



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2002

No. 23

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord, merciful and gracious God, bless Congress today. You lead all into the desert in search of salvation. There light and darkness are bold and relentless, each night falling suddenly on the Nation's brightness. For in Your presence the barren land is timeless. As the cold mountains are once again awakened by the pounding, shake us into Lenten awareness.

Forty years seems hardly a lifetime anymore. Yet Your people wandered aimlessly through purification longing for Your promises to be fulfilled.

Forty days seems far longer than a month's time now. Yet removed from the crowd, Moses and Jesus climbed the desolate stage of this mountain to seek Your face.

This year make our annual desert story victorious by Your Holy Name. May Passover and Christian Pasch bring forth the first vestiges of peace. For this we pray now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts 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.

YUCCA MOUNTAIN POSES A MOVING DISASTER

(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, how much more simply can I say it, that shipping nuclear waste back and forth across this country 96,000 times is simply unsafe. Sure, proponents of the Yucca Mountain Project would say that some 3,000 shipments have already been made to destinations in America without any incidents. But let me say, I am sure that the elevators in the World Trade Center operated faultlessly until September 11. We cannot use the past to predict the future.

Mr. Speaker, terrorist threats against one of these many shipments is a real danger, and it would be foolish to disregard it. Moreover, the news program "60 Minutes" last year said that train accidents due to track failure are happening at a rate of nearly 1 every 24 hours. Just a few months ago the city of Baltimore was nearly shut down due to a chemical train accident.

Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to gamble on transporting the deadliest

substance known to man back and forth through 43 States, especially when DOE has no strategy or plan for the possibility of disaster. We need to protect our communities and constituents, protect our Nation. I urge Members to vote "no" on Yucca Mountain.

WHY ALL THE GIMMICKS?

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, remember the Social Security lockbox? Republican leadership had us vote on protecting Social Security with a lockbox eight times over 5 years. But now, of course, the lockbox has been ripped opened and plundered, and over the next 10 years it will finance tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans.

Now there is a new gimmick. Hey, certificates. Certificates suitable for framing on the wall and hanging next to the Enron stock certificate. They will be just as valuable. That is their new gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, why all of the gimmicks? Because they are proposing a privatization plan that will undermine the foundations of Social Security, cut benefits, increase the retirement age; or, phenomenally, increase the debt. They have yet to say how they are going to pay for their risky privatization plans, taking 2 percent, doubling the problem that Social Security has. Instead of Social Security running out of money in 2038 and only being able to pay 73 percent of benefits after that time, they have a plan that will run Social Security out of money in 2024. That is not a great plan.

THE AXIS OF EVIL

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

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.

H689

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, when the leader of the free world came to this Chamber in January to deliver his State of the Union address, he described the axis of evil governments. He mentioned them by name: Iran, Iraq and North Korea.

Since then, some people have criticized the speech. In fact, one of President Bush's predecessors said the speech was "over simplistic" and "counterproductive."

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Iran spends millions of dollars financing the murder of innocent civilians and violence in the Middle East. The Government of Iraq has used chemical weapons to kill its own citizens and has invaded its neighbors. North Korea is the only country I know of today that has concentration camps where people enter and never come home from. They literally starve their citizens.

If that is not evil, I do not know what is. Years ago another President referred to the Soviet Union as an evil empire, and some of us remember the Soviet refusenik Natan Sharansky. He was in a gulag when President Reagan gave that speech. Mr. Sharansky told me, when I met him, that news of that speech spread like wildfire through the Soviet gulags. Not until then did they realize that a leader in the West understood the nature of communism.

STOP CORPORATE EXPATRIATES

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the 6 months since the devastating attacks of September 11, we have seen some of the most heartwarming images of our American family pulling together to support one another. While Congress grapples with the tough decisions on how to pay for this war against terrorist and enhanced homeland security and other pressing national priorities, one member of the American family is losing its commitment. I quote, "Maybe patriotism needs to take a back seat to improve our earnings."

Mr. Speaker, these were the disturbing words of one aggressive accountant a mere 3 months ago urging her corporate clients to sneak out of the U.S. in the dark of night to avoid paying income tax. For a mere \$27,000 to rent a post office box offshore, one U.S. corporation has avoided \$40 million a year in corporate income taxes. If these were individuals doing this, the American taxpayers would be outraged.

Mr. Speaker, join me in shutting down this loophole exploited by corporate expatriates before one more American company decides to shelve the Stars and Stripes to save some money on the bottom line by avoiding corporate income tax.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO CATHY LAIRD

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in deep humility to join in the shock and the grief of the citizens of Shelby County, Indiana, to pay tribute to the passing of a leader, a wife, a mother, and a distinguished local citizen, Cathy Laird, who passed away at the age of 37 yesterday following the complications from an automobile accident. Cathy Laird was not only a distinguished public servant who would have, without term limits, been permitted to run for her third consecutive term as county clerk, she was also the devoted wife of Roger, the devoted mother of Mary, 9, and Emily, 5. Emily was in the car when the accident occurred; and characteristic of Cathy, she looked after Emily making sure Emily got to her appointment while she was taken to the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage Roger and all family and friends to not grieve like the rest of men who have no hope. Cathy had the hope that is now realized, and we will pray for her husband, her children, her family, her friends, and a grieving community who take comfort in the faith, hope and love of Cathy Laird.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE BUDGET

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, Social Security has been a successful program. It has helped millions of seniors out of poverty. Our seniors are facing a dilemma, one that threatens their security and their trust. We must fight to preserve our Social Security trust fund and honor the country's commitment.

The President's budget does not honor the commitment to our seniors, and in turn fails all Americans. Now is the time for us to focus on a long-term budget plan that will recover as the economy recovers, returning us to an era where we can fully protect and even strengthen our Social Security trust fund. We need to recommit to the idea of Social Security surplus dollars only for Social Security and paying down the national debt.

The President's new budget raids the Social Security surplus to pay for government programs, not just 1 year but 10 years. Our seniors deserve better than gimmicks and budget tricks. They need us to lead and fight for the preservation of a historic program and for the needs of seniors. We ask Congress to reconsider their budget, reconsider their tax cuts, and reassume the responsibility, and that is to pay down our debt and take care of our seniors.

ARMY NEEDS ADEQUATE RESOURCES

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the enduring commitment the Army provides to our Nation. Throughout our history, we have relied on the Army to provide decisive force to defend America and her interests.

In the aftermath of September 11, the Army again answered the call by effectively leading efforts to support victims and secure our borders. They continue to coordinate efforts to protect our Nation throughout this country through homeland defense.

Last week General Shinseki testified about the need of the Army to increase its end strength. I believe we would do well to heed his advice.

Today America only boasts the ninth largest army in the world. Of the top eight, six are potential adversaries. We must work to increase the Army force structure. It should be obvious that we must maintain stability through strong ground forces.

Mr. Speaker, we rely on the Army to win wars and maintain the peace. Now more than ever, we must give these men and women adequate resources to meet these requirements.

□ 1015

INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to talk about Ludwig Koons. Ludwig is still being held illegally by his mother in Italy.

He was born in New York City in 1992. When he was a year old, his mother, Ilona Staller, took him to Rome. After promising a quick return, Ilona delayed her return to the United States after Mr. Koons had purchased tickets for his family to return to New York. But in December of 1993 he learned that Ilona had left their son with unknown third parties and traveled to Ecuador to participate in an erotic pornographic show.

Mr. Koons quickly went to Rome to find his son. He found Ludwig confused, disoriented and abandoned by his mother, left in the care of a foreigner who spoke neither Italian nor English. Ludwig's housing environment was filled with pornography and was physically dangerous due to construction materials left strewn about. Neither the Italian nor the United States governments are helping to correct this situation.

Mr. Speaker, we would not want our own children in this kind of an environment. We should not want it for any American child. It is time to bring our children home.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to address a very serious and pressing problem in our communities and in our society, domestic violence. Around the world at least one woman in every three has been beaten, coerced into sex, or otherwise abused in her lifetime. Most often, the abuser is a member of her own family. Increasingly, gender-based violence is recognized as a major public health concern and a violation of human rights.

In my home State of West Virginia, domestic violence complaints to law enforcement agencies have increased by 400 percent since 1998. Last April, Attorney General John Ashcroft announced that West Virginia would be receiving \$1.1 million. I commend this effort.

We must keep in mind that battering behavior is prevalent across all lines of race, ethnicity, geography, education, social class, religion and sexual orientation and that battering has adverse, long-term psychological, emotional, physical and economic effects on women and children.

Mr. Speaker, this is Violence Against Women Week, and so I urge all of my colleagues to stand up for battered women everywhere.

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, this week I will be introducing a bipartisan resolution recognizing and supporting the goals of International Women's Day celebrated March 8 every year. We should commemorate this day by honoring the women around the globe who have contributed enormously to the struggle for gender equality and the advancement of women. That struggle continues today. While the right to vote has been won here in the United States, there still remain women in many countries fighting for their voices to be heard and for representation in their political process. Furthermore, women still earn less, own less property and have less access to education, employment and health care than men.

Our war against terrorism should include ending violence against women. The U.N. estimates that one out of every three women and girls has been beaten or sexually abused in her lifetime. Each year there are 1 million to 2 million women and children illegally trafficked across international borders, with 50,000 transported to the United States. It is estimated that 130 million girls and young women have been subjected to female genital mutilation, with at least 10,000 girls at risk of this

practice here in the United States. It is unacceptable.

I urge the Congress to pass this bipartisan resolution commemorating International Women's Day.

AGRICULTURE BILL IN CONFERENCE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the agricultural bill in both the House and the Senate are now meeting to come to an agreement on what should the agricultural policy be for the United States for the next 5 yrs. The Senate put in provisions in their bill that there should be payment limitations that limit how much money a farmer can get from price supports. The House, when we brought up my amendment, failed by 28 votes to pass such a payment limitation amendment.

I urge my colleagues to join us and call my office or the office of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) or the office of the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), sending a letter to those conferees to encourage that we have some payment limitations. There are huge farm operations receiving 15, 20, 25, 30, \$35 million from 1998 until 2001. There is logic to having a farm policy that helps most of our farmers, the traditional family farms instead giving an extra \$2 to \$3 billion to the huge mega farms.

I would ask my colleagues to join in this effort to have a good farm policy bill with some payment limitations.

CALLING FOR AN EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, it may be great comfort to the unemployed in this country to know that we have gathered here in the House of Representatives today to debate whether or not there should be a mourning dove hunting season.

The Speaker made us very comfortable back in September saying we would do something about the unemployed. We have not done anything since then about it that can get through both the House and the Senate. The Senate sent over a clean unemployment bill that should be brought to the floor and sent back to the Senate and become law.

Since September, 1.3 million Americans have exhausted their benefits. In January alone, 356,000 people exhausted their benefits, the single largest loss of benefits in almost 10 years.

Why is it that you have to bring a bill out here today with another poison pill tied to it? There are 222 press secretaries right now in those Republican offices with their thumb right over the

send button to send out the press release that we have done something about unemployment. You know it will die in the Senate because you designed it to die in the Senate. I do not think that is fair, and I think that we ought to bring the Senate bill out here and pass it with no problems.

