 percent or so, ethanol could compete with gasoline at today's prices. If oil prices rise in the next century, gasoline could actually be at a substantial price disadvantage.

Such a reduction of ethanol cost is entirely plausible for two reasons. First, a simple comparison of energy content reveals that a dry ton of biomass crops—\$40 is a reasonable current average cost—is comparable to oil at \$10–13 a barrel. Agricultural wastes, in many cases, are considerably cheaper than either: many are free or have negative cost. So the overall costs of cellulosic biomass are likely to at least be in the same ballpark as those of crude oil. Second, further reductions in the cost of processing seem quite achievable. The current cost of processing ethanol is significantly higher than the equivalent price per barrel for oil. But this discrepancy reflects the maturity and sophistication of the petroleum industry, developed over the past century, as compared to the fledgling biofuels effort. Producing ethanol is not inherently more complex than refining petroleum—in fact, just the contrary. The world has simply invested far more effort in the latter.

JUMP-START

While the private sector will provide the capital and motivation to move toward ethanol, the federal government has a vital role to play. Market forces seldom reflect national security risks, environmental issues, or other social concerns. The private sector often cannot fund long-term research, despite its demonstrated potential for dramatic innovation. Hence, the federal government must increase its investment in renewable energy research, particularly in innovative programs such as genetic engineering of biocatalysts, development of dedicated energy crops, and improved processing. The very small sums previously invested by the Departments of Energy and Agriculture have already spawned dramatic advances. Every effort should be made to expand competitive, merit-based, and peer-reviewed science and to encourage research that cuts across scientific disciplines.

Research is essential to produce the innovations and technical improvements that will lower the production costs of ethanol and other renewable fuels and let them compete directly with gasoline. At present, the United States is not funding a vigorous program in renewable technologies. The Department of Energy spends under two percent of its budget on renewable fuels; its overall work on renewable technologies is at its lowest level in 30 years. Because private investment often follows federal commitment, industrial research and development has also reached new lows. These disturbing trends occur at a time of national economic prosperity when America has both time and resources for investing in biofuels. The United States cannot afford to wait for the next energy crisis to marshal its intellectual and industrial resources.

Research alone will not suffice to realize cellulosic ethanol's promise. The federal government should also modify the tax code to spur private investment. The existing renewable alcohol tax credits have recently been extended by Congress through 2007—which will help the growth for the new biofuels industry and offer some protection in the transition from grain to cellulosic biomass. But the tax credit structure should facilitate the gradual adoption of cellulosic ethanol—in time, it should not need subsidies. Government incentives to produce FFVs should also be increased.

Finally, there must be a coordinated effort across the many different federal agencies that oversee government laboratories and regulatory agencies. The analogy to the semiconductor industry is instructive. In 1987, Congress authorized the creation of a government-industry partnership, the Semiconductor Manufacturing Technology Asso-

ciation (SEMATECH). Under the direction of the Department of Defense's Advanced Research Projects Agency, SEMATECH pursued fundamental research in semiconductor components and manufacturing processes. Private firms with innovative ideas were encouraged to devote research dollars to transform the idea into a commercial reality. The few domestic semiconductor manufacturers were brought together in forums where the companies could discuss technical hurdles without sacrificing competitive advantage. Today, the success of SEMATECH is evident, as the high-technology sector demonstrates. Biofuels offer a similar opportunity.

Cellulosic ethanol is a first-class transportation fuel, able to power the cars of today as well as tomorrow, use the vast infrastructure already built for gasoline, and enter quickly and easily into the transportation system. It can be shipped in standard rail cars and tank trucks and is easily mixed with gasoline. Although somewhat lower in energy content, it has a substantially higher octane rating than gasoline, allowing for more efficient combustion. It can radically reduce the emission of global warming gases, help reduce the choking smog of our cities, and improve air quality. It is far less toxic than petroleum, far less likely to explode and burn accidentally, and far simpler physically and chemically, making possible simpler refining procedures. If a second Exxon Valdez filled with ethanol ran aground off Alaska, it would produce a lot of evaporation and some drunk seals.

Our growing dependence on increasingly scarce Middle Eastern oil is a fool's game—there is no way for the rest of the world to win. Our losses may come suddenly through war, steadily through price increases, agonizingly through developing-nation poverty, relentlessly through climate change—or through all of the above. It would be extremely short-sighted not to take advantage of the scientific breakthroughs that have occurred and that are in the offing, accelerate them, and move smartly toward ameliorating all of these risks by beginning to substitute carbohydrates for hydrocarbons. If we do, we will make life far less dangerous and far more prosperous for future generations. If we do not, those generations will look back in angry wonder at the remarkable opportunity that we missed.

IDENTIFYING THOSE KILLED IN OPERATION ANACONDA, AND URGING AMERICANS TO FULLY SUPPORT THE REBUILDING OF AFGHANISTAN

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Afghanistan just a few hours ago, being on the ground and visiting with the military personnel, serving and dedicating themselves to freedom, I thought it was appropriate to come to the floor of the House to acknowledge the cause upon which we fight, and to call the names of those in the last 72 hours who have lost their lives:

In the Army, Sergeant Bradley Crose, 27; Sergeant Philip J. Svitak, 31; Specialist Marc A. Anderson, 30; Private Matthew A. Commons, 21.

In the Navy, First Class Neil C. Roberts, 32;

In the Air Force, Tech Sergeant John A. Chapman, 36; Senior Airman Jason D. Cunningham, 26.

And in the last 72 hours, as well, Army Chief Warrant Officer Stanley L. Harriman, 34.

It should be recognized that the American people love freedom and they love their values of democracy and justice. Those young men and women that we visited with likewise love those values and fight for them. To them I pay great tribute this evening.

I say to the American public that we must look at their battle that is continuing as we speak as a battle for the recapturing, if you will, of the virtues of democracy and justice and freedom and equality for the people of Afghanistan.

As we traveled the one road they had and saw the conditions of their major cities, and looked at the frighteningly poor people with no food and 97 percent illiteracy in their women, and thousands of children living in orphanages and burned-out and bombed-out buildings, it did not occur because of the American influence of the last couple of months, but because of the 23 years of war.

It is important for America to understand that if we are to fight terrorism and win, we must rebuild Afghanistan, its systems of government, its love for freedom, its economic structure. That must be the war we must fight.

I will take to the floor of the House to tell Members what I saw: The conditions of women, the conditions of the people who lived there. There is no agriculture and no food. Hospital units that I visited had malnourished babies and children because there is no food.

So as Chairman Karzai has said, Afghanistan would have been in hell if it had not been for the brave men and women that are fighting there today. But as we fight to rid it of the last vestiges of terrorism, let us not be fearful of investing dollars, so they might not only love freedom, but they may act upon freedom.

Again, I will share with the Members how the women still wear burqas and that there is no system of equality of rights for women. But we must never undermine those young men and women who fight and stand side by side because they believe in those values and virtues that we cling to in this Nation.

Hopefully, we will realize as Americans that what we fight most of all for, what should be the end result, is peace, not only in central Asia but peace in the Mideast; and the only way we can secure peace is if we engage in diplomacy and begin to put into structure constitutional rights and privileges: equality, justice, and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a lot to learn, but the one thing we know today is that brave men and women offered their lives so we might be free, and others around the world.

THE TWILIGHT ZONE, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS GEORGE BUSH'S AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am worried about what is happening to our great country today. I fear that many of us cannot see what is happening here. Maybe we are too close. Maybe there are even people who do not want us to see; but our friends and allies in Europe and elsewhere are reporting that they are seeing disturbing developments in our country, like the fading of our fundamental constitutional rights, the creation of a war machine that threatens world peace, the spending of a generation of Americans on this war on terrorism, and even an attack on truth in government by forming the Office of Strategic Influence to lie to us and to the rest of the world. The President even asked Hollywood to make these developments palatable to the American people.

With this as a backdrop, I would just like to ask that Members close their eyes and imagine being drawn deeper and deeper into black space. If Members keep their eyes closed and if they close them good and tight, they will be able to imagine themselves going faster and faster and deeper and deeper into a black unknown.

All of a sudden we see a bright light at a distance far away, but faster and faster and closer and closer it becomes brighter and brighter; and in one instant, with one grand motion, we can cross from the darkness into the light. But just before we make the crossing, a huge booming voice coming from nowhere, and at the same time coming from everywhere, booms all around us: You unlock this door with the key of understanding. Beyond it is another dimension, a dimension of hearing that which is not spoken, a dimension of seeing that which is invisible, a dimension of reading that which is not written.

We are moving into a land of both shadow and substance, of things and ideas. Welcome. We just crossed over into the Twilight Zone, otherwise known as George Bush's America. For it is here and only here that the White House could receive warning after warning of massive attacks that were going to take place on American soil, the attack happens, and both the President and the Vice President, in separate phone calls to TOM DASCHLE, ask that Congress not investigate what happened and why. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that an administration battling worldwide perception, as well as a domestic one having come to power in circumstances like Zambia's or Kenya's, could form a shadow government inside the selected government, with no one in the real government knowing about the shadow government except the shadow leaders in it. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that this President could propose the biggest hike in defense spending, where his dad stands to make a mint, as long as increased spending does not get lost wherever the \$2.3 trillion is that the Pentagon has already lost, and the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, says we can afford it. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Or that Arthur Andersen, who kept Enron's books, could still have contracts to keep the books over at FBI, DOJ, and the Pentagon. That could only happen in the Twilight Zone.

Wake up, America. We are not only in the Twilight Zone, we have crossed the threshold into George Bush's America.

CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY AND FRIENDS OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER STANLEY HARRIMAN

(Mr. MCINTYRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman of the Third Special Forces Group of the United States Army who gave his life in the service of our country.

I join with his family and friends in paying tribute to him for the ultimate sacrifice that he has made on behalf of our Nation, and my prayers are with his family.

Stanley Harriman was a decorated soldier who willfully and enthusiastically participated in Operation Enduring Freedom. Among his many awards and decorations were two Meritorious Service Medals, three Army Commendation Medals, three Army Achievement Medals, the Valorous Unit Award, Army Superior Unit Award, two Army Good Conduct Medals, the National Defense Service Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, three Southwest Asia Service Medals, the Humanitarian Service Medal, three Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Medals, the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon, the Master Parachutist Badge, and the Special Forces Tab. Now, because of his heroic actions in recent days, he will also receive the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

This tragedy should remind us that our freedom and our security are neither free nor secure; they are repeatedly earned and protected by our men and women in uniform. They risk their lives so freedom may survive. Chief Warrant Officer Harriman's courage in the face of danger reflects his character, a character born of his personal commitment to his Lord as a committed Christian and to his family as a committed husband, father, brother, and son.

We owe Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman a tremendous debt of

gratitude. His courage, character, and commitment to freedom are an example to all of us. It is important that we not only remember Stanley as an excellent and dedicated soldier and Christian family man, but also as the American hero that he is.

May God bless him and his family and those who have served with him. May God bless our great country. We indeed are a better Nation because of men like Stanley Harriman and those who serve with him in our Nation's Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman 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.)

SOCIAL SECURITY, THE SHADOW GOVERNMENT, AND THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of different issues that I would like to address this evening; but I find myself, having listened to the last hour of comments, in need of a little rebuttal to some of these comments, especially those comments that were directed to us by the minority leader, which of course went un rebutted.

First of all, the minority leader talks about some kind of secret Republican plan for Social Security. Where does he get that? What gives him the liberty to make those kinds of remarks? That speech that the minority leader gave, in my opinion, was one of the most partisan speeches I have heard on this floor.

I challenge the minority leader to show me one Republican or show me one Democrat on the House floor, one in office in either our House or at any elected level, that is against Social Security. Show me one elected official in this country that wants to devastate Social Security. Show me one Congressman, Mr. Minority Leader, that meets the standards that he put out there: because they are Republican, they must be against Social Security.

What really justifies some of those remarks, I would guess, is the fact that it is an election year, and now is the time to begin to position oneself as the savior of Social Security. The minority leader talks about, we should not talk about numbers, we should talk about values. He is right, the minority leader, we should talk about values. Part of those values are the preservation of that system.

All of us on this floor, Republicans and Democrats, want to preserve the

system; but in order to meet that value of preservation of the system, we need to talk about numbers. Let us talk about a few numbers.

When that system was created 67 years ago, we had, what, 12 workers for every retired person? Today that statistic is three workers for every retired person, and in a few short years it is going to be that there are two people working for every retired person. Take a look at the math on that, Mr. Minority Leader, and take a calculation of what that means.

Furthermore, take a look 67 years ago what the average age was, the average life expectancy for a male and a female, and compare it to today.

□ 1930

I would suggest that the difference between 67 years ago and the life expectancy today is at least a minimum of 14, perhaps 15 or 16 years. And what will it be when the generations of my children grow, another 10 years, when people are living longer?

And that is the good news. The fact is that our system is getting more and more weight put against it. We have got to come up with more and more dollars to continue the same kind of benefits. One, if we have less people putting in and more people taking out, we better talk about numbers, Mr. Minority Leader. And because of the fact that some of us who are fiscally conservative want to talk about numbers does not mean we are against Social Security.

Mr. Minority Leader, there are a number of Democrats on your side of the aisle who are fiscally conservative. There are a number of Democrats who worry about those numbers. There are a number of Democrats who put the emotion aside, the rhetoric aside and try and sit down with us and those who are interested in trying to figure out how do we work with these numbers so that, one, we can meet the demands of the future.

Any elected official that tells you that any other elected official wants to do away with Social Security, frankly, is not telling you the truth. I have yet in my years of service in the United States Congress, I have yet to find one Congressman, and we have gone through hundreds of Congressmen in the years that I have been in service, I have yet to find one Congressman who has told me to my face or I have heard it through an indirect conversation that has said what the minority leader said, and that is that the Republicans want to get rid of Social Security; that they have a secret plan out there for Social Security to slash the benefits of all of these people.

Mr. Minority Leader, I think your approach would be better phrased if you said, hey, look, we better sit down, both sides of this thing. We better talk numbers. Obviously, the value is preservation of the system. I think everybody agrees with that. So there should not be any argument about who wants to preserve the system.

Again, everybody that I know of in the United States Congress, and I defy the minority leader to show me somebody who does not, but everybody I know, every Congressperson wants to preserve the system. So put that argument aside. It is not an argument of preservation. It is a discussion of numbers.

How do we work with these numbers? How do we figure it out? Take a look at 67 years ago, the benefits that Social Security paid out, and take a look at the expansion of benefits that have occurred in the last 67 years without a reflective expansion of revenue coming in.

In other words, the Congresses through the years and the people of the country through the years have appropriated and approved more benefits than they have revenue coming in. Come on. You have got to deal with your family budget and you have a responsibility to deal with the budget of this country.

The best way to preserve Social Security for the future, which we all want to do, is to act with some economic sensibility. Do not mislead the people by pretending to promise them things that you know several years after you leave office, several years after you accomplish what you want to accomplish politically, somebody else gets stuck with the bill. That is what happened years ago when 40 years of rule here stacked up deficit after deficit.

Now we are back into a deficit this year, but it is not because of some kind of slight of hand. It is because we are engaged in a war and we are watching our revenue drop. We have to sit down and discuss that, just the same as Social Security. So those remarks at the beginning of this evening by the minority leader, again, some of the most partisan remarks I have seen on this floor, are clearly devised for election strategy.

It is an election year, and as we proceed closer to November, you will see, unfortunately, more and more people using the strategy of this microphone to enhance their own political self-serving interest. And I hope we can avoid that, especially when it comes to Social Security. Many of us, many Democrats that I know do not take part, do not participate in those kind of partisan discussions. They instead sit together in groups of people and say, how do we figure out, how do we work the numbers?

We have a problem. We have a lot more going out in Social Security over time than we have coming in. On a cash flow basis we are okay, but on an actuarial basis over time Social Security needs to have some adjustments.

I do not condemn the President of the United States. I commend the President of the United States for stepping forward and saying, get some expert help. Let me reach out to a commission, a commission made up of Republicans and Democrats, a commis-

sion made up of experts and of people who understand the needs of that generation and the needs of future generations, people that know, that are experts in accounting and economics.

That is the kind of panel that this President, President Bush, put together. Instead of condemning it and saying it is some kind of secret society out there which, of course, is obviously nothing but politically-charged language, the fact is they have come up with some suggestions, that the commission has worked long and hard to try to come up with something that is constructive towards preservation of the Social Security system.

So I would hope that the minority leader would tone down these kind of partisan remarks; and instead of showing up at the microphone and firing out with this negotiation as an election year strategy, in my opinion, I think he would be much better served if he would join us and sit down and maybe go over to the commission and sit down in person with that commission and talk about what their ideas are and what we can do to preserve the system.

SHADOW GOVERNMENT

Let me move on to a couple of other things that I think are very, very important.

First of all, in the last few days I have seen a media barrage, a media barrage across this country, about how aghast some people are that President Bush, the Vice President and the administration have put into place a back-up government in case a terrorist attack took out the sitting government in Washington, D.C.

Why would anybody be surprised about that? You better have a back-up plan in place. You know what happened at this U.S. Capitol on September 11? I was here. You know what kind of back-up plan we had? Zip. Zero. We were fortunate that a few brave souls, a few brave souls took a plane into the ground in Pennsylvania, because my guess is this plane would have been right here, coming through this dome in this Capitol and would have very easily wiped out the congressional leadership. That plane that hit the Pentagon very easily may have been intended to hit the White House and take out the leadership there.

Sure, we have a line of succession; but what happens to that line of succession, as occurred on September 11, when in one central location are your Cabinet secretaries and your different agencies, and they have no direction from the selected government on how to run? Of course you better make up back-up plans.

In fact, some of the people, some of my colleagues here have different bills they have introduced, for example, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) on succession. I think it is a very legitimate and, frankly, is a responsibility of this administration, after September 11 especially, to say, hey, what if this happens again? What if they would have wiped out the

United States Congress? What if they would have wiped out the White House? Who gives direction to our government? What kind of safeguards do we have?

So I commend the administration, not condemn it. I commend the administration for thinking forward into the future, for having some kind of foresight as to what we ought to do in case this scenario repeats itself again.