THE WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Valdosta, Georgia, and Savannah, Georgia, received the sad news that four of our service members in the First Ranger Battalion were among those who were killed in Afghanistan. We join their families and the entire Nation in mourning their loss and appreciating their patriotism and sacrifice.

But even as we do that, the criticism of the policy in Afghanistan by the Democrats continues. Jimmy Carter says that Bush's approach is too simplistic. Let us review time a minute. When the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, Jimmy Carter was President, and his very complicated reply was to boycott the Olympics. I guess that is not simplification, but what George Bush is in uniting a global front against terrorists, I guess that is simplistic. It is interesting that Mr. Carter only served one term.

Meanwhile, Democrats in Congress are saying that the war will not be won or complete until we get Osama bin Laden. I guess they better explain that to World War II veterans because, after all, we never found Hitler, and they must think that we lost that war as well.

I join Democrats, and I know it is not all the Democrats, there are a lot of good Democrats who are supporting this administration, but I invite the liberal extremist fringe in their party to support the President and to support our service members. This is a matter of freedom.

AMERICAN CORPORATIONS GO TO BERMUDA

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, America goes to war against terrorism. America's fighting men and women are put in harm's way. American soldiers lose their lives. And American corporations go to Bermuda. At a time of national emergency, accountants are writing advice to their corporations saying that maybe patriotism will have to take a back seat in the opportunity to maximize their profits by avoiding American taxes on their corporation by taking up illegal residence on the island of Bermuda.

With the Republican tax cuts to the wealthy, the burden of paying for this

war is falling more and more on middle-class and lower-income Americans. More and more this war is being fought out of the Social Security trust fund that is paid more and more by middle-class and lower-income Americans, but American corporations decide that they will escape any liability, any responsibility for the payment of America's efforts against terrorism by going to Bermuda and taking a tax holiday.

Ensuring that domestic violence victims receive necessary services to protect themselves and their children is one of the most important things that this legislative body can do while we attempt to sensitize those who are guardians of law, who are sworn to uphold the meaning of the law, will be further sensitized to the violence against women and how it can be abated.

Hobson	McInnis	Ryan (WI)
Hoefel	McIntyre	Ryan (KS)
Hoekstra	McKeon	Sanders
Holden	McKinney	Sandlin
Holt	Meehan	Sawyer
Honda	Meek (FL)	Saxton
Horn	Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky
Hostettler	Mica	Schiff
Houghton	Miller, Dan	Schrock
Hoyer	Miller, Gary	Scott
Hunter	Miller, Jeff	Sensenbrenner
Hyde	Mink	Serrano
Inslee	Mollohan	Sessions
Isakson	Moran (VA)	Shadegg
Israel	Morella	Shaw
Issa	Murtha	Shays
Istook	Myrick	Sherman
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Sherwood
Jackson-Lee	Neal	Shimkus
(TX)	Nethercutt	Shows
Jefferson	Ney	Shuster
Jenkins	Northup	Simmons
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Simpson
Johnson (IL)	Nussle	Skeen
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Olver	Slaughter
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Smith (MI)
Kanjorski	Osborne	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Ose	Smith (TX)
Keller	Otter	Smith (WA)
Kelly	Owens	Snyder
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Souder
Kerns	Pallone	Spratt
Kildee	Pascarell	Stark
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Stearns
King (NY)	Paul	Stenholm
Kingston	Payne	Stump
Kirk	Pelosi	Sullivan
Klecza	Pence	Sununu
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Kolbe	Petri	Tauzin
LaFalce	Phelps	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pitts	Terry
Lampson	Platts	Thomas
Langevin	Pombo	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Thune
LaTourette	Portman	Thurman
Leach	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Quinn	Turner
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Upton
Lipinski	Rahall	Velazquez
Lowey	Rangel	Vitter
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Walden
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Walsh
Luther	Reyes	Wamp
Lynch	Reynolds	Watkins (OK)
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Watt (NC)
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Watts (OK)
Manzullo	Rodriguez	Waxman
Markey	Roemer	Weiner
Mascara	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
Frost	Ross	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Rothman	Wolf
McCrery	Roukema	Wynn
McGovern	Royce	Young (FL)
McHugh	Rush	

TEACHER TAX CREDIT ACT OF 2002

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

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Teacher Tax Credit Act of 2002 to the Congress.

Over the next 10 years, America will have to recruit and train 2 million new teachers. While we do not have a teacher shortage now, we do have a maldistribution of teachers. This Tax Credit Act would provide a \$2,000 non-refundable tax credit for teachers, assistant teachers, principals and assistant principals who teach in title I eligible schools. Those are schools in our poorest neighborhoods where it is often hard to keep teachers, where the average experience level of teachers is lower than they are in other schools because it is a tougher job.

So let us give teachers in our schools that need the most help a little more support from the Federal Government by saying, yes, we want to give you the resources you need to stay in that neighborhood, teach in that school and make sure that we leave no child behind.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

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

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, historically, domestic violence has been a silent epidemic. According to a recent study conducted by the Commonwealth Fund, almost 4 million women are physically abused each year in the United States. In my district alone, domestic violence remains unabated. We had the tragic situation where a young man went to court, was convicted of domestic violence, was allowed to leave the courtroom and go home and prepare himself for prison. Instead, he visited his wife's job and killed her and another day care provider.

Domestic violence is the leading cause of injury to women in this country, where they are more likely to be assaulted, injured, raped or killed by a male partner than by any other type of assailant. We need to expand the Call to Protect program, continue funding of VAWA and demand that the Violence Against Women Office in the Department of Justice become permanent.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 43, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—352

Ackerman	Capps	Evans
Akin	Cardin	Everett
Allen	Carson (IN)	Farr
Andrews	Carson (OK)	Fattah
Armey	Castle	Ferguson
Baca	Chabot	Flake
Bachus	Chambliss	Fletcher
Baker	Clay	Foley
Baldwin	Clement	Forbes
Barcia	Clyburn	Ford
Barr	Coble	Fossella
Barrett	Collins	Frank
Bartlett	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Conyers	Frost
Bass	Cooksey	Gallely
Becerra	Costello	Ganske
Bereuter	Cramer	Gekas
Berkley	Crenshaw	Gibbons
Berman	Crowley	Gilchrest
Berry	Culberson	Gillmor
Biggart	Cummings	Gilman
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Gonzalez
Bishop	Davis (CA)	Goode
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Blunt	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boehkert	Davis, Jo Ann	Goss
Boehner	Davis, Tom	Graham
Bonilla	Deal	Granger
Bonior	DeGette	Graves
Bono	Delahunt	Green (TX)
Boozman	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Boswell	DeMint	Greenwood
Boucher	Deutsch	Grucci
Boyd	Diaz-Balart	Gutierrez
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Hall (OH)
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Hall (TX)
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hansen
Brown (SC)	Doyle	Harman
Bryant	Dreier	Hart
Burr	Duncan	Hastings (WA)
Burton	Dunn	Hayes
Buyer	Edwards	Hayworth
Callahan	Ehlers	Heger
Camp	Emerson	Hill
Cannon	Engel	Hilliard
Cantor	Eshoo	Hinchea
Capito	Etheridge	Hinojosa

Jefferson	Ney	Shuster
Jenkins	Northup	Simmons
Johnson (CT)	Norwood	Simpson
Johnson (IL)	Nussle	Skeen
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Skelton
Johnson, Sam	Olver	Slaughter
Jones (NC)	Ortiz	Smith (MI)
Kanjorski	Osborne	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Ose	Smith (TX)
Keller	Otter	Smith (WA)
Kelly	Owens	Snyder
Kennedy (RI)	Oxley	Souder
Kerns	Pallone	Spratt
Kildee	Pascarell	Stark
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Stearns
King (NY)	Paul	Stenholm
Kingston	Payne	Stump
Kirk	Pelosi	Sullivan
Klecza	Pence	Sununu
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
Kolbe	Petri	Tauzin
LaFalce	Phelps	Taylor (NC)
LaHood	Pitts	Terry
Lampson	Platts	Thomas
Langevin	Pombo	Thornberry
Larson (CT)	Pomeroy	Thune
LaTourette	Portman	Thurman
Leach	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Tierney
Lewis (GA)	Quinn	Turner
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Upton
Lipinski	Rahall	Velazquez
Lowey	Rangel	Vitter
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Walden
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Walsh
Luther	Reyes	Wamp
Lynch	Reynolds	Watkins (OK)
Maloney (CT)	Riley	Watt (NC)
Maloney (NY)	Rivers	Watts (OK)
Manzullo	Rodriguez	Waxman
Markey	Roemer	Weiner
Mascara	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
Matheson	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (NM)
Frost	Ross	Wilson (SC)
McCollum	Rothman	Wolf
McCrery	Roukema	Wynn
McGovern	Royce	Young (FL)
McHugh	Rush	

NAYS—43

Aderholt	Jones (OH)	Stupak
Baird	Kennedy (MN)	Sweeney
Baldacci	Kucinich	Tanner
Borski	Larsen (WA)	Taylor (MS)
Brady (PA)	Latham	Thompson (CA)
Capuano	LoBiondo	Thompson (MS)
Crane	McDermott	Towns
DeFazio	McNulty	Udall (CO)
English	Moore	Udall (NM)
Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Hefley	Ramstad	Wicker
Hilleary	Sabo	Wu
Hooley	Schaffer	
Hulshof	Strickland	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—38

Abercrombie	Condit	Doolittle
Ballenger	Cox	Ehrlich
Bentsen	Coyne	Filner
Blagojevich	Cubin	Gephardt
Calvert	DeLay	John
Clayton	Dooley	Kilpatrick

Lantos	Miller, George	Toomey
Lee	Napolitano	Trafficant
Linder	Oberstar	Waters
Lofgren	Pickering	Watson (CA)
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Wexler
Millender-	Sanchez	Woolsey
McDonald	Solis	Young (AK)

□ 1051

Mr. ENGLISH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. JENKINS, EHLERS, and ROSS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 48 on approving the Journal I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 48, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California district. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3694

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3694.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 353 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 353

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the 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. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the concurrent resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. During consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional

Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 353 is an open rule waiving all points of order against the consideration of H. Con. Res. 275, a sense of the Congress regarding hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves. The rule provides one hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule waives all points of order against the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The rule also authorizes the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 275 is a sense of the Congress introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and it expresses the sense of Congress that, one, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 should be modified to allow for mourning dove hunting during the last week in August in areas north of 37 degrees north latitude; two, that the United States should begin discussions with the appropriate parties to ensure that all Americans have an opportunity to harvest migratory mourning doves in an equitable manner; and, three, that hunters and wildlife management agencies in the States north of 37 degrees latitude should support an earlier opening date for the mourning dove season.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 275 was reported by unanimous consent of the Committee on Resources on February 27, 2002. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support both the rule, H. Res. 353, and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is an open rule. It will allow for consideration of H. Con. Res. 375 and, as we have heard, this is a resolution regarding hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves.