We all know that there are people out there who hate the United States and would love nothing more than to destroy this great building and the people that work in it and to disable our government. So now is the time to prepare.

So my opinion is people that have criticized this surprise me. Criticizing the President for, in effect, buying a back-up fire truck in case the fire station burns down. You ought to say, good job. Keep it up. That is the kind of forward thinking that we need to prepare against this ongoing battle against terrorism and this ongoing battle against people who wish evil against the United States of America.

HONORING CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER STANLEY L. HARRIMAN

I want to move on from this and visit just for a moment about the horrible causalities that we have taken as far as in the last 48 hours or so. The deaths that were suffered were terrible, but I want to read, in fact, about the gentleman who was mentioned here, Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman who lost his life in the last few hours in Afghanistan. I wanted to read a few comments out of today's New York Times from the families.

This is a card last month that the Chief Warrant Officer sent his wife, an e-mail message rejoicing that he had been sent to Afghanistan. "Honey, I am so excited about going to Afghanistan. I will be doing what I have trained for 16 years to do."

His survivors, which include his wife, a 6-year-old daughter and a 3-year-old son, his father, who is retired military, and he has a brother; and of this family, the commitment of this family towards the duty of their father, towards the duty of their husband, towards the duty of their son, towards the duty of their brother, it is an amazing family, that the duty and the preservation and the great things that we have in this country called for him to be in Afghanistan.

Let me share that card. Let me repeat a card that the Chief Warrant Officer sent to his wife, another card. He mailed a card to his wife from Kuwait which she received about one week ago. Mrs. Harriman, the wife, read from it during an interview. "I know that it is not always easy with me gone so much, but we have so much to be thankful for. We are truly blessed by God, and these trials and tribulations will only make us stronger."

Then let me say to you what his brother said, after learning of his brother's death. This is the Chief War-

rant Officer's brother, Steve. He said that "he hoped the military would not flinch at pursuing military operations to their conclusion.

"Stan would not have changed it if he could. He would do it the same way," Steve said. "I hope they continue to do what they say they are going to do, to complete the mission."

And the key words here are "to complete the mission." We cannot allow the enemy to kill seven or nine or any number of our American soldiers over there and cut and run from our mission.

Some of you may have had the opportunity to see the movie *Black Hawk Down*. Those are the results, that is the kind of results where the sight of a body bag convinces many of our enemies across this world, the al Qaeda and some of the other people, that all you have to do is show the American citizens a body bag and they will cut and run. If you want to break America's resolve, kill a few of their soldiers.

As Steve said about his brother, his brother would want the military to complete its mission. And we have a very heavy mission on our shoulders, this country does, for the world, for the future of the world, not just for our generations and future generations of America, but for generations of all countries of this world. And that is to rid this world to the extent that we possibly can of the cancer that we discovered that had gone a lot further than we had ever imagined. That cancer had spread, and we discovered it on September 11.

Now, we have been able to locate some of that cancer, and we have got to cut that cancer out. You cannot ignore it. You cannot love it off your body. You cannot pray it off your body. All of these things help. Do not get me wrong. That all helps. But the reality is you have to go in with chemotherapy. You may have to go in with surgery. You may have to go in with radiation. You have got to get that cancer. You cannot turn your face the other way. You have got to complete your mission.

You cannot go in and get a few cells of the cancer. You cannot go in and nip the little end off of it. You cannot even go in a take a big chunk of it but still leave some vital cells of cancer still in your body. You have got to complete the mission.

This country has taken a loss in the last few days of some very young and very brave American soldiers. But I would guess that the families of those soldiers and every one of those soldiers if they could say it today would say to the United States of America, complete your mission. Take out the enemy. Destroy those who would destroy this country. Destroy those who would destroy democracy in this world. Destroy those who, without any regard to nationality, any regard to sex, any regard to age would kill thousands of people in an act of terrorist attack.

So I think that our resolve should be hardened. I do not think we should give any kind of message because I do not think it is true with the American citizens. I think our resolve should be hardened to complete this mission.

We have learned from the past. In Somalia, it was a disgrace, frankly, our brave soldiers that fought and gave their lives. Vietnam was another example. We did not complete the mission. And you know what? We have trained people out there, we have convinced our enemies that the United States, again, all they have to do is have a death of their soldiers or torture some of their soldiers or drag them through the street like they did in Somalia, and within a couple of weeks after seeing their soldiers dragged through Somalia the president of the country will order their troops out and we will have beat the American giant.

□ 1945

If we want to protect democracy in this world, if we want to stop terrorism before it stops us, and a better word, instead of stopped, is destroy us, we have to complete the mission. That is exactly what the Harriman family has relayed through the tragic death of Chief Warrant Officer Harriman, and that is "complete your mission."

I want to visit a little about the President and his dedication to the completion of this mission. I noticed some criticism in the last few days of some individuals who say, number one, the President ought to inform us of the operational details of what is going on over there. Listen, we are not military experts. We are Members of the United States Congress. We have some oversight authority and so on, and we work with the administration, but what do my colleagues want done? What, do they want the President to come over to Congress every day and say, all right, here is how many helicopters we have dispatched in this portion of Afghanistan, here is where this ship is, this is what we are doing? Let the President and the military administration do their job.

I heard a complaint over the weekend on some of the news stories that we do not seem to really have a plan of where this is going. Well, I think the Vice President, DICK CHENEY, did a very good job of responding to that. I think it was last evening, when he said, look, the people we are dealing with are terrorists. They are not going to meet us in some country and have a summit for peace or sign a peace treaty with us. There is not going to be some kind of long-term peace plan that they want to execute or cooperate in with the United States of America. There is no deterrent out there against these kind of people. They have one mission in mind: they want to destroy the United States, and they want to destroy anybody that is affiliated with the United States, and they want to destroy people that do not agree with them in any regard.

These are not the kind of people we can draw out some kind of peace plan or conclusion with short of taking them into custody or destroying them. And we cannot just stop with the al Qaeda. We have to call people what they are; we have to call it what it is.

I was amazed that after the President's speech, where he talked about North Korea, that all of a sudden some of my colleagues or some of the commentators across the country were starting to act like North Korea is a very amicable country; that the leadership, and not the people of North Korea, but the leadership of North Korea is not as evil as we portray them to be. What a misconception.

Take a look what North Korea is all about. In fact, if I was a wealthy man, I would spend my money and I would take every high school graduate in this country, if they wanted to go, and I would fly them to Korea and I would take them up to the DMZ and I would show them that line that separates two societies, the society of democracy and freedom against the society of communism and dictatorship and ruthlessness.

But all of a sudden, because our President and his administration, and a very able administration, DICK CHENEY and Condoleezza Rice and Donald Rumsfeld, because they say it so, we all of a sudden see them draw criticism. It was interesting that Colin Powell had to say the other day to even some of our allies in NATO, hey, every time you pound on the United States, why not pound on Iraq.

And when the President talks about Iraq as part of the axis of evil and the evilness of Iran, do not forget the leader of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, who has poisoned his own people. He has not used chemical warfare or other kinds of poison against an enemy, but used it against his own people who disagreed with his policies. Look at the mass executions in that country. Look at the oppression against women in that country. Look at the oppression against scholars.

And let me remind my colleagues that they are not content to keep it within their own borders. North Korea is not content to stay within its own borders. Iraq is not content to stay within its own borders. They want to reach outside their borders, and they want to destroy the signs of freedom, and they want to destroy the evidence of democracy. And we had better stand up to it.

Frankly, most of the people in America have given their support to the President and his leadership. We have got to draw the line in the sand. That is what the President has said, and he is willing to commit the American forces to complete the mission. That is what all of us need to do. But some of my colleagues stand up to the American people and say, well, where is this going and to start criticizing the administration at this point in time on our war against terrorism, when they

have not sat 10 minutes as the commanding officer of the United States, our chief military officer; they have not sat for 10 minutes in a lieutenant's chair in this mission. We need to give these people confidence. We need to give them our confidence that the job they are doing is what needs to be done.

The cancer that is the al Qaeda, the acts of these terrorists, must be stopped. And thank goodness we finally have an administration that, despite the fact that we have taken some casualties, understands that if we are going to clear out the rats, if we are going to get in there and get those cancer cells, we are going to take casualties. There is a lot of dirty work ahead for us to get rid of this threat. But if we do not get rid of it now, the casualties we take today will be nothing, nothing compared to the many casualties we will take in the future and the regrets we will have in the future because we did not support this administration and take out the al Qaeda while we had the opportunity to take out the al Qaeda; while we had the opportunity to do something to restrain the expansionist mode of Iraq and the ideals of Iraq to use nuclear weapons, or biological weapons, or any kind of weapon of mass destruction against the rest of the free world.

So I would urge my colleagues to be a little slower in their criticism; study the facts a little more and do not pretend to be some kind of tank captain out there who knows how to run the battlefield. We have experts out there that do that.

Now, I am not saying that Congress should forgive or forget or release our oversight responsibilities and our budgetary responsibilities, et cetera. I am not saying that. I am just saying that I am beginning to sense that Congress and some Members of Congress are beginning to run interference on their own team. As our quarterback is getting ready to throw the ball, it is not a member of the enemy team that has broken through the line, it is some of our own people, kind of confused and running back there and asking the quarterback if he ought to be throwing the ball, right in the middle of the play. That does not work.