As the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate that will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule. This is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have an opportunity to offer germane amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1916 be renegotiated to provide a longer hunting season for mourning doves above the 37 degrees latitude. If the hunting season were extended, that would affect 22 States where mourning dove hunting is permitted. It also includes my State of Ohio.

Though this measure is important to many hunters and it is an important issue in many parts of this country, there is a far more important matter of legislation to extend unemployment insurance to out-of-work Americans that we are very concerned about. Many men and women have lost their jobs after the September 11 terrorist attack which was almost 6 months ago, and those benefits will soon run out unless we pass a bill to increase their unemployment insurance. We need to deal with this issue immediately.

Therefore, I will oppose the previous question and, if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule which will permit the House to take up the Senate amendment to H.R. 3090, which would extend unemployment insurance by 13 weeks.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is kind of a cherished thing in America, the hunting of doves. Many of us who hunt have noticed in our younger years that dove hunting was not a big thing. Deer season was always such a big thing in the State of Utah that they closed the schools, the churches, and everything else at the opening of deer season. Fishing was always a mass exodus out of town to get to various mass areas. Dove season was never considered as much.

I do not think people understand the importance of this little elusive bird

that people call the mourning dove. Actually, there are millions of them. The problem we have on this particular bill is that when the days start getting shorter and when we have a cold snap, what happens is they go south because they are a migratory bird.

□ 1100

When they go south, the people who want to hunt in the northern areas do not get the opportunity to hunt, so they maybe can pick up a straggler here and there. But the folks from Florida, Texas, the southern States, Arizona, New Mexico, Southern California, they have a heyday. The folks in Mexico really have a heyday because they do not have a limit on it, and they go down there and shoot them by the thousands. That I think is another issue, not one before us today, but possibly one that should be considered.

So the people in the north who enjoy hunting, and hunting is one of the traditions of America which we all seem to enjoy, or many folks seem to enjoy, do not get the opportunity or privilege that people below the parallel that was mentioned before have.

So with this bill we are not telling them what to do; we do not have that right. We cannot set the limit. What we are merely saying is the President of the United States will then urge the people in Canada and Mexico to renegotiate and start the limit above that parallel by 1 week earlier. That week seems to be critical, because for those of us who have hunted doves, they can see literally thousands of those birds in the area the last week of August. Where do they go the last week of September? As if they knew exactly, away they go, and the hunting is rather poor.

So all this bill does is urge these countries to renegotiate. No one in this body or the other body has the privilege or the right to change the law. We can just urge that it be done, and this bill would urge the President of the United States to begin that type of a process.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "yes" vote on this rule and a "yes" vote on the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the great gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 275 expresses the sense of Congress that hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves should be modified so that individuals have a fair and equitable opportunity to hunt such birds.

I think that the American people would have every right to ask the question: Why is Congress considering a resolution on mourning doves when 11,127,000 Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits?

The people of this country expect a sense of proportion about what we do here, a sense of priorities. When we are coming forward to this Congress with a

bill that seeks to address the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 to try to modify that act to allow for mourning dove hunting during the last week of August, while over 1 million Americans are being deprived of an opportunity to receive income into their family because they are running out of unemployment benefits, and the Federal Government has not acted to extend those benefits, people have every right to ask, What are we doing here in this Congress? Why is Congress considering a resolution on mourning doves when the recession has lasted 52 weeks so far? Why is Congress considering a resolution on mourning doves when this week and next, persons who became unemployed after September 11 will exhaust their unemployment benefits?

Now, if Members agree with many of us that this is an example of skewed priorities, it is an example of not being in tune with the real needs of the American people, then I want to ask them to join with us in opposing the motion on the previous question.

The reason is this: if we are successful in defeating the motion on the previous question, we will then have a straight debate on unemployment insurance extension without any poison pills. I urge that we keep our priorities straight.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me the necessary time to at least express interest not only in the passage of the rule, which I think is an important rule to accompany this resolution, but the folks in my State and in the adjoining States, all those above the 37th parallel, do not enjoy the opportunity, as was stated by several of the speakers before myself, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources, to be able to hunt the mourning dove during our season because, as the treaty, which was established in 1916, states, we cannot open our season before September 1. All we need in Idaho and those States that are north of the 37th parallel is just a little bit of a cooling trend and all the doves immediately go south.

It is a responsible thing to do, and it is a responsible thing to do because of some of the subject matter that has been brought up by the gentleman across the aisle, that there are a lot of folks that cannot afford to go to the southern States, cannot afford to go to Mexico, cannot afford to transport the weapons or the transportation, and these people then are denied the opportunity to hunt, as well.

So I think this is an economic stimulus package, and it is also a package to help those folks who do not have the necessary resources to be able to enjoy hunting in their home State and be able to take the mourning doves, within a certain limit.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join with the good gentleman from Washington and all

those others who have spoken in hopes that we will vote for the rule, pass the rule, and then vote and pass the resolution.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are here to vote on the fate of mourning doves. That may be a serious matter, and people may in fact cherish the opportunity to go and shoot these birds, and that would be appropriate at some other time, I might suspect.

However, there are people mourning in America today because they are working families who have suffered record layoffs since the tragic terrorist attacks of September 11 and prior to that time.

From September 11, the date after which people exhausted their benefits, the date they would get additional benefits under the bipartisan legislation passed in the Senate 100 to nothing through January of this year, more than 1.3 million people will have exhausted their regular employment benefits, and we are here talking about doves.

In nine States, including my home State of Massachusetts, the number of unemployed workers exhausting their unemployment benefits from November to January more than doubled from the comparable period a year ago. On April 15, just a month from now, unemployed workers across this country will be paying their taxes, filing their returns to pay taxes for the money they made before September 11. Those tax dollars go to pay our salaries here in Congress. They expect us to work, and they expect us to set priorities.

Long before the priority of shooting doves, we should be doing something about the unemployment insurance for people who are out of work. We were able to work to bail out the airlines. We promised to help the laid-off workers then, and we still have not done it. Instead, we have a tax package to help corporations. The majority in this House tried first to give a 15-year break of \$25 billion back to Enron and other megacorporations, but did not do anything about unemployment insurance.

They still are now trying to undermine that by taking that 100 to zero proposal from the Senate that would extend unemployment insurance and add another poison pill, this time shifting from the employer to the employee the cost of their basic health insurance, trying to undermine our employer-based health insurance system as the price for having unemployment insurance.

Well, we have suspension of the rules for mourning doves, Mr. Speaker, and we should have suspension of the rules to deal with the unemployment insurance. Oppose the motion on the previous question, bring forward that Senate bill. No more poison pills. Let us

get our business done for America's working families.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the State of Washington for yielding time to me.

While I am a freshman, I hope I never get to the point on this House floor in my time as a United States Congressman to belittle the opportunity or attempt of any other Member in the United States Congress to do something for their constituency.

Within the State of Montana, this is an important issue. Fish and game can be debated for many hours and many days in Montana because of not only the hunting experience, but the economic benefit that it provides to my residents. On my own ranch we have dove hunting. Unfortunately, because of the dates that are included here, sometimes it can only last 3 days because, as the light hours change in the day and the temperature changes, these migratory birds move south.

This is an opportunity to create some economic development for my State, a State that has been gripped for 3, 4, 5, and sometimes 6 years by drought, now. We have a new term in Montana. It is called "continuing drought."

So I will not belittle their opportunity or attempt to do something for their constituency, and I hope they will not continue to do that in this particular case, because this is an important piece of legislation for my constituency.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 100 to nothing, the other body voted for a 13-week extension of unemployment benefits. The purpose of our act today is we want to bring that same proposal to the floor so we can vote on it as well, and extend unemployment benefits.

We are going to hear that there will be an effort to do that later in the day put forth by the majority, and they have some things added on to it. What is wrong with that? Let me tell the Members what is wrong with the majority's health care scam that is added to the unemployment benefit extension.

A person who has been out of work for 6 months and is about to lose his or her benefits, who has \$1,000 in his or her checking account, here is how they get health care under the Republican plan. They are supposed to go out and pay \$7,000 or more in premiums to buy a health insurance policy, and then wait until next year, when they file their income tax return and get \$4,200 back as a credit.

The Republican health insurance scam requires people to use dollars

they do not have to pay a premium they cannot afford to get a tax credit they will not use until more than a year from now. That is a hoax, not a plan. The majority should join with us and defeat this previous question.

Let us have a clean up-and-down vote on whether or not to do as 100 Senators did and extend unemployment benefits for America's unemployed for 13 weeks. Vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to our great leader, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge our colleagues to vote against the previous question. Here we are on the floor of Congress at a time when our country is in a very difficult place economically. This month, a record number of people have exhausted their unemployment benefits, a record number of people. Here we are on the floor of the House; and instead of addressing that very pressing need for all of those families, we are taking up suspensions, a second day of suspensions.

I have no quarrel with our dealing with certain issues, like extending the hunting season for mourning doves, if that is necessary and that is our jurisdiction. That is something that should be a small part of what we do.

But the American people see us on TV. They see the irrelevance of what is going on on the floor of the House of Representatives. Can we not give to the workers of America the same due that we give to mourning doves, to extend, to extend the time frame? Why does that not have at least as high a priority to the Republican majority? Why do not unemployed workers receive the same priority as hunting season for mourning doves?

There was a proposal that was supposed to come to the floor today which would have extended the benefits but would have a poison pill, a very unwise provision in terms of health benefits. The Democratic proposal would have been very smart: extend the benefits at least 13 weeks, hopefully 26 weeks, again, recognizing that record numbers of Americans are exhausting their unemployment benefits, and couple that with a plan to make the COBRA benefits available to these unemployed workers.

When we had the tragedy of September 11, we immediately moved to bail out the airline industry, and we had to do that. But that happened with the promise that we would shortly be addressing the needs of those Americans who lost their jobs because of September 11.

Six months later, we are still waiting for the Republican majority to bring a bill to the floor that adequately addresses those concerns. Instead, we are here this morning talking about extending the hunting season for mourning doves.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

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

We do have with us today, Mr. Speaker, a group of students. I think they are probably sitting up there wondering, what is the Congress talking about today? The issue before the House is to extend the hunting season for mourning doves, little mourning doves that go whoo, whoo, whoo. In the winter they are at the bottom of the feeder. For the most part, they are ground feeders. They are pretty little birds, very, very peaceful. What we are doing today is extending the season so we can kill them.

Well, the students probably know or have talked to their folks who have indicated this is a bad economy. Maybe one of the parents is laid off, or a neighbor or an uncle or aunt; and it is Congress's authority and it is in our power to give them unemployment compensation benefits.

□ 1115

What is happening is they are running out of their original natural allotment. The U.S. Senate, your Senators, passed a bill providing a 13-week extension for unemployment compensation benefits to help people who are laid off. It is in the House, but the Republicans in this House do not want to take it up and instead bring before the House today, we have nothing else to do today, they bring before the House today a bill to extend the season on killing these little, whoo, whoo, whoo, mourning doves.