This country, I think, has shown very admirable dedication to what this country is all about, and that is freedom and the protection of people throughout this world. Clearly, it has been reflected by our military, which has done an outstanding job. It has done such a good job that up to this point we have been able to limit casualties. But now when it comes to hand-to-hand combat, which is a necessary part, now when it comes to digging in real deep to get those cancer cells, we are going to have casualties.

I wish we would not have casualties. Everyone in this Chamber wishes we would not have casualties. These poor families who have suffered the worst loss a family can suffer wishes they

had not suffered that. But it is my opinion that almost everybody, almost everybody comes to the same conclusion, and that is that sometimes we have to fight. We cannot run. Sometimes we have to do what is right. Sometimes we have to draw that line in the sand; and when the other person steps over it, we have to stop them. Because if we do not, we will pay a very, very heavy price in the future.

Let me talk very briefly about NATO. As my colleagues know, NATO is our North Atlantic defense council or European council treaty organization, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is very important. They have played an important part in our war in Afghanistan. Within hours after the September 11 attack against the United States of America, NATO, for the first time in its history, for the first time in its history, invoked what is called article 5.

Article 5 in the NATO agreement says, simplified, an attack against one is an attack against all. Within hours after that, NATO agreed to give the United States of America whatever was necessary, whatever the United States requested to assist them going after the people who committed that atrocious act of war against us. And the United States took advantage of that offer and took advantage of our membership in NATO.

We called upon our friends to help us track down the financial network that supported this from a financial point of view. We called upon our friends to help us with intelligence and to help us break up those cells, those terrorist cells, located throughout the world, including some located in the United States of America. We requested, and it was supplied, NATO AWAC aircraft. For the first time in the history of the United States, we had nine U.S. aircraft patrolling our skyways while we sent our AWAC aircraft over to the theater of operations.

I just recently returned from NATO meetings; and when I listened to your British, it was like listening to your own brother. The British are there. They are there 100 percent. And the British people, the ambassador over in London, told me what it was like hours after September 11. Tens of thousands of Britons came to the embassy to sign the condolence books. They could not get a phone call out because there were so many condolence phone calls from the British people to the American people. Tony Blair's resolve was instant and has only strengthened. It has not weakened. He came to the assistance of the United States.

And so I want to commend NATO, but at the same time that I commend our partners in NATO, I want to remind some of our fair weather friends in NATO that this is not going to be an easy battle. Do not let these casualties of the last few hours scare you off. This, clearly, is a battle for this next century. This is a battle that determines the safety and the freedom and

the future for all of our countries, whether you are in NATO or not. This time around it was the United States of America. It was New York. It was Washington, DC. Next time it might be Paris or next time maybe a terrorist attack in the country of Luxembourg or, God forbid, some other place in this world.

We need to stick together as a team. This is not the time to pound on the United States, as Colin Powell has said. It is time to recognize who the enemy is, to acknowledge to the American people and to all world people who that enemy is, and to do something about the enemy. It is time to get a rope around that wild horse and bring it in. This cancer that is spreading throughout the world must be stopped, and it is not going to be stopped through weak knees. It is only going to be stopped through teamwork, through dedication, and, frankly, through sacrifice.

The sacrifice reflected in the last few hours by the loss of American soldiers is exactly the kind of medicine that unfortunately is going to be necessary to take that cancer off that body. So let me, in conclusion of my remarks, just repeat what I said earlier, and these are the remarks of the brother of Chief Warrant Officer Stanley Harriman, who was killed in action in the last few hours, here is what his brother says; and this is how I conclude my remarks this evening: His brother Steve said that he hoped the military, and I add to that NATO and all our allies throughout the world, he hoped the military would not flinch in pursuing military operations to their conclusion. Stan would not have changed it if he could. He would have done it the same way. Steve said, I hope they continue to do what they say they are going to do, to complete the mission.

Our military, with our support, and the administration, which is doing an outstanding job of leading this effort, must be allowed to complete the mission, to protect the freedom of the world and democracy as we know it.

THE BUDGET AND THE DEBT CEILING INCREASE

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, this will be another in a series of 1-hours that the so-called Blue Dog Coalition is taking to focus on the budget, to focus on the request of the administration to raise our debt ceiling by \$750 billion. We want to continue to talk about this.

I want to make it very, very clear that we, the Blue Dogs, are willing to support a temporary increase in the debt limit to meet the expenses of the war and to allow government to meet its obligations; but we suggest holding

off on a long-term increase in the debt ceiling until we have a plan in place to return our country and our fiscal affairs to balance.

□ 2000

I remind everyone that it was less than a year ago that we stood and debated on this floor of the House the economic game plan that we were going to follow for the next year and the next 10 years. I remind everyone just briefly that the Blue Dogs felt that we ought to be conservative with the \$5.6 trillion projected surplus just in case it was not real, just in case something of an emergency nature might occur, just in case those who projected that surplus might be wrong.

We suggested that we ought to take half of that \$5.6 trillion projected surplus and pay down the debt. We were told by our friends on the other side of the aisle and the administration that they were concerned about paying down the debt too quickly.

Well, I do not know where they got that information, but now all of a sudden the President's budget that he has submitted to the Congress this year projects deficits and the utilization of the Social Security trust fund for the next 10 years. I repeat. The President's budget proposes using Social Security trust fund dollars for the next 10 years. That is the economic game plan that we are under tonight.

The Blue Dogs are suggesting that we ought to sit back, the Congress and the President, and our friends on the other side of the aisle need to sit back and roll up our sleeves and have an honest discussion about what we need to do to put our budget back in order. We need to have a serious discussion with everything on the table. The preceding speaker opened his remarks in just that vein, and there are a large number of Democrats who are willing to sit down and try to put our fiscal house back in order, but that offer has to be extended and so far it has not.

The bottom line tonight is that we are being asked to increase our debt ceiling by \$750 billion. That means we are going to have to borrow or it is suggested that we need to borrow that amount of money. In the conduct of the war, we are perfectly willing, if that should be the decision of the President, to borrow the money to fight the war.

There are some that suggest that maybe, just maybe, we ought to consider paying for it, because when we borrow it today we are saying that this generation does not wish to pay for that which we are enjoying, but we are perfectly willing to send that obligation to our children and grandchildren. That is part of the discussion that we wish that we were having on this floor tonight.

We have made it very clear we are willing to participate in a meaningful dialogue, a meaningful debate in which we can have ideas and suggestions put forward as to how we get from where

we are to where we need to be. Where we are today is we are back into deficit spending. We are back into spending the Social Security trust funds when after I think last year five times, five times we voted on this floor unanimously a lockbox on the Social Security trust fund. I guess we did not mean it.

The Blue Dogs when we were on the floor last year talking about the economic game plan that we suggested not only suggested that we ought to take that \$5.6 trillion surplus and devote half of it to paying down the debt, 25 percent of it to cutting taxes, and 25 percent of it to be spent on the priorities of this Nation.

What were those priorities? Fixing Social Security, fixing Medicare, dealing with prescription drugs, dealing with the educational problems of this country. We believe and still believe that we could do what we needed to do with that amount of revenue, and then we proposed cutting taxes with 25 percent of that proposed projected surplus.

Well, we lost. We came up 14 votes short, I believe was the number. And under our system of government, when you lose, you go on to the next round.

Well, here we are into the next round being asked to increase the debt ceiling by 750 billion additional dollars. We say, whoa, let us not do that much at one time. Let us not admit that this body is not capable of working with the other body and working with the President and putting our fiscal house back in order and balancing our budget at a time certain. We are perfectly willing to deal with spending caps, with pay-go so long as everything is put on the table so we might have an open and honest dialogue and then get a vote on the issues in which we are concerned.

Now what does the debt ceiling mean to the average person watching us tonight? I know many times when you listen to us you get very confused. But, basically, it is a businessman going to their lender. It is a student going to their parents, having run up a \$6,000 credit card bill. Of course, the parents will pay because they do not want the kid's credit damaged in the long run, but they will work out the arrangement that includes reducing the allowance, getting a part-time job, and getting promises for less partying, et cetera.

The worse thing that we are doing with our accumulated Federal debt is the reverse of this scenario. Parents are going to the students with their bills and expecting the youths to pay for their elders' irresponsible consumption. A businessman that reaches his credit limit at his bank needs to go to his banker and say, I need to borrow additional money, I have this great investment potential, I have got this great idea, and you convince your banker that you have a plan that will pay him back not only what you have borrowed up to this point but also will pay back that which you are intending to borrow in upping your credit limit.