Let me tell you about the mourning dove. I come from the State of Wisconsin. When I was in the State legislature a couple years ago, back in 1971, the State legislature passed a bill naming the mourning dove a bird of peace, a bird of peace. How noble. It was befitting this little bird. Well, then the legislature and the Natural Board of Resources last year voted to open the season. It is bugging some people that this little bird which mates for life is at the bottom of some people's bird feeders cleaning up the seeds that have been knocked out of the feeder and so the response for Wisconsin is kill them. So Wisconsin says let us kill them. They are bugging someone. But then those who want to kill them are saying, Oh, but are they good eating.

Listen, after we take the feathers off that little guy, it is about this big and 4 ounces. Is that a meal? To hear the Republicans come up and say we need to kill these birds because of economic stimulus or because we need it to provide some economic development, how hungry can you be?

We know full well the bad news is the bird of peace in the State of Wisconsin is now being killed because it provides such great meals. I guess it is something like a turkey.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Members are reminded not

to introduce or bring to the attention of the House an occupant in the galleries.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I frankly believe that this legislation of the mourning doves will not help those Texans in my State. But I do know what will help them and that is a concern about unemployment benefits that need to be extended.

If you want to know what unemployment is about, just come to my home town of Houston. Although we are the can-do city, we fought against the stress of Tropical Storm Alison, the number of layoffs of our corporate friends like Continental and the disaster of Enron with some 4,500 employees being laid off, we know we can pull ourselves up by our boot straps when people are hurting. It is time for this Congress to address the question of the devastation of extended unemployment just like we went to the aid of many of those corporate friends who were devastated after September 11. Thirteen weeks, I will support that; but I also believe 52 weeks of extension because in April my State will see an exhaustion of unemployment benefits of some 175,000 individuals.

I have heard the stories of individuals who cannot pay for health coverage, cannot provide the dollars that allow them to have the COBRA. We need to respond to the crisis of Americans right now and need to talk about unemployment to the extent that we provide the bridge and support for those who are in need.

I have my constituents talking to me about saving Social Security and the prescription drug benefit, but there are working families now who have contributed to this economy and through no fault of their own they are no longer working. I think we are wasting America's time by not coming to this floor, extending unemployment benefits like the Senate did for 13 weeks; and if we can do more we should do more. My advocacy is for the extended 52 weeks because I know in April and May there will be people in my home town who will be hurting.

We have to face reality, Mr. Speaker. Legislation that does not help all of us maybe should be reconsidered. I will be voting against this rule because I want to vote for extended unemployment benefits for Americans. I want them back on their feet. I want them to pay for tuition for the young people going to college. I want them to have health care. I want to make sure they pay their mortgages. I want them to be proud to be an American. I want to thank those men and women who are fighting in Afghanistan to help free us and free Afghanistan. Let us do something for the people here in the United States and extend the unemployment benefits.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a very much-distinguished member of the Committee on Rules and of this body.

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

Mr. Speaker, this morning the morning news from Rochester tells me that this year my district has lost 12,400 jobs. That is almost unheard of in Rochester, New York.

In 1929 when the crash came, we hardly noticed it up there. Our unemployment rate has been always steady and very good, but we are bleeding jobs. I suspect for many of you, your mail must reflect mine. Can you do something about unemployment? I have lost my unemployment. My unemployment is running out. Now to add to the rest of our woes, we also have a lot of people employed by Global Crossing.

I am embarrassed that the people in my district are seeing this morning that what we are most concerned about is the shooting of mourning doves, as the previous speaker said, the peace bird of the State of Wisconsin. I do not know if enough people in my district will be able to shoot enough birds to feed their family, but it does not look like we will be able to do much here on extending their unemployment benefits.

I am sure they understand that we do not control the agenda of this House, or it would have been done a long time ago; and we should have been taking up the Senate bill. I urge Members to vote against the previous question and the rule to try to get some unemployment insurance up here.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the time, I would just like to say that it has been nearly 6 months since the tragic events of September 11. Millions of American jobs have been lost since then. The unemployment benefits for 1.3 million Americans have already expired. Millions more will be losing benefits in the coming weeks. We must act.

Last month the other body passed a very clean extension of these critically needed benefits. Every day we fail to act means economic hardship for more and more Americans. In a bipartisan fashion we should not be wasting time and be together on this and vote to extend unemployment benefits.

As far as the rule is concerned, the rule is okay and it is open. We have no problem with it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind Members because there is a lot of concern on both sides of the aisle regard-

ing the unemployment benefits for those who were adversely harmed by what happened on September 11 and because of the economy, we intend to take that up and we will take that up; and I just wanted to remind my colleagues of that.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this rule would clear the way for the House to debate a nonbinding resolution about changing the hunting seasons for migratory mourning doves.

That is an interesting resolution, and it could make for an interesting debate. But the fact that it is proposed for debate today on the House floor is little short of a disgrace because of what it says about the priorities of the House's Republican leadership.

In short, they have made it a priority to debate this nonbinding resolution, instead of trying to help people who have lost their jobs and are in an economic bind.

I know we are all encouraged by the signs the economy is recovering from recession. But the recovery is far from complete, and unemployment insurance is running out for thousands of people who have lost their jobs.

Extending those benefits is something they need and something that will help the economy because it will enable them to continue paying their bills. And it is what we should be doing today instead of debating whether Congress should go on record with some opinions about changing a hunting season.

There should not be any partisan disagreement about this. That is why the Senate has already twice unanimously approved bills that would extend unemployment compensation benefits for 13 weeks.

And that is what we should be doing today, instead of debating hunting seasons. We should be passing that bill—the bill supported by every Senator, regardless of party—and sending it to the President so he can sign it into law.

It's too bad the Republican leadership does not think that should have priority over this resolution. I don't share that view, and so I cannot support this rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 354 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 354

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, March 6, 2002, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures:

(1) The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation.

(2) The bill (S. 1857) to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims.

(3) The bill (H.R. 1870) to provide for the sale of certain real property within the Newlands Project in Nevada, to the city of Fallon, Nevada.

(4) The bill (H.R. 1883) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon.

(5) The bill (H.R. 1963) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route taken by American soldier and frontiersman George Rogers Clark and his men during the Revolutionary War to capture the British forts at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, Illinois, and Vincennes, Indiana, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System.

(6) 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.

(7) A resolution expressing support for the democratically elected government of Colombia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 354 is a rule providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules at any time on the legislative day Wednesday, March 6, 2002. This is a fair rule that will allow for consideration of several pieces of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last night the Committee on Rules in fact had the debate and the vote about those things which we are going to choose to consider today and one of those that we talked about at the time we have now made a decision that we are not going to present at this time; and it should be noted that though, while the unemployment benefits bill is listed under the rule, it will not be called up for consideration today, meaning that it will not be a part of the package that we are seeking at this time.

Mr. Speaker, since the tragic events of September 11, the House has worked with speed and deliberation to pass much-needed legislation that will provide an extension of critical-needed unemployment benefits to dislocated workers. It is regrettable that though this bill has passed several times with bipartisan votes that there will be no action on this today and also that there has been no action by the other body on this.

As the 6-month anniversary of September 11 approaches us, there are people across the country who are still struggling to recover from the tragic events of that day, whether it be emotional, physically, financially or otherwise. It is my hope that the issue will stay at the forefront of our legislative

business until we pass and enact a bill that will help each of those people.

Mr. Speaker, I have outlined those things which we will be considering, or hope to consider, today under suspension of the rules; and I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule which will allow us to consider these pieces of legislation.

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

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

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will allow us to consider a number of suspension bills today, bills that many of us had hoped would be of critical importance to our constituents. In fact, last night rumors circulated that the leadership of the body was preparing to do what we hoped it would have done long ago and extend unemployment benefits to the thousands of workers who were laid off in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

For weeks we have begged the leadership of the body time and time again to pass a clean unemployment extension bill. Recently released Labor Department data for January 2002 shows that from September 11 through January of this year more than 1.3 million workers exhausted their regular unemployment benefits. As of January, about 7.9 million Americans, or about 5.6 percent of the workforce, were unemployed. Over 12,000 people a day are exhausting their unemployment insurance. And earlier this year the Senate adopted a simple extension of unemployment benefits by unanimous consent.

The House leadership, rather than acting expeditiously, refused to pass the same extension without tying it to a package of dying stimulus plans.

□ 1130

The plan, no one was surprised to learn, consisted almost entirely of tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy. And the measure, no one was surprised to learn, went nowhere in the Senate.

We now have an opportunity to do today, or we did have, what should have been done weeks ago, pass a clean unemployment bill. Were we to pass such a measure this morning, the bill could be on the President's desk immediately. But, instead, the leadership of the body is preparing to push a measure that would augment a simple extension of jobs benefits with controversial tax provisions that will kill it in the Senate.

Why can we not simply extend unemployment benefits by an additional 13 weeks? Tax credits do little to aid the unemployed, many of whom are not paying taxes in the first place while out of work. A clean bill could go

straight to the President, and the leadership in the body could signal to the unemployed that this House cares about the plight of their families. Today's confusion, however, will ensure just the opposite, more delay and not a penny of relief for impacted families.

Mr. Speaker, this is not leadership; this is petulance. Having failed three times to pass accelerated tax breaks for upper brackets and reducing the alternative tax on corporations or actually doing away with them, the leadership is taking a fourth swing at the other body. What is stunning about this maneuver is the sheer cynicism it embraces. The leadership is making it perfectly clear that it is willing to inflict further pain on desperate families in order to have another crack at a divisive, partisan agenda.

Moreover, Members of this body are being afforded little notice of what these bills contain. The House of Representatives is not a shadow government. Our rules mandate that we deliberate in the open. What aversion do we have here to regular order? Instead of informed deliberations, my colleagues are left with scant information. In fact, the bill we have been talking about has not yet been seen, and my colleagues and I have no information and no debate time on which to base decisions impacting millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this extraordinary rule we are considering today is normally reserved for those times when Congress is hard at work, not when we are working 2½ days a week, and it needs flexibility to meet its commitments. But not today. The long stretches of idleness in this body can surely be replaced with meaningful deliberation on important measures.

We just got the report of people being abused in nursing homes. We should be concerned about all the corporations in America that are registering themselves over in Bermuda to avoid paying America's taxes. While we name post offices and contemplate shooting mourning doves, the measures that impact prescription drugs and saving Social Security languish.

I have a bill that would ban genetic discrimination in health insurance that has over 258 bipartisan cosponsors; and it would affect every man, woman, and child in the United States. But for over 6 years we have not been able to have that on the floor. I implore, then, if they are going to abuse the power of suspensions, to put it to good use and make a real difference in the lives of American people.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to try to defeat the previous question on the rule in order to amend the rule simply to allow what should be done, a straight 13-week unemployment benefits extension bill. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of this House to support this effort because the American public demands and deserves it.

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

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

We are hearing a lot about this unemployment problem, and it is a problem, and the health care problems, and there are health care problems. This body has addressed this issue numerous times. This issue was prepared to be on the floor today, except there was some disagreement as to whether it would be on suspension or whether we would have long enough even to speak about it. The bottom line is, I do not believe we should be playing politics with the health and livelihood of American workers, whose families' jobs and their own jobs, their own problems, are right on the line.