That is what we are trying to focus on tonight as Blue Dogs, a plan. If Members want to increase the debt ceiling, tell us how they are going to get the budget back into balance in a time certain and in a short time. The economic plan that we are under tonight says 10 years. Ten years we will stay in the Social Security surplus; and then, remember, baby boomers begin to retire in 2008. 2008, that is not very far from tonight. In 2011, we begin to have the baby boomers retiring in earnest. That is not very long. We cannot afford to continue to go into the Social Security trust fund without coming up with a plan for how we are going to fix Social Security and Medicare for the future. That is what we are going to be talking about tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), another one of the true leaders of the Blue Dog Coalition. He has been focusing not only on budget but health care matters and on agricultural matters.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I appreciate the gentleman's great leadership in this House of Representatives over many years. Almost from the beginning, he has been a great champion of fiscal responsibility. He was one of the founders of the Blue Dogs, and fiscal responsibility is our hallmark, and we are very proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot begin to tell you this evening how heartbroken I am that we are here on this floor yet again tonight to talk about the fact that this country simply cannot live within its means. It is a heart-breaking thing to know that we continue to run up bills, borrow money, pass the debt on to our children and grandchildren and tell the American people everything is all right, do not worry about it. That is what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I have to ask: When is this going to stop? How long are we going to allow this to go on? When I came into this House in 1997, that was the last time we had a vote to raise the debt ceiling. We worked hard to create a situation where we would have money to pay off the debt that this generation has accumulated, and we have nothing to show for it.

We worked hard in this House to get a balanced budget and to accumulate a little bit of a surplus and to create a situation where we would have the ability to pay off this debt. Just a year ago, in a Blue Dog meeting, the gentleman that is the director of the Office of Management and Budget, the President's bookkeeper, the President's accountant, came to the Blue Dogs, and I will never ever forget his statement. He said, our greatest fear is that we will have so much money that we will pay off all of the debt, and no one will have a safe place to invest their money because you will not be able to buy a United States treasury bond.

I almost embarrassed myself by laughing out loud right in front of him. I thought it was the most ridiculous

statement I had ever heard because his plan was to create the situation that we have today. He told the Blue Dogs we are not interested, count us out when you talk about taking this surplus and taking half of it and paying down the debt because we do not want any part of that.

We said, let us take a fourth of it and reduce taxes. We thought we should do something about the marriage tax penalty and the estate tax, and I still think we should have. Then we said, let us take a fourth of it and deal with some disparate spending priorities that we feel that we need to deal with. To achieve the balanced budget and the surplus that we had at that time, we had basically train-wrecked the senior citizens health care system because we have created a situation where the health care providers in this country are not going to continue to provide health care to our seniors for the small amount of reimbursement that they get. They are just not going to do it. We are about to ruin the health care system in this country for our seniors. We do not have any money for prescription drug benefits.

We wrote a farm bill to try to balance the budget that bankrupted the entire agricultural community of this country and has cost us far more than we ever intended or a responsible farm bill would have cost us had we done it right.

The long-term interest rates in this country have not gone down, even though we have done everything that we know to do to try to drive them down, and that is an indication that Wall Street and the world's financiers do not want any part of this.

□ 2015

They know that we are borrowing money that we cannot pay back. They know that we are passing an economic burden on to our children and grandchildren that they cannot bear.

What is going to happen? We have already spent all of the Social Security trust fund. We have spent all the Medicare trust fund. All the money is gone. And now we are being asked to raise the ceiling on the amount of money above that that we can borrow: "Let's spend all the money we can get our hands on and then borrow some more to go with it." And what are we going to have to show for it? Nothing. We have not built a road. We have not built a school. We cannot point to anything that we have accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I carry this buckeye in my pocket. It is a relatively worthless little nut off a small bush in Arkansas. The squirrels will eat it sometimes. Nothing else will. Folklore has it that if you take that little nut and carry it in your pocket and rub it just right with your thumb, the oil from your skin will make it shiny and the shinier it gets, the better your health will be. It will protect you from rheumatism. It will protect you against all kind of evil spirits. And it will bring you good

health. Mr. Speaker, that is what the Medicare system is going to look like in 15 years, because we have squandered the opportunity to make Medicare and Social Security whole and make sure that they are here so that our children and grandchildren do not get stricken by a horrible tax burden.

Let me read to you what the GAO Comptroller General, David Walker, said just a few days ago: "Absent substantive reform of the entitlement programs, a rapid escalation of Federal spending for Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid beginning less than 10 years from now is virtually certain to overwhelm the rest of the Federal budget."

We are not going to be able to do anything but pay for Social Security and Medicare and pay the interest on the national debt. That is not a secure Nation. It is not a responsible Nation. It is something that we should not allow to happen. The Blue Dogs are overwhelmingly in favor of doing whatever we have to do to fight the war and the recession. But we are not willing to give the administration, or anyone else, a blank check and say, go borrow all the money you want to borrow, pass the debt on to our children and grandchildren and not even have a plan as to how we are going to deal with it. They do not even want to talk about a plan. They just say, just keep borrowing money, just keep cutting taxes more and more, and hope for the best. This same Comptroller General makes the comment that you cannot grow economically fast enough to take care of this problem once it reaches that particular spot that he was talking about.

It is time for us as a Nation and it is time for this House and this Congress to be responsible and sit down and work together for a plan that will provide for the responsible fiscal operation of this country.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my friend from Arkansas for those remarks. I want to remind everyone now what we are all about tonight. We are saying that to increase our debt ceiling without a plan for getting us back into balance is irresponsible. We are prepared to vote to increase the debt ceiling short term. We do not want to see our country default on its debt. We do not want that; no one wants that. But we do believe it is irresponsible for us to blindly follow an economic game plan that has squandered \$5 trillion of surpluses without first dealing with the problems of Social Security and Medicare. We think that is irresponsible. And we hope that as a majority of this House puts together their budget, this year we would hope that we could be a part of it.

We are here tonight saying that if you participate in a budget process that gives us a plan to get us back into balance in a reasonable period of time and that keeps us in balance, we will support it. We will support it. But we will not support increasing the debt limit by \$750 billion by not only continuing down the plan area that we are

into tonight but actually making it worse as the budget that has been presented to Congress projects to do. That, we will not do.

I yield to the other gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS), one of our newer Blue Dogs, to discuss this issue that we bring before you tonight.

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

When I tell people I am a member of the Blue Dog Coalition, they ask me, what is the Blue Dog Coalition all about? I tell them that we are about being fiscal conservatives.

I come from 10 years in the Arkansas State Senate where I helped balance the State budget for 10 years. My wife, Holly, and I own a small business in our hometown of Prescott, Arkansas, a town of 3,400 people. We know what it is like to meet a payroll every Friday. We know what it is like to live within a balanced budget at our small town family business. And I do not think the American people expect anything less of those of us in the United States Congress, those of us that are setting out the vision and the priorities for the future of this great country. That is what the Blue Dogs are all about, being fiscal conservatives.

I can tell you something else that I am about and I think the Blue Dogs are about, and, that is, we are sick and tired of all the partisan bickering that goes on in our Nation's capital. It should not be about what makes the Democratic Party look good or bad or what makes the Republican Party look good or bad. It ought to be about doing the right thing by the people who sent us here to represent them. I believe there are extremists in both parties. The Blue Dogs are trying to bring the extreme sides of both parties to the middle to find some commonsense solutions to the problems that face us here in America.

The administration requests to raise the debt limit by another \$750 billion. Last year, the administration said we would not need to raise the debt limit for at least 7 years. The administration even said that there was a danger in paying down the debt too soon. I have not figured that one out yet. And now the administration in their fiscal year 2003 budget puts us back in deficit spending by \$100 billion, by creating \$100 billion in new debt, and I believe that is wrong. Raising the debt limit, allowing our government to go further into debt, raids the Social Security trust fund. It simply authorizes the government to write another \$750 billion in IOUs to the Social Security trust fund.

There are several problems with that. Most of us have loans at banks or credit unions. When we go to the bank or credit union for a loan, normally they want to know how we are going to pay it back, what terms, how long it is going to take, how much the monthly payments are going to be. But not our government. Our government simply writes another IOU, and sticks it in the

Social Security trust fund with no provision, absolutely no provision, on how that money will ever be paid back. I think that is wrong. That is why the first bill I filed as a Member of Congress was a bill to tell the politicians in Washington to keep their hands off the Social Security trust fund and, yes, to keep their hands off the Medicare trust fund.

Let us talk about the debt, some \$5.7 trillion in debt. A lot of people do not want to talk about it. I think we should. We should not only talk about it, we ought to pay that debt down. Why? Because we are the ones that created it. At least the majority of the people in America elected the politicians that created that debt. I think it is wrong to pass it on to our children and our grandchildren.

\$5.7 trillion this country is in debt tonight. What does that mean for all of us? Some people in this country think we spend too much money on food stamps. That is \$2 billion a month. Some people in this country think we spend too much money on foreign aid. That is \$1 billion a month. We spend \$1 billion every single day in America simply paying interest, not principal, just interest, on the national debt.

How much is \$1 billion? I put that in my calculator, and I get that little E at the end. But I can tell you what really brought it home for me. I was recently touring a brand new state-of-the-art elementary school in Monticello, Arkansas. As the principal and some teachers took me through that school, they mentioned that it cost \$5 million to build. And it hit me. You know, we could build 200 brand new state-of-the-art elementary schools every single day in America simply with the interest we are paying on the national debt. I am not advocating that we do that, although there are some schools that need our help in a very big way; but I think that demonstrates to all of us how much \$1 billion a day in interest really is. Give me a couple of days of it, and I can finish I-49 in Arkansas. Give me a week of it, I can build I-69 across Arkansas. It is time we pay down the debt.