But for those who would call for a clean bill, I would quote Speaker HASTERT, who yesterday said this is about as clean as you could get it. And I would add that it is also a straightforward approach to addressing the real needs of laid-off workers as we can get. That was what this bill was supposed to do. It was clean. It was about unemployment and health care tax credits. Oh, but then we find out that they simply do not like the way we have done it, and that is why the other side is opposed to what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, we disagree on lots of issues, and they are honest disagreements that we have in Washington, about taxes, about the size of government, about how much we are going to tax the American people, about who will be paying in and who will be receiving what. But the bottom line is that this Republican Congress has attempted expeditiously and carefully to address the needs and the issues of people who are having tough times. But we also believe, as Republicans, that it is important for us to put out a plan that addresses the needs of the Nation. That is why we asked for tax cuts.

We believe that people not only want a job but they want the ability to have a secure job. Savings and investment and the opportunity for people to have more take-home pay to protect the jobs that we have is what the Republican plan is, also. It is not just about the health care needs, where we offer tax credits. It is not just about unemployment. It is about a broad, overarching idea that we believe that this government can, must and will react and respond properly to people. And that is what the Republican plan has been since September 11.

I am sorry we are not addressing that issue today. We will continue to wait for the other body as they deliberate and deliberate and deliberate on this issue, but we will keep going with the things we know are good for people.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to my friend.

I appreciate that people who are unemployed, who have families to feed, who have mortgages to pay, who have no prospects immediately of a job are not terribly interested whether or not we do away with an Alternative Min-

imum Tax and give money back to IBM and money back to Enron and money back to major corporations in the United States. They simply want some kind of action here.

In all times of trouble, when we have this kind of unemployment rate, it has been the policy of the government of the United States to extend unemployment. For some reason, we simply cannot seem to get that done here. I am appalled at that and urge that that be rectified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my colleague on the other side, he just said that we are playing politics. I would say the problem here is that the Republicans are in charge of the floor. They are in charge of the House. They are in the leadership because they are in the majority. They are playing politics because they are not allowing a clean bill on unemployment insurance extension to come up.

I cannot believe I am hearing this from my Republican colleagues, somehow suggesting that if we take action on this bill that they put in order under this rule that we will have some relief for the unemployed. It is not true. We know if this bill goes over to the other body and it includes anything other than extension of unemployment compensation it will never pass and it will die.

The other body has already taken up I do not know how many stimulus packages, tried all kinds of options, with or without different kinds of health care benefits, with or without Alternative Minimum Tax, and finally the leadership said, look, there is nothing we can pass here other than a clean unemployment compensation extension, passed, I believe, 100 to nothing.

So the lesson is learned. The only thing that will work, the only thing that will provide relief for Americans who are running out of their unemployment insurance is if we just pass a clean bill that has nothing else attached to it.

We have done the same thing over here. The Republican leadership has brought up three stimulus packages, pretty much the same. I suspect if this bill is voted down today they will bring up another stimulus package tomorrow or next week. They are playing politics because they will not allow a clean bill to pass. It passed the other body 100 to nothing. It will pass here probably unanimously. Let us just do it.

Now, let me talk about the tax credits for health care that are in this bill. My Republican colleagues know that this is a very controversial issue because the Democrats do not believe it will work. When we talk about tax credits for health care, most of the people who are uninsured, very few are going to be able to go out in the individual market and buy insurance, which is \$4,000 or \$5,000 a year, with the

pidly tax credits the Republicans are proposing.

So the Democrats have been saying this is not going to work, this tax credit. We have talked about extending COBRA, we have talked about the need to extend Medicaid to cover more people at a little higher level of income. My own State of New Jersey, a perfect example, is suffering because they do not have the money, and so many States are not able to provide the Medicaid benefits they have now and cover the people they now have and are considering cutting back on Medicaid.

So we have a major difference here. Democrats believe COBRA extension and Medicaid extension will bring more people and provide insurance. We do not believe the Republican proposal with tax credits will work. So forget about this for the time being. We do not have agreement. Let us go with the thing we do have agreement on, which is unemployment expansion, a clean bill. We should bring it up and get it over with.

The Republican side is playing politics and not giving a fair shake to those people in my district and around the country that need these extra weeks of unemployment compensation.

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

We can keep talking about this. It has passed this House four times. This body has dealt with this issue. Now what we hear is my colleagues on the other side suggesting we have to bow down to what the other body wants to do, that we must do what the other body wants to do. Well, that is not the way it works. This body has its own leadership, has the two sides of the aisle. We work on the things that we work on, just like the items that we passed and have sent to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we have been open and clear about what we are trying to do. We are offering an opportunity to put together unemployment benefits, health care, and, at the same time, make sure that it would be done in a way which we believe would work. Now, what we understand from the other side is, we disagree that it is not going to work that way, so we are going to oppose what you are doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard this lots of time. We heard this about the balanced budget. A balanced budget will never work. We can never have a balanced budget.

Secondly, we heard when we went to welfare reform, oh, my gosh, welfare reform will never, ever work. We heard this about the capital gains tax cut, that it is going to cost our government \$9 billion. In fact, it did work and brought in \$90 billion to the government and created an economic stimulus that our country has lived off for several years now.

Republican ideas are simply bad to the other side every time, and that is where they play politics, and I am sorry that it is that way. But what we are doing is proposing something that

will allow families who today have to use pre-tax dollars to pay for their health care, and we are trying to make it easier to where they can then deduct this amount.

Tax credits do work. They work for the families that use them over and over and over. Tens of thousands of African Americans, tens of thousands of Hispanics, and, oh, yes, tens of thousands of Caucasians will get this same tax credit. It works for people. It works for people who have health care today by helping them pay for what they want and they need.

I am proud of what we are doing. I am sorry that my colleagues on the other side simply disagree and so they are not willing to venture in to helping anybody because they do not like what we have done. That is the politics, Mr. Speaker, and it is a real shame that it is happening again today on the floor of the House of Representatives right before our very eyes.

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

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

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has made it clear what this is all about. He says we are waiting for the other body. The other body has twice unanimously passed an unemployment compensation extension bill. Twice. What is my colleague waiting for? He says we should not bow down to the Senate. To whom? TRENT LOTT? Every other Republican in the Senate who voted for this extension?

□ 1145

Bowing down, this is a fight with Republicans in the Senate. It is not only a fight with us. The gentleman is all alone.

Secondly, the gentleman says this issue is not just about unemployment. That is the problem. The gentleman is ignoring the needs of the unemployed because the gentleman has another agenda. I want the gentleman to go and talk to the 356,000 people who exhausted their benefits in January and tell them this is not just about unemployment. It is the largest number of people exhausting their regular benefits without receiving additional aid in a single month, in any single month on record. So I suggest that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) go to the 50 States of this Union and tell them that this is not just about unemployment. Shame.

The other side of the aisle insists on adding to this unemployment bill controversial issues, and the gentleman knows they are. The health provision is the same one that has created the controversy in the Senate. This is what Mr. LOTT said on February 7.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSSELLA). Members are reminded to

refrain from improper references to Senators.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this is what has been said. "My recommendation is that they send just a clean bill." That is the gentleman's leader over in the Senate. I shall not name his name.

This is what this is all about. The other side wants a package, and then they change it. They want a package that essentially says to the unemployed of this country that their unemployment is not enough for Congress to act.

Mr. Speaker, my suggestion to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and Members on the Republican side, including many of the leaders who said they wanted a clean bill, is to think again. These millions of people are not getting unemployment on their watch. They are disregarding them. They have another agenda. Take up unemployment compensation today, pass it, send it to the President. I am sure he will sign it, and then we will go on to other issues.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will reiterate that Members must avoid improper references to Senators, whether specifically by name or otherwise.

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

Mr. Speaker, we do have a broader agenda. It is about jobs in this country. It is about the ability that we have to make sure through stimulus or through tax cuts or through those things that will allow people to have more money in their own pocket. That is also what this is about.

Yes, it is bigger than unemployment. It also includes health care. It includes the things that are the essence of what will maintain the vitality of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I learned a long time ago when I came to Congress, some 6 years ago, that virtually every single bill, every single debate that takes place on this floor is about more government, more spending, more taxes, or about the reverse.

I am falling off on the side of the people who want jobs in this country, who want to make sure we have a sound economy and make sure that what this government does, it does, and is done efficiently. I am proud of what we are doing and what we have passed.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind this entire body that if we can lay aside our differences, lay aside the things that we think will not work and get to work on the things that we are going to propose that will work, that means real money to real people in the time of their need, that in fact we will achieve the things that we are after. Government should not pick the winners and losers. We should help the people that need help.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is to try to help the people that need help. I know the un-

employed do want jobs. I am sure that all unemployed workers thought that, during their working years when they paid their taxes, they believed that should a catastrophe hit and they lose their jobs that this government would help them out. That has been in the best tradition, to tide them over until a new job can be found; and when that job is found, I hope it will be as good as the job they lost.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow the House to vote on a straight 13-week extension of the unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 6 months since the tragic events of September 11. In addition to the horrendous loss of life that occurred as a result of that day, the economic destruction has been enormous. Our economy, which was already in an economic downturn before the event, has worsened considerably. Millions of American jobs have been lost since then.

The unemployment benefits for many of these jobless workers have already expired. Many, many more will lose benefits in the coming weeks. We must act immediately. The other body has already passed a clean extension of these critically-needed benefits. Every day that we fail to act means economic hardships for thousands of Americans and their families. Let us stop wasting time and vote to extend the unemployment benefits. I urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 354—MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

In the resolution after "(6)" strike "the bill (H.R. 1963)" and all that follows through "health insurance costs, and for other purposes" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 3090) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have heard it here today. Republicans have this hidden agenda. The other side of the aisle is right. Our hidden agenda is jobs and growing the economy, getting people back in their jobs, having an extension of unemployment benefits, having health care tax credits. And yet we have heard now what the other side of the aisle says about that. That is that they do not like the way that we have done it, and because they do not like the way we have done this, they oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to continue this Republican conference, and Congress is going to continue passing things that are great for people, good for workers, continues economic opportunities. We are going to keep talking about how America's greatest days lie in our future. Opportunities for people who are going to school and want jobs,

people who today may not have a job. We are going to rebound this economy. It is going to head back.