And something else, we must pay back the IOUs to the Social Security trust fund. They already total \$1 trillion. Let me tell you why that is important to all of us. When Social Security was created, we had 30 people paying in for every one earning benefits. Sometime between 2011 and 2016, depending on whose numbers you want to believe, we are going to have more people earning Social Security benefits than we are going to have paying in to the Social Security trust fund. And everyone agrees that by 2038, Social Security is broke. It is broke in 2038 even if the \$1 trillion in IOUs which, I might add, there is no provision on how we are going to pay them back, it is broke in 2038 provided that \$1 trillion in IOUs is paid back, even with them being paid back, not counting the new \$100 billion that the President and this administra-

tion proposes that we take from the Social Security trust fund and go back into the days of deficit spending. Despite all that, if all that some way or the other gets paid back, Social Security is still broke in 2038.

I have got a grandmother. My grandfather died when I was a year old. My grandmother is now 91. But when he died, she first learned how to drive a car. Then she got her GED, she moved to Little Rock, which is about 100 miles from where we live; and she went to nursing school. She came back to our hometown, and she worked tirelessly for about 20 years as a nurse at our local hospital. My grandmother did not have the benefit of a big retirement plan. She has lived from Social Security check to Social Security check. I know what it is like for seniors to try and live from Social Security check to Social Security check. That is why I want to see us not increase the debt limit. That is why I want to see the politicians in Washington stop raiding the Social Security trust fund. That is why we need to not honor this request of raising the debt limit. It is time for fiscal responsibility at our Nation's capital.

Mr. STENHOLM. I thank my friends from Arkansas, both of them, for making some very relevant points. One of the statements that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) just made was that we need to tone down the partisan rhetoric. That is what we are trying to do tonight. That is why I will join the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) from the other side tomorrow going before the Committee on Ways and Means in which we will be saying to the Committee on Ways and Means, let us sit down and begin to honestly and sincerely talk about what kind of a fix we need to put in for Social Security so that it does not run into financial difficulties in 2030. Let us start reasoning together.

I do not understand, and that is what the Blue Dogs said last year, we ought to have had that discussion last year; but we did not. But it is not too late. It is never too late for reasonable men and women, elected by our constituents in our respective 435 districts. All of us get here the same way. We get elected by a majority of the people in our district. All of us are well-meaning. But every now and then you vote for something that puts in place something that we think tonight we would like to turn around.

□ 2030

When you had a \$5.6 trillion surplus last year, and you squander it in 1 year, and we go back now back into the Social Security trust fund for the next 10 years under the economic game plan we are under, I would hope our friends on the other side would not say, "there you go again."

All we are saying is we think, before we increase the debt ceiling, we ought to make one more attempt to get a true balanced budget, to get out of the

Social Security trust fund and, even in an election year, have a serious debate and discussion about how we would fix Social Security.

I have got a plan that I have joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) on. Others have plans. Anyone that stands on this floor and criticizes the other person's idea without offering one of their own, I do not think too highly of. But I would welcome an honest and serious debate, and I hope at some time in the future we could use some special orders in which we would actually have a discussion about what it is that we are differing on.

Tonight, for example, I would welcome someone from the other side of the aisle that would come over and say, you guys are all wet. Here is what we are doing. I would welcome that. Maybe we can get into that.

Now I would like to yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON). The gentleman from Utah is making a real mark here in the Congress. One of the things I have appreciated is his understanding of energy, because he kind of comes from that experience. But, also, just as my two colleagues from Arkansas have been real leaders within the Blue Dog Coalition for focusing on fiscal responsibility, so has the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas, and I appreciate him leading this discussion tonight on an issue that is so important to me. It is important to the Blue Dog Coalition, but it really ought to be important to all of us.

It was about 150 years ago that my great-great grandfather came to the United States from Scotland. I have to say that I believe I personally am true to my Scottish ancestry when it comes to money, especially the people's money. I do not like deficits. I do not like debt.

When I first decided to run for public office, I never had heard of the Blue Dogs. I was a candidate working hard, talking about issues that I thought were important and the notion of being fiscally responsible, the notion of trying to pay down debt. That was really important to me.

As I got involved in being a candidate, suddenly I heard about this group called the Blue Dogs, and the more I heard about them, the more I said, you know, those guys are saying a lot of the same things that seem to make sense to me, and it has been a group that I am real proud to associate with, for a number of reasons.

Number one, they have a reputation for caring very much about being fiscally responsible. Number two, they also have a reputation for just putting the cards on the table.

What I like about this group is that we try to get away from a lot of the rhetoric, and we are real open to discussion. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Stenholm) just said, if someone wants to disagree with us, that is great. Let us invite that dialogue. Let

us have a discussion about how we can come together and come up with some good ideas from both parties to be fiscally responsible.

I think the Blue Dog budget that was introduced a year ago was a real responsible plan. It was a good idea, and we nearly won. We nearly did. But we did not quite make it.

Now we find ourselves in a rather extraordinary circumstance compared to 1 year ago. I recognize that there are a lot of changes in what this country faces from a year ago, and we as Blue Dogs understand that we face some new expenditures in our government right now.

We face a war on terrorism that costs money, and it is a serious issue and something that we support. We face issues about homeland security that we were not thinking about a year ago, and those are going to take resources, too. We support that, and we want to take care of those issues and address them in a responsible way.

To the extent that the economy is in a downturn and to the extent we face some of these issues, we understand that there may be times, extraordinary circumstances like that, when the government may have to go into some deficit in the short term, and if we are coming right up against that borrowing limit, it may be responsible to raise that up a little bit to get us through this short-term problem we face here.

But that is not what we are looking at. That is not what the administration is asking us to do. The administration is asking us to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion.

We throw so many numbers around this place, I think we grow numb to the meaning of these numbers. But \$750 billion in more debt? That is just a lot of money and that is a big blank check that we are asking for, that the administration is asking for; and, quite frankly, they are asking for Congress to be given the latitude to run up another \$750 billion of debt with no plan, with no financial plan, with no idea that has been presented about how we are going to right this ship, how we are going to get away from this pattern of just increasing debt over and over and over.

That just does not seem to make sense. From my Southern Utah roots that does not pass the smell test. We ought to be willing to be responsible about this, and before we write a huge blank check, let us take a look at the short-term issues, as I suggested. Let us be willing to acknowledge that we ought to maybe increase the debt limit a little bit, because we have these increased expenses from the war on terrorism, homeland security.

The economy has been slow. We understand that. But, for crying out loud, \$750 billion, that is a lot of money.

I notice what the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) was saying about trying to get people a sense of what \$1 billion means. I really like that example of 200 elementary schools.

There is another part of that example that ought to be amplified, and that is if you spent that money on 200 elementary schools, you would have something to show for it. You would have an important asset, an asset that creates value. It is an investment in our country, it is an investment in our children, which is the best investment we can make. But when we pay that interest payment, we have nothing, we have nothing to show for it, every single day. I thought that was a great analogy to point out, the difference in how you either spend money or invest money.

There are things government should do, and there are some things government should not do, but I think we ought to keep in mind the notion that there is an investment component to what we do.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) mentioned that he is a small businessman. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) I know has been a farmer. I am sure both of them in their lives had the experience of at times borrowing money for their business. They have gone to the bank, and they have had to tell a story, a legitimate, credible story about how, if they are going to borrow that money, how they are going to put it in that business and how that business is going to create some recurring income over time to pay that loan off.

It has been my personal experience, too. I used to work in the energy business, built a couple of cogeneration projects that cost \$100 million apiece. I had to go to a bank to find that money to help build that project. I will tell you, they made me jump through a lot of hoops to explain how that project, once it was built, was going to pay for itself over time. And we got that loan, and those projects are making electricity and those loans are getting paid off because we told a story that was credible, and I am glad to say it has worked out that way as well.

The same thing applies to all of us. Everybody has gone out, maybe they borrowed money to buy a car or a house. You cannot just walk in and say, well, I have no idea how I am going to pay you back, but please give me money.

Yet in terms of raising this debt limit, that is what we are talking about. I know there is a lot of uncertainty when you look out in the future. I understand the problems with long-term projections. We all have to live with that uncertainty.

But that does not mean you just ignore the future. That does not mean you do not try to give your best effort to figure out what you are going to do in the future. As time goes on, you retool your plan to fit changes that you did not expect.

But what we have now is this request to raise the debt limit by \$750 billion, and there is no end in sight. There is no sense of how we are going to ultimately change this pattern of deficit spending.

That is why we are here tonight. That is what we are talking about. We are trying to engage people in a dialogue.

I do not claim to have all the answers for how we are going to right this ship. I really do not. I have some ideas. I think I have some good ideas. But I think we have to be committed, collaboratively, as Democrats and Republicans, and with the administration, too, to talk these things through. These are serious issues. These are tough issues. If they were simple, we would have resolved them already. And they got more difficult in the past year. We have new challenges we were not thinking about a year ago.

This is when we are supposed to rise to the occasion. This is why people elect us. They elect us to come here, think these issues through, learn all the facts, talk to as many experts as we can, and work together to come up with viable, common-sense solutions.

That is what the Blue Dogs are all about. That is why I have been so proud, as I said, to be associated with that group. Their reputation speaks for itself. They have been very helpful in terms of guiding this discussion. And that is why we are here tonight, to talk about this issue of raising the debt limit.

I cannot say enough about how important this is. I think about this issue through the eyes of my little boy who is 3 years old. He has gotten no benefit out of this debt we have run up around this country, none at all. But we are going to stick him with having to pay it off.

You know, as I take on this job and as I think about issues, I try to look at all of these issues through the eyes of him, through the eyes of a child, and think about what kind of world he is going to be growing up in. It is just not fair. It is not right. Those kids do not vote. They do not vote, but they are our constituents, and they are our future. Those are the people we are supposed to be representing.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for those very pointed remarks. What we are talking about tonight is aimed at his child, at my two grandsons, and that is all we are asking that we take a look at.

I have been in this body now for going on 24 years. I have worked with five presidents, and it matters not whether there is an R or D after the president's name. It matters not whether that is an R or D after any of my colleagues' name. If they have a good idea, I will join in attempting to pass it, or at least attempting to discuss it.

Tomorrow I will join with our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), in which we will ask the Committee on Ways and Means to tone down the rhetoric regarding Social Security. I will be equally hard on my party, those who choose to get a little bit rambunctious with the rhetoric on

Social Security, as I will be equally hard on the majority side. I am very critical of the majority for not taking up a Social Security reform plan. I think that is legitimate.

I used to get blamed for a lot of things that happened when we were in the majority on the Democratic side, but now it seems I still get blamed for what is going on, even though I am in the minority.

Everyone tonight has stated the absolute importance of dealing with the future of Social Security, and we are pointing out our belief that you do not deal with the future of Social Security by digging the hole deeper. When you have an unfunded liability in the Social Security system tonight of \$22 trillion, we do not believe it is a solution to dig the hole to \$23 trillion.

You do not really back up and get a running start out of a hole. When you find yourself in a hole, the first rule is to quit digging. That was the infamous words of Garfield. That is what we are saying tonight. You do not just automatically borrow additional money unless you have got a plan.

Our colleague talked about going and borrowing \$100 million to finance a cogeneration plant. It was a good investment or he would not have gotten the money.

Tonight we are being asked to borrow additional money so we can pay interest on that debt without doing anything to solve the problems of this Nation. That is what bugs us. A lot of people say, well, you know, are you all not being just a little inconsistent? Some might say, how is the debt limit vote different this year from the last time?

Well, let me point out how it is different. We are being asked to raise the debt limit outside of a plan for balance. The last two votes that this body had to raise the debt limit came at a time when Congress and the President were engaged in bipartisan negotiations on a balanced budget plan that ultimately led to the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. The current situation is very different. The President has submitted a budget which projects deficits financed by borrowing the Social Security surplus for the next decade. I repeat, the plan that we have been asked to put into place borrows the Social Security trust fund for the next 10 years. That is not a plan we can support.

□ 2045

Now, also we are going to hear, I hope we do not, but I have already heard rumblings of this, that we need to change the manner in which we determine what the numbers are. The last time this bill came up in 1997, we had a different President in the White House. The minority leader of this body said, and I quote, "We said from the beginning of this Congress that we want to negotiate with the President, but we cannot negotiate with a President that does not want to balance the budget. We do not want to negotiate

over whether to balance the budget or not. We want him to submit a budget that balances by CBO."

Now, here we are in danger of again doing, as we have seen happen a few times over the years, we will either use OMB, that is the Office of Management and Budget, that is the administration's budget arm, or we will use the Congressional Budget Office, that is CBO, that is the bipartisan congressional budget arm. We agreed several years ago that we would use CBO; we, the Congress, agreed that CBO would be the arbiter of what the numbers are. Not saying that they are automatically right; not saying that they are any better than OMB, but since we often have different assumptions, we just agreed that we would use CBO.

Now, I hope that the majority this year will stick to what we have agreed to doing. We will use CBO, whatever they say because, remember, these are projections. Let us not slip into using OMB when it works to the advantage or CBO when it works to the advantage; let us use CBO.

Congress and the President need to sit down, roll up our sleeves and have an honest discussion about what we need to do to put the budget back in order with everything on the table. We need to put together an honest plan, putting the budget on a reasonable glidepath toward balance without using Social Security using CBO estimates. That is what we are trying to say tonight.

In 1995, in 1995, 48 Democrats joined with the Republican majority to insist that President Clinton submit a plan that was balanced under CBO numbers. We hope that the 148 Republicans who voted for that legislation, who are still in the House, will stay consistent. Those 48 of us on our side of the aisle do intend to stay consistent. We believe that since we, over the last 8 years, got our Nation's fiscal house in order, eliminated the deficits as far as the eye could see, actually got ourselves into surplus for 1 year, that all of the pain and anguish that has been caused or was caused or was utilized in order to accomplish that goal for our country should not be squandered in 12 months.

Now, is that an overly partisan statement to make? I would hope not. I listen very carefully to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They say, and I believe it sincerely, as we do, that that is what they want to do. But we cannot do it on this side of the aisle unless they do it. We are in the minority. When we are in the minority, we do not have 218 votes.

Now, I want to repeat, we are not playing politics with this issue. We are not. We will vote for a short-term debt ceiling, provided there is a plan of how to get from where we are to where we need to be. We do not think that is too much to ask of the majority. We are willing to put our money where our mouth is. We are willing to vote on a temporary increase on the debt limit

to meet the expenses of the war. We are willing to do that. What we are not willing to do is give a \$750 billion blank check to continue on an economic game plan that has already squandered \$5 trillion of projected surpluses in one year. We do not think that is unreasonable. But we did not think our budget last year was unreasonable either. We put forth our best effort on the floor, and we lost. And when we lose, we go on to the next battle. Well, the next battle is now. The next battle is now.

Now, again, in case someone is just now joining us, on the debt limit, I used one example, and I will use another. On the debt limit, it is kind of like going into one of our best restaurants in Texas and enjoying one of our infamous Texas beef steaks, enjoying it, and then walking out and saying we are not going to pay for it. That is what the debt ceiling is all about. The other example is a businessman in trouble because of unforeseen difficulties, but has a good record. We have a lot of farmers in that condition right now out in the country that, through no fault of their own, they are finding it difficult to pay back their banker. To go back to the banker, the banker knows them, and they make adjustments. They make adjustments in their economic game plan. They make adjustments in their budgets. We cut back here; we do things a little differently. We tighten our belt. Well, that is what we are asking. We just do not believe it makes common sense to arbitrarily say to our country, we are going to borrow \$750 billion on a game plan that has squandered \$5 trillion of surpluses.

Now, I think it was very important that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) a moment ago acknowledged the war. I have said three times tonight, we are perfectly willing, and we are 110 percent behind our President, regarding the conduct of the war. Separate that issue from what we are talking about tonight. We will do what is necessary to make sure that our young men and women have the tools necessary, both now and in the future, to do what they are called on to do, and that is defend the freedom of this country. We will do that. That is not what we are talking about tonight. I hope that as we get closer and closer to that vote on the debt ceiling, that we will make a few changes in that economic game plan. We will be proposing how we would do it. We have already proposed how we would do it. We told our colleagues last year how we could do it, but we lost.

I want to conclude my remarks tonight by going back again to the Social Security question. I want to make it very, very clear. This is one Member on this side of the aisle that has happened to agree with the President regarding his proposal for individual accounts. I have joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) on that for the last 6 years. We have introduced, re-introduced and reintroduced for the

third time our suggestion of how we can, in fact, make Social Security as sound or even sounder for our children and grandchildren. I am perfectly willing to discuss and debate that issue until the cows come home, and if we could get a majority, we win; if not, somebody will beat us with a better idea.

What I am deeply concerned about is on my side of the aisle critics talking about Social Security without offering their own plan. We will find no one anywhere in the United States tonight that says that Social Security will be there for our grandchildren without making some changes. No one. No one on it today should be concerned for one second about their Social Security check. But for my grandsons, 6½ and 4½ years old, we had better start getting concerned about their Social Security if Congress continues to not do what we need to do in coming up with a plan to reform it.

That is why even if, even if 9-11-01 had not occurred, we still would be standing here tonight saying the economic game plan that we are under, we ought to change. I repeat: even if 9-11-01 had not occurred, we would still be having the discussion that we are having tonight, based on the estimates of CBO and OMB. That is something that people need to understand.

Again, I want to make it very, very clear. The Blue Dogs have taken this hour tonight to say that we are willing to support a temporary increase to meet our expenses, but only a temporary increase. I think we need to keep this Congress's feet to the fire, and we need to make the tough decisions, hopefully starting with at least beginning a dialogue on Social Security this year, without elevating the rhetoric and attempting to win elections this November based on someone pointing a finger at the other side and suggesting that one side is going to bankrupt the system and the other side has all the answers without ever saying what their answer would be.