I believe that the President, working with this Congress, will have a lot of success. That is what this is about. That is our hidden agenda. Our hidden agenda is simple. It is about jobs. It is about economic growth and the opportunity for people to get a job, keep a job and know that they can have more take-home pay.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic voting on adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 191, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—218

Aderholt	Duncan	Issa
Akin	Dunn	Istook
Army	Ehlers	Jenkins
Bachus	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Emerson	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	English	Johnson, Sam
Barr	Everett	Jones (NC)
Bartlett	Ferguson	Keller
Barton	Flake	Kelly
Bass	Fletcher	Kennedy (MN)
Bereuter	Foley	Kerns
Biggart	Forbes	King (NY)
Billirakis	Fossella	Kingston
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Kirk
Boehert	Gallegly	Knollenberg
Boehner	Ganske	Kolbe
Bonilla	Gekas	LaHood
Bono	Gibbons	Latham
Boozman	Gilchrest	LaTourette
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Leach
Brown (SC)	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Bryant	Goode	Lewis (KY)
Burr	Goodlatte	Linder
Burton	Goss	LoBiondo
Callahan	Graham	Lucas (OK)
Camp	Granger	Manzullo
Cannon	Graves	McCrery
Cantor	Green (WI)	McHugh
Capito	Greenwood	McInnis
Castle	Grucci	McKeon
Chabot	Gutknecht	Mica
Chambliss	Hall (TX)	Miller, Dan
Coble	Hansen	Miller, Gary
Collins	Hart	Miller, Jeff
Combest	Hastings (WA)	Moran (KS)
Cooksey	Hayes	Morella
Cox	Hayworth	Myrick
Crane	Hefley	Nethercutt
Crenshaw	Herger	Ney
Culberson	Hilleary	Northup
Cunningham	Hobson	Norwood
Davis, Jo Ann	Hoekstra	Nussle
Davis, Tom	Horn	Osborne
Deal	Hostettler	Ose
DeLay	Houghton	Otter
DeMint	Hulshof	Oxley
Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Paul
Dreier	Isakson	Pence

Peterson (PA)	Schaffer
Petri	Schrock
Pickering	Sensenbrenner
Pitts	Sessions
Platts	Shadegg
Pombo	Shaw
Portman	Shays
Pryce (OH)	Sherwood
Putnam	Shimkus
Quinn	Shuster
Radanovich	Simmons
Ramstad	Simpson
Regula	Skeen
Rehberg	Smith (MI)
Reynolds	Smith (NJ)
Riley	Smith (TX)
Rogers (KY)	Souder
Rogers (MI)	Stearns
Rohrabacher	Stump
Ros-Lehtinen	Sullivan
Roukema	Sununu
Royce	Sweeney
Ryan (WI)	Tancredo
Ryun (KS)	Tauzin
Saxton	Taylor (NC)

NAYS—191

Ackerman	Gutierrez
Allen	Hall (OH)
Andrews	Harman
Baca	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Hill
Baldacci	Hilliard
Baldwin	Hinche
Barcia	Hinojosa
Barrett	Hoefel
Becerra	Holden
Berkley	Holt
Berman	Honda
Berry	Hooley
Bishop	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Inslee
Bonior	Israel
Borski	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	(TX)
Boyd	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	John
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)
Capps	Kanjorski
Capuano	Kaptur
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)
Carson (IN)	Kildee
Carson (OK)	Kind (WI)
Clay	Kleccka
Clayton	Kucinich
Clement	LaFalce
Clyburn	Lampson
Conyers	Langevin
Costello	Larsen (WA)
Coyne	Larson (CT)
Cramer	Levin
Crowley	Lewis (GA)
Cummings	Lipinski
Davis (CA)	Lowe
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)
Davis (IL)	Luther
DeFazio	Lynch
DeGette	Maloney (CT)
Delahunt	Maloney (NY)
DeLauro	Markey
Deutsch	Mascara
Dicks	Matheson
Dingell	Matsui
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)
Edwards	McCollum
Engel	McDermott
Eshoo	McGovern
Etheridge	McIntyre
Evans	McKinney
Farr	McNulty
Fattah	Meehan
Ford	Meek (FL)
Frank	Meeks (NY)
Frost	Menendez
Gephardt	Miller, George
Gonzalez	Mink
Gordon	Mollohan
Green (TX)	Moore

NOT VOTING—25

Abercrombie	Cubin
Bentsen	Dooley
Blagojevich	Doolittle
Buyer	Finler
Calvert	Hyde
Condit	Kilpatrick

Terry	Roybal-Allard
Thomas	Sanchez
Thornberry	Solis
Thune	
Tiahrt	
Tiberi	
Toomey	
Upton	
Vitter	
Walden	
Walsh	
Wamp	
Watkins (OK)	
Watts (OK)	
Weldon (FL)	
Weldon (PA)	
Weller	
Whitfield	
Wicker	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Traficant	Wexler
Waters	Woolsey
Watson (CA)	

□ 1222

Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, DINGELL, BARRETT of WISCONSIN, ALLEN, FORD, HINOJOSA and ISRAEL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. REGULA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 49, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California, district. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 49 on ordering the previous question I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unable to cast my vote on two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall 48, Approval of the Journal: “aye”; rollcall 49, Previous Question: “nay.”

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, 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, rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after disposition of House Concurrent Resolution 275 relating to mourning doves.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT ON ITS BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point on its bicentennial anniversary, and commending its outstanding contributions to the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Whereas establishing a military academy to teach the technical arts of war was a desire of many of our founding fathers, particularly George Washington;

Whereas Congress passed legislation on March 16, 1802, to establish such a military academy to be located at West Point, New York, a site that Washington called the key to the continent because of its strategic importance during the Revolution;

Lantos
Lee
Lofgren
Millender-
McDonald
Napolitano

Whereas President Thomas Jefferson signed the legislation establishing the United States Military Academy at West Point, an institution dedicated to promoting scientific education to benefit the Nation and to attracting a diverse array of young citizens to the Nation's military leadership;

Whereas Sylvanus Thayer, who served as Superintendent of the Academy from 1817 to 1833, established the foundation of the Academy's strong academic program, strict adherence to discipline, and emphasis on moral and ethical conduct;

Whereas, under Douglas MacArthur's leadership as Superintendent from 1919 to 1922, the Academy was modernized to prepare its graduates for the challenges of the 20th century;

Whereas the Academy, the first school in America to teach engineering, produced graduates who were responsible for the construction of the Nation's first railroad lines and many of its early harbor improvements, bridges, roads, and canals;

Whereas Academy graduates introduced engineering education to numerous colleges and universities, and carried out such monumental engineering projects as the construction of the Panama Canal project;

Whereas Academy graduates have also distinguished themselves in the leadership of such innovative scientific research and development projects as the development of atomic bombs in the Manhattan Project during World War II;

Whereas Academy graduates have served with character and distinction in all of America's wars and military actions since the War of 1812;

Whereas 74 Academy graduates have earned the Nation's highest military honor, the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 2 Academy graduates, Ulysses S. Grant and Dwight D. Eisenhower, served both as distinguished general officers and as the President of the United States, and many other graduates have served in all levels of government;

Whereas dozens of Academy graduates have been astronauts, including the Academy graduate who is the first American to walk in space and 2 Academy graduates who walked on the moon;

Whereas hundreds of Academy graduates have utilized their talents in the private sector, to provide managerial and technical expertise that is responsible, in part, for nurturing and sustaining a system of enterprise that is admired around the world;

Whereas the Academy has provided an opportunity for men and women of all races, religions, and cultures to receive a college education and to begin a life of service to the Army and the Nation; and

Whereas the motto of the Academy, "Duty, Honor, Country", exemplifies the spirit of this Republic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress congratulates the United States Military Academy on its bicentennial anniversary, recognizes it as an outstanding leadership development institution that upholds and promotes the highest virtues of American society, and commends all those who have led and taught at the Academy for inculcating its 58,000 graduates with moral, ethical, and intellectual values and skills that are the foundations for the dedicated service so honorably given by those graduates to the Army, the Nation, and friends of freedom and liberty around the world for 200 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs.

TAUSCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S.J. Res. 32.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S.J. Res. 32 celebrates the bicentennial anniversary of one of our Nation's most valued institutions, the United States Military Academy at West Point.

I should say, Mr. Speaker, this is a particularly proud moment for me personally. As an 8-year member of the Board of Visitors at that illustrious institution and as a 10-year member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have come to know firsthand the amazing contributions and the invaluable role that West Point has played, both in our Nation's history and in our Nation's present.

The Military Academy has performed its primary objective of educating military officers with unparalleled excellence throughout its history. To understand the value of West Point, one only has to look back on the long line of great men that have led our forces in war who were the products of this tremendous institution. Perhaps the most important achievement of West Point is the "long gray line," the many graduates beneath the great names of history who have formed the foundation of the officer corps that is the bulwark of the United States Army in peacetime, as well as war.

Throughout its history, the Military Academy has molded the best and the brightest of our youth into leaders with skills, character and commitment to not just defend America, but to make it a better place throughout their lives. In my experience, the contributions and achievements of the graduates of the Military Academy extend well beyond their lives as military officers. Academy graduates have historically made and continue to make contributions to local government, business, and academia across the Nation.

Through their leadership talents and commitment to service, they have been successful in making their bedrock values, duty, honor, country, part of every community they touch.

The effectiveness of their influence is most evident in Washington, D.C., here at the seat of government. I would venture to say there is not a single government agency here in Washington that does not directly benefit from the presence of a West Point graduate.

It has been my experience that West Point graduates are more often focused on the challenges of a job and society's

need for that job to be done than they are on the personal financial rewards and recognitions that any employment slot may offer. They do not shy away from the difficulties and the sacrifices we are required to work with within government, but rather they embrace the challenges and seek the reward of knowing they have made a difference in that important mission.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has benefited in many ways from these remarkable citizens. While we treasure the graduates, we must also honor the institution that gave these wonderful Americans the opportunity to learn and grow.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly like to extend a word of thanks to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for his leadership and for his hard work in helping to bring this resolution to the floor. We are all deeply in his debt.

So, Mr. Speaker, S.J. Res. 32 correctly congratulates the United States Military Academy on its 200th anniversary as a leadership institution that upholds and promotes the highest virtues of American society. I would like to also add my personal thanks to the men and women, past and present, who have made it a bastion of learning in which students may witness and assimilate the individual qualities that we have come to hold dear and view as authentically American; and specifically I speak of the professors, the faculty, the staff, and, of course, the administrative staff, who have really led this institution and have helped form it and in the process helped to form so many great young American men and women to fill an invaluable role, both in our military and our society in general.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 32, which recognizes the bicentennial of the United States Military Academy, commonly referred to as West Point.

The United States Military Academy has been nurturing and developing a spirit of duty, honor, country in our Nation's Army cadets for 200 years since its founding in 1802 by President Thomas Jefferson. As a member of West Point's Board of Visitors, it is an American tradition of excellence I am honored to be proud of. During the Revolutionary War, General George Washington considered West Point to be the most important strategic position in America.

Nestled on nearly 16,000 acres in West Point, New York, along the Hudson River, the United States Military Academy is dedicated to attracting diverse young men and women to our Nation's military leadership. For 2 centuries, West Point has been both home and training academy to thousands of cadets who have committed themselves to serve our Nation and the virtues of duty, honor, and country.

□ 1230

Among the graduates of this distinguished institution are: Presidents Ulysses S. Grant and Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Stonewall" Jackson, Robert E. Lee, John J. Pershing, Douglas MacArthur, George S. Patton, Omar Bradley, Edwin E. "Buzz" Baldwin, Brent Scowcroft, and H. Norman Schwarzkopf.

Other honorable graduates include: Dennis Hart Mahan, a distinguished educator and writer who taught the science of war; Henry O. Flipper, the first African American graduate in 1877; Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, a pioneer of Army aviation; astronauts Frank Borman, who commanded the first circumlunar flight; Edward White II, the first American to walk in space and who tragically perished in the Apollo spacecraft fire; and Michael Collins, who participated in the first manned lunar landing; Roscoe Robinson, Jr., the first African American four-star Army general; Andrea Lee Hollen, the first woman to graduate from the Academy and a Rhodes Scholar; and Kristin Baker, the first woman brigade commander of the U.S. Corps of Cadets.

These and many other well-known and not so well-known graduates of West Point have made an impact on our Nation's history.

The United States Military Academy's mission is "to educate, train, and inspire the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate is a commissioned leader of character committed to the values of Duty, Honor, Country; professional growth throughout a career as an officer of the United States Army; and a lifetime of selfless service to the Nation." For 200 years, the Academy has faithfully and dutifully carried out the "West Point Experience" by challenging intellect, requiring rigorous physical stamina, and developing the military and moral and ethical character of cadets.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating the United States Military Academy on its bicentennial and support S.J. Resolution 32.

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

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend my fellow Board of Visitors member, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), for both her work on this resolution and for her very eloquent statement in support. I think she very effectively outlined the specific contributions of this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY); not just from New York but a very special part of New York who, beyond being also a member of the Board of Visitors, has the honor of representing in her congressional district this fine institution.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have been a member of the Board of Visitors of West Point for 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom of this Nation was bought through the ideas of

democracy and independence of our Founding Fathers, but those ideas would never have come into a reality without a commitment of men to fight for those ideals.

Throughout our country's history, we have been led through tumultuous times by the men and women of the military who are motivated by a deep patriotism and a willingness to put their lives on the line to defend our Nation and keep us safe. It is no secret that many of the great leaders of these brave men and women have been trained on the hallowed grounds of West Point.

As mentioned before, George Patton, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Ulysses Grant, and Douglas MacArthur are just a few of the names on a long list of the leading American soldiers who obtained the tools to become great American leaders as cadets on the banks of the Hudson River at West Point. Our Nation owes a continuing debt of gratitude to strong men and women who are at The Point and who have graduated from The Point and are leading our armies even now. I am proud that this illustrious institution is in my district.

The history of The Point, dating from the very first days of the revolutionary war to the present, is one of heroism and leadership. I wish a happy anniversary to the U.S. Military Academy and congratulate all of those who have had an association there on 200 years of dignified service to this Nation.

I congratulate the men and women who teach at The Point and those who have taught there. Thank you for training generations of young people to understand just what the motto "Duty, Honor, Country" stands for.

Congratulations to all of our West Point grads, past and present and future. Our Nation is grateful to you for your selfless service.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McNULTY).

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

I am delighted to join with my colleagues in congratulating the Military Academy of West Point on the occasion of its bicentennial celebration. The reason I like West Point so much is because West Point produces veterans. If we remember to keep our priorities straight, we will remember that, had it not been for the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States military through the years, we would not have the privilege of going around bragging, as I often do, about how we live in the freest and most open democracy on the face of the earth.

Freedom is not free. We have paid a tremendous price for it, and I try not to let a day go by without remembering with deep gratitude all of those who, like my brother, Bill, made the supreme sacrifice and all of those who served and were willing to put their lives on the line as servicemen and

women are doing right now, for all that we hold dear. That is why, Mr. Speaker, when I get up in the morning, the first two things I do are to thank God for my life and veterans for my way of life.

So on this special day I salute and pay tribute to all of the graduates of the Military Academy at West Point through the years, including my own Albany County Executive, Mike Breslin, who went on to serve as a company commander in the Vietnam War, all the way to Colleen O'Malley, who will graduate this year. West Point is a great national treasure. May it endure for many generations to come.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the gentleman I mentioned earlier, a graduate of West Point and someone who, to this day, returns on a regular basis and instructs in the classrooms and helps to mold those leaders that all of us have been speaking about and are in such deep admiration of. Also, of course as I mentioned, the gentleman is the primary driving force behind having this resolution before us today.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, many of our Founding Fathers, particularly George Washington, wanted to establish a military academy to teach the technical arts of war. On March 16, 1802, Congress passed legislation to establish such a military academy to be located at West Point, New York. Thomas Jefferson signed this bill into law.

The Academy daily fulfills its mission: "To educate, train and inspire the Corps of Cadets so that each graduate is a commissioned leader of character, committed to the values of Duty, Honor, Country; professional growth throughout a career as an officer in the United States Army; and a lifetime of selfless service to the Nation."

The Academy was the first school in America to teach engineering, produce graduates who were responsible for the construction of the Nation's first railroad lines and many of its early harbor improvements, bridges, roads, and canals.

Graduates of the Academy have served with character and distinction in all of America's wars and military actions since the War of 1812.

For 200 years, the military academy has educated and trained some of the best and brightest in the Nation.

The "West Point Experience" includes a challenging academic program in the arts and sciences, military training, physical education, and moral and ethical development.

From the day of its founding, West Point has remained committed to the task of producing commissioned leaders of character for America's Army.

The Academy continues to provide men and women of all races and cultures to receive a college education

and begin a life of service to the Army and to the Nation, and this resolution highlights some of the leaders that we know about from our history books.

But I want to give my colleagues a snapshot of just one class, and that is my class, the graduating class of 1980 that entered in 1976, the first class at West Point with women. We admitted 1,366 men, 119 women, for a total of 1,485 cadets. Of that, upon graduation in 1980, 855 male graduates, 62 female graduates, a total of 917. Of that class, four were Olmstead Scholars, one was a Rhodes Scholar, and one went on to be an astronaut.

In September of 2001, of that graduating class of 1980, after our 20 years of service had expired, we still have 188 males serving in the active Army of our country and 12 females serving in the active Army of our country; and we are very, very proud of all of those graduates. That is a snapshot of just a class from West Point.

But I also want to expound on those characters and attributes of those who are not always remembered and those who are not named. Dennis Michie introduced football to the military Academy and trained the first Army football team. When war broke out with Spain in 1898, Lieutenant Michie proved he was every bit of a soldier as he was an athlete. Acting as a runner with messages for the far right of the U.S. line during the battle of San Juan Hill, he traversed the entire length of the front during the morning of July 1. Somewhere along the way back from the forward battalion, Dennis Michie was killed. He was only 28 years old.

Thomas Truxtun excelled in both soccer and lacrosse. When he was not on the playing fields, Truxtun was leading the Corps of Cadets. During World War II, near Tabio on June 6, 1945, Lieutenant Colonel Truxtun went forward with the infantry unit his battalion was supporting, he commanded a field artillery battalion, to ensure the fire his men provided was doing what the infantry needed. Far forward in an exposed position, he was shot and killed by a Japanese sniper. He was only 31 years old.

Thomas Shea was born in Virginia. After serving as an Infantryman, he got an appointment to the Academy. He then excelled in track. He then made a life-changing decision upon his graduation. He had the opportunity to train as a track runner for the upcoming Olympics or continue his military training and go to Korea. He went to Korea.

On July 6, 1952 Lieutenant Shea's company was stationed on Pork Chop Hill and was attacked by a numerically superior Communist force. Shea personally led a counterattack against the enemy and held the enemy back. On July 8, the Communists came again and, despite additional wounds, Shea led the counterattack. He died in hand-to-hand combat with the enemy. Richard Shea was only 26 years old.

Thomas Hayes was an athlete and a leader at West Point. Lieutenant Hayes

called for covering fire, left his covered position and ran through concentrated fire to a wounded soldier and pulled him to safety. Lieutenant Hayes then began directing his platoon's fire against the well-entrenched enemy. Lieutenant Hayes died during this fight when a Viet Cong sniper opened fire and mortally wounded Hayes. Hayes' actions that day saved the lives of two of his soldiers. Thomas Hayes was only 25 years old when he was killed in action in 1968.

More than 1,250 Academy graduates have been killed in action or died from battle wounds. At least another 500 were the victims of nonbattle deaths in military actions of our country. This is why we hold so dear our alma mater which says, in the last verse, "And when our work is done, our course on earth is run, may it be said, 'well done, be thou at peace.' E'er may that line of gray increase from day to day. Live, serve, and die, we pray, West Point for thee."

We have a national treasure in the upper highlands of the Hudson Highlands in New York. It is fitting that we recognize its bicentennial and its commitment to our country: "Duty, Honor, Country."

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), another member of the Board of Visitors.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join with my colleagues in sponsoring this House Resolution to recognize the United States Military Academy on its bicentennial. This venerable institution was chartered by Congress 200 years ago on March 16, shortly after the birth of the Nation.

Known most commonly by the name of the town where it is located, West Point, New York, the United States Military Academy was born out of the experience of our Founding Fathers during the Revolutionary War. Many of the key battles in the fight for independence were fought along the banks of the Hudson River. At the time, the Hudson was the main artery of transportation and commerce as well as security in the Nation.

George Washington chose a site at the bend in the river on the bluffs overlooking the west bank about 50 miles north of New York City to establish an academy to train the military leaders of our country. Today, the view from West Point is one of the most breathtaking sites in America. Two hundred years ago, it was one of the most militarily strategic locations in America.

I grew up near West Point, near its halls. It is an important part of the Hudson valley, and the contributions that it makes are mighty to all of our communities.

□ 1245

It is more than just West Point football games in the fall. It is also the

academy support for local cultural institutions, schools, and athletic programs that make it such a fine neighbor.

"Duty, honor, country," the school's motto, is the foundation of West Point education. West Point graduates have served our country with distinction. They have led our troops into battle in every war, military conflict, and police action, from the war in 1812 through the current conflict in Afghanistan. Seventy-four have won a Congressional Medal of Honor. Countless others have received numerous decorations for bravery and valor on the battlefield.

More than waging war, West Point graduates have also negotiated peace treaties and served in our Diplomatic Corps. School of Engineering West Point graduates built the infrastructure of our Nation. They constructed the first harbors, bridges, canals, roads, and railroads. They made manifest destiny a reality as America expanded westward.

West Point graduates have led our country as Presidents, Governors, Senators, Members of the House of Representatives. My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois and the sponsor of this resolution, is a fine example.

West Point graduates have walked on the Moon, headed up major corporations, written best-sellers, competed in the Olympics, and excelled in every walk of life. Every year it produces more winners of Rhodes, Truman, Fulbright, and Marshall International scholarships than nearly every other school in the country.

I am proud to serve this institution as one of the newest members of the Board of Visitors. As West Point celebrates its bicentennial, I look forward to helping lead it into the future.

Again, I wish to thank the gentleman from Illinois for sponsoring this legislation and the leadership for placing it on the calendar today. This is a fitting tribute for an institution that has served our Nation long and well. I know that everyone in this House will support this resolution.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a final word of praise for all those Members who are here today, and to the gentleman from Illinois for his special effort in urging our fellow Members to join us in commemorating this very worthy resolution on this 200th anniversary.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32.

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. McHUGH. 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.