I will join with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and others, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) on the other side of the aisle, for example, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) on my side, and the gentleman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY), and others who have been a part of coming up with a constructive solution; we will join. I just do not think it is too much to ask of the majority to spend a little bit of time in serious legislation on the most serious problem facing us, other than the war, and that is the future of Social Security. We are going to have a lot more to say about it in the days and weeks ahead, and I thank my colleagues for their indulgence tonight.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

TO FACILITATE POSITIVE ADJUSTMENT TO COMPETITION FROM IMPORTS OF CERTAIN STEEL PRODUCTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 203(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act"), I hereby transmit documents to the Congress that describe the safeguard action that I have proclaimed on imports of certain steel products, pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 203(a)(1) of the Act and as President of the United States, and the reasons for taking that action.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 5, 2002.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF MONDAY, MARCH 4, 2002 AT PAGE H-653, ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1206. An act to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

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

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

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
 Ms. MCKINNEY, for 5 minutes, today.
 Mr. MCINTYRE, for 5 minutes, today.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, March 6 and 7.

Mr. GANSKE, for 5 minutes, March 7.
 Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, March 6.
 Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 6, 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:

5733. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Carbon Monoxide Redesignation Request, Maintenance Plan, and Emissions Inventory for the Cities of Lowell, Springfield, Waltham, and Worcester [MA084-7214a; A-1-FRL-7143-7] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5734. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Wisconsin: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL-7150-9] received February 26, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5735. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Montana; Billings Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [MT-001-0036a; FRL-7139-6] received February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5736. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Final Determination that State has Corrected the Rule Deficiencies and Stay of Sanctions, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District, State of California [CA 253-0321c; FRL-7139-4] re-

ceived February 19, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5737. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to India for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-15), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5738. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Ireland for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 02-04), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5739. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the Department of the Army's proposed lease of defense articles to Greece (Transmittal No. 01-02), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

5740. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 05-02 which informs the intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and Canada concerning Vaccinia (Smallpox) Virus Vaccine under the Chemical, Biological and Radiological (CBR) Memorandum of Understanding, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

5741. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 04-02 which informs the intent to sign a Project Arrangement between the United States and the Kingdom of Norway concerning the Lightweight Hypervelocity Missile Flights Demonstration, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

5742. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Switzerland [Transmittal No. DTC 140-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Egypt [Transmittal No. DTC 116-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5744. A letter from the President, Republic of the Marshall Islands, transmitting a report Presented to the Congress of the United States of America Regarding Changed Circumstances Arising from the U.S. Nuclear Testing in the Marshall Islands, pursuant to 48 U.S.C. 1681 nt.; to the Committee on Resources.

5745. A letter from the Independent Counsel, transmitting the annual report for the Office of Independent Counsel-Barrett, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 595(a)(2); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5746. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 65-90, 65-A90, 65-A90-1, 65-A90-4, B90, C90, C90A, E90, and H-90 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-80-AD; Amendment 39-12602; AD 2002-01-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 28, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5747. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Certain Transfers of

Property to Regulated Investment Companies and Real Estate Investment Trusts [REG-142299-01] [REG-209135-88] (RIN: 1545-BA36 and 1545-AW92) received February 25, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 353. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 275) expressing the sense of the Congress that hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to hunt such birds (Rept. 107-364). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 354. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 107-365). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PLATTS, and Ms. HART):

H.R. 3839. A bill to reauthorize the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FORD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3840. A bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for timely notification of plan participants and beneficiaries whose individual accounts hold employer securities of insider trading in employer securities; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 3841. A bill to provide assistance to displaced workers by extending unemployment benefits and by providing a credit for health insurance costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and the Budget, 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. LAMPSON (for himself and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H.R. 3842. A bill to assure that recreation benefits are accorded the same weight as hurricane and storm damage reduction benefits as well as environmental restoration benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 3843. A bill to amend the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 to extend until January 1,

2008, a program applying simplified procedures to the acquisition of certain commercial items; to establish an exchange program between the Federal Government and the private sector in order to promote the development of expertise in information technology management; and to authorize telecommuting for Federal contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Mr. HORN):

H.R. 3844. A bill to strengthen Federal Government information security, including through the requirement for the development of mandatory information security risk management standards; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Science, 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. FOLEY:

H.R. 3845. A bill to provide that adjustments in rates of pay for Members of Congress may not exceed any cost-of-living increases in benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. FRANK:

H.R. 3846. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize the submission of an application for naturalization under section 322 of such Act on behalf of a child by the child's grandparent or legal guardian, if the parent who otherwise would be authorized to submit such application is deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3847. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to designate New Jersey Task Force 1 as part of the National Urban Search and Rescue System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 3848. A bill to provide funds for the construction of recreational and visitor facilities in Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H.R. 3849. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 306 Pickens Street in Marion, Alabama, as the "Jimmie Lee Jackson Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H.R. 3850. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1313 Alabama Avenue in Selma, Alabama, as the "Reverend James Joseph Reeb Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 3851. A bill to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself and Mrs. NORTHUP):

H.R. 3852. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Kentucky among the States which may divide their retirement systems into two parts so as to obtain Social Security coverage, under State agreement, for only those State and local employees who desire such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 3853. A bill to make technical corrections to laws passed by the 106th Congress related to parks and public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. RIVERS):

H.R. 3854. A bill to authorize funding for the development, launch, and operation of a Synthetic Aperture Radar satellite in support of a national energy policy; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 3855. A bill to establish a program administered by the Department of State to promote visits to the United States by youths from regions of conflict for training in peaceful cooperation and mutual understanding; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mr. MCINNIS):

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a collection of memorial tributes made in honor of the late Gerald Solomon; to the Committee on House Administration, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. ORTIZ):

H. Res. 355. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with regard to negotiations between the United States Government and the governments of Mexico and Canada with regard to the North American Development Bank and the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. KIRK):

H. Res. 356. A resolution supporting the goals and ideas of North American Occupational Safety and Health Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. LEE, Ms. SOLIS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FRANK, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Res. 357. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the recognition of the authorities of Tibet who are currently exiled in Dharamsala, India, as the legitimate representatives of Tibet; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia introduced a bill (H.R. 3856) to exempt a historic amphib-

ious landing ship from inspection requirements under title 46, United States Code; which was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 17: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 168: Mr. WICKER.
 H.R. 228: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 250: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 292: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FORD, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. OBERSTAR.
 H.R. 356: Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 488: Mr. SAWYER.
 H.R. 600: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 638: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 745: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 854: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 951: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 1013: Mr. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 1064: Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1109: Mr. CAMP, Mr. DREIER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. BONILLA.
 H.R. 1158: Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1296: Mr. PORTMAN and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1460: Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 1466: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 1543: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 1556: Ms. WATSON and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1609: Mr. BAKER and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 1626: Mr. BENTSEN and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1754: Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 1809: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1861: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 2014: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 2018: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 2117: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HILLEARY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BOHLERT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 2118: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 2125: Mr. BOHLERT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. REYES, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 2148: Mr. COSTELLO.
 H.R. 2160: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. GEKAS and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2258: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 2332: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2335: Mr. POMEROY.
 H.R. 2339: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2341: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. GRAVES.
 H.R. 2374: Mr. RAMSTAD.
 H.R. 2569: Mr. HORN.
 H.R. 2592: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 2638: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BIGBERT, and Mr. GOODE.

- H.R. 2667: Mr. TANCREDO.
 H.R. 2674: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 2695: Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 2787: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
 H.R. 2874: Mr. FARR of California.
 H.R. 2908: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2946: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 2953: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HOUGHTON.
 H.R. 3013: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 3041: Mr. CLEMENT.
 H.R. 3154: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. CARDIN.
 H.R. 3215: Mr. LATHAM.
 H.R. 3236: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 3238: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 3267: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GORDON, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3279: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 3321: Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. KING, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. RAHALL.
 H.R. 3336: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
 H.R. 3351: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SABO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 3360: Mr. FRANK and Mr. BERRY.
 H.R. 3375: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 3389: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 3412: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 3414: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3424: Mr. REHBERG, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. CANNON.
 H.R. 3430: Mr. UNDERWOOD and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 3443: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 3450: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 3464: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 3524: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 3581: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3661: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3670: Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 3698: Mr. SCHAFFER.
 H.R. 3710: Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 3713: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3716: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3731: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. STUMP.
 H.R. 3733: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 3747: Mr. WEINER and Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 3773: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. CHAMBLISS.
 H.R. 3784: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BASS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WU, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. DEMINT.
 H.R. 3794: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
 H.R. 3797: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KING, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 3802: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. STUMP.
 H.R. 3810: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. STUPAK.
 H.R. 3833: Mr. STEARNS.
 H.R. 3834: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 3838: Mr. EDWARDS.
 H.J. Res. 6: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
 H.J. Res. 40: Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. DICKS.
 H.J. Res. 83: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
 H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Con. Res. 162: Ms. VELAZQUEZ.
 H. Con. Res. 238: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. MURTHA.
 H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. FORD.
 H. Con. Res. 290: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
 H. Con. Res. 336: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. *Pastor*, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

 PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Legislature of Westchester County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 265 petitioning the Congress of the United States and the State of New York to develop a comprehensive plan to properly defend the Indian Point nuclear plants from all potential areas of attack; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Westchester County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 266 petitioning the Congress of the United States and Entergy, the New York State Public Service Commission and all other relevant parties to immediately begin a detailed feasibility study on converting Indian Points II and III from nuclear energy to natural gas or other non-nuclear fuel; to the Committee on Armed Services.