ENCOURAGING THE NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT OF TRIBAL CLAIMS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1857) to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1857

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

SECTION 1. SETTLEMENT OF TRIBAL CLAIMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of determining the date on which an Indian tribe received a reconciliation report for purposes of applying a statute of limitations, any such report provided to or received by an Indian tribe in response to section 304 of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4044) shall be deemed to have been received by the Indian tribe on December 31, 1999.

(b) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—Subsection (a) is solely intended to provide recipients of reconciliation reports with the opportunity to postpone the filing of claims, or to facilitate the voluntary dismissal of claims, to encourage settlement negotiations with the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a bill to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims. S. 1857 allows Indian tribes to postpone the filing of lawsuits against the United States for either the loss of money held in trust for the tribe or the mismanagement of those funds, such as the loss of interest income or the crediting of the wrong tribal trust fund account.

Under present law, the statute of limitations does not run against such claims until each tribal account holder receives an accounting "from which the beneficiary can determine whether there has been a loss." Although the United States began to provide Indian tribes with reconciliation reports in early 1996, no one knows for sure whether these reports commenced the running of the statute of limitations.

The Government Accounting Office has given Congress real reason to doubt that these reports constitute a sufficient accounting to satisfy the Federal Government trust obligation. However, if, as many Indian tribes fear, the report serves to trigger the statute of

limitations, a tribe may feel obligated to file a lawsuit to protect its interests. S. 1857 will help prevent a flood of litigation and the costs it will incur.

I commend my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for introducing a House companion bill, H.R. 3815, of which I am an original cosponsor. As we have learned from the ongoing class action lawsuits that began as *Cobell v. Babbitt* in 1996, we will all be best served if there are as many of these trust fund accounting claims as possible settled through negotiation without litigation.

S. 1857 will give the Federal Government until December 31, 2005, to create a process for settling these claims. I applaud the administration for its foresight in assisting with these efforts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the mismanagement of the Indian trust funds is truly one of the worse embarrassments of this Nation. Sadly, we have become the United States of broken promises to many of our first Americans.

Today, as we consider S. 1857, there is a multi-billion dollar lawsuit pending where the court has already ruled that the Interior Department is in breach of its trust responsibility to Indian account holders. Two cabinet Secretaries have already been held in contempt of court, and a third may also be found in contempt at any time.

The Federal Government has held monies in trust for the American Indians since 1820, and almost immediately the criticism started on how funds intended for the benefit of Indians were handled. In 1828, Henry Rowe Schoolcraft, a noted negotiator of several Indian treaties, wrote, "The derangements in the fiscal affairs of the Indian department are in the extreme. One would think that appropriations had been handled with a pitchfork."

In 1834, the House Committee on Indian Affairs filed a report which characterized the administration of Indian Affairs as being "expensive, inefficient, and irresponsible."

Were these warnings heeded? No. Let us fast forward almost 160 years to 1992, when the House Committee on Government Operations released a report on the mismanagement of Indian trust funds. The report detailed numerous basic problems, including the inability of the Department of the Interior to give account holders proper account balances, the lack of uniform written policies governing how accounts are to be managed, the insufficient training of personnel needed to carry out the duties required, and the inadequate automated and recordkeeping systems.

Some of us remember our response to that 1992 report. We sat down with tribal and individual Indian account holders, the Department of the Interior, banking and trust management experts, and the computer experts and together developed legislation to address these problems.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate but true that even after that legislation was signed into law and sent to the Department of the Interior for implementation, as of today the four basic problems I just outlined still exist. Indeed, there are no written uniform policies. Personnel charged with such an important job are not given sufficient training. The promise of a greater computer system has become a multi-million dollar disaster, and the Department cannot provide account holders with a full and complete accounting of their funds.

This last point brings me to the issues raised by the pending legislation, S. 1857. Congress appropriated \$20 million, which was contracted to Arthur Andersen to provide each Indian tribe with an accounting of their federally held trust fund accounts. It was clear when these reports were sent to Indian tribes in 1996 that they were not a full and accurate reconciling of the tribal accounts.

Now, 6 years later, Indian tribes fear that a statute of limitations could run out on them and they could be precluded from challenging the accuracy of those Arthur Andersen reports.

While I think it is unlikely any court would find in favor of the government in any such case, we need to allay the concerns and put off this deadline. S. 1857 would extend the statute of limitations for another 3 years in order to give an extension of time for negotiations between Indian tribes and the Federal Government over trust fund account balances.

I am an original cosponsor of the companion legislation in the House, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill and head off dozens of additional lawsuits filed against Secretary Norton.

This is an important step to take, but it is only a temporary one. We must settle the issue of all Indian trust fund account balances, and we must set up a system where future Congresses are not quoting us when describing a still-continuing problem.

Let me be clear: the Federal Government cannot give a full and accurate historical accounting of Indian trust funds to the account holders. Members do not have to take my word for it. Numerous reports exist detailing trust fund documentation that are too damaged to read or are lost entirely. Members can read testimony from BIA employees of storing documents in a barn in Oklahoma, only to toss them out to make room for new documents. Members can ask Secretary Gale Norton, who admitted as much before the House Committee on Resources just last month.

Just this past November, Secretary Norton announced the establishment of a new agency within the Department of the Interior to handle Indian trust activities. She made a dreadful mistake by not working with the account holders before bursting forth with this proposal. I know she realizes that now, but not after precious time has slipped by.

I do not claim to have all the answers; but I do know that the answer will come only when we all stand up and face our responsibility, admit the mistakes, and work openly and honestly with Indian country.

I urge passage of the pending legislation.

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

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), a gentlemen, I might add, who has been very much on the forefront on this and other Indian issues, and a valued member of our Committee on Resources.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, as co-chairman of the congressional Native American Caucus, I rise today in strong support of S. 1857, a bill to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims.

I introduced the House companion bill, H.R. 3851. I want to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), for agreeing to be original cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has deep bipartisan support and the support of the administration. I want to commend my colleagues in the Senate for their swift action to address the issue of tolling the statute of limitations on legal claims Indian tribes may assert against the United States relating to the management of tribal trust funds.

This issue is certainly not new to Congress. Since 1991, Congress has approved language in the Department of the Interior's appropriations acts to toll the statute of limitations until the tribal account holders have been provided an accounting of such funds.

In addition, since 1987, Congress has required the Department of the Interior to reconcile tribal trust fund accounts. By providing an accounting of these funds, Indian tribes will have the opportunity to determine whether there has been a mismanagement of trust funds. These requirements were included in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2003.

The problem this bill seeks to address relates directly to the reconciliation reports that the Department of the Interior provided to tribal account holders in 1996. Several Indian tribes believe that the reconciliation reports do not constitute an accounting.

Since the statute of limitations for filing legal claims is 6 years, the tribe's concern is that the Department may claim that the 1996 reconciliation reports commence the running of a statute that would expire this year. In an attempt to preserve their legal claims against the United States, many tribes have already filed claims in Federal courts across the country.

This bill does not address the legal issues involved in those lawsuits. This bill, however, will facilitate the voluntary dismissal of these legal claims. Also, it provides the tribal account holders an opportunity to postpone the filing of claims from 2002 to 2005 and encourage negotiations for the settlement of tribal accounting or resource management claims.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), another very valuable leader and friend of Indian country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our chairman and our ranking member, and also the chairman of our Native American Caucus, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), for their work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the bill, S. 1857. This bill gives tribal trust fund account holders the opportunity to postpone filing legal claims until 2005. Technically, the bill tolls the statute of limitations on legal claims that Indian tribes may assert against the U.S. relating to the management of tribal trust funds.

The bill is necessary, as I know my colleagues have already said, because many tribes believe their legal claims may be time-barred because the statute of limitations expires as early as this year.

I really wanted, though, to talk about the larger issue, that the BIA has grossly mismanaged the remaining tribal lands and has squandered billions of dollars worth of resources that should have gone to the benefit of often-impoorished American Indians.

□ 1300

Today, the Secretary of the Interior is faced by a mandate of Congress to clean up the accounting and management of Indian trust funds, and by a lawsuit alleging a great failure of the Secretary's trust responsibility for Indian lands. In response, the Secretary has proposed a plan to create a new Bureau of Indian Trust Asset Management and remove the trust functions from the Bureau of Indian affairs.

I am very much opposed to this proposal. I am greatly concerned that this plan is repeating the failures of the many past trust reform efforts. Recently, 193 Indian tribes unanimously adopted a resolution opposing this reorganization and the transfer of the responsibilities to the BIA. I strongly believe that this reorganization effort cannot go forward until the Department consults with Indian tribes in the development of a business processes plan for trust reform, a clear plan for performing the basic trust functions of accounting, collections, record keeping, inspections, enforcement and resource management. The plan has to include policies, procedures and control.

I know the Secretary is now saying she is doing this, but she is consulting

with the tribes after the fact. The fact is many of them do not feel they are still being properly consulted even today. This criticism, as my colleagues know, came up at the hearing that we held on the issue in the Committee on Resources.

It is notable that this criticism, a lack of structural foundation, is exactly the same as has been leveled against the Department's development of the Trust Asset and Accounting Management System, TAAMS. All tribal leaders strongly support trust reform and want to work constructively with the Department and with Congress to ensure strong management of tribal assets. In fact, it is the tribes that have the greatest interest in ensuring that tribal assets and resources are properly managed.

Given such BIA and TAAMS mismanagement practices, the passage of this bill will give tribal trust fund account holders the opportunity to postpone filing legal claims until 2005. Such time is necessary in order for the tribal trust funds account holder to unravel the financial accounting mess that the BIA and TAAMS have put them in.

I think, obviously, this is the right thing to do. We have to support the bill, but I know we also have to look at the larger issue of trust reform and make sure it goes forward only with consultation with the tribes. I know my colleagues that are here all believe very strongly in that.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1857.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FALLON RAIL FREIGHT LOADING FACILITY TRANSFER ACT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1870) to provide for the sale of certain real property within the Newlands Project in Nevada, to the city of Fallon, Nevada, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1870

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fallon Rail Freight Loading Facility Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF FALLON, NEVADA.

(a) CONVEYANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the city of Fallon, Nevada, all right, title,

and interest of the United States in and to approximately 6.3 acres of real property in the Newlands Reclamation Project, Nevada, generally known as "380 North Taylor Street, Fallon, Nevada", and identified for disposition on the map entitled "Fallon Rail Freight Loading Facility".

(2) *MAP*.—The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in—

(A) the offices of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation; and

(B) the offices of the Area Manager of the Bureau of Reclamation, Carson City, Nevada.

(b) *CONSIDERATION*.—

(1) *IN GENERAL*.—The Secretary shall require that, as consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the city of Fallon, Nevada, shall pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the real property, as determined—

(A) by an appraisal of the real property, conducted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act by an independent appraiser approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation and paid for by the city of Fallon, Nevada; and

(B) without taking into consideration the value of any structures or improvements on the property.

(2) *CREDIT OF PROCEEDS*.—The amount paid to the United States under paragraph (1) shall be credited, in accordance with section 204(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 485(c)), to the appropriate fund in the Treasury relating to the Newlands Reclamation Project, Nevada.

(c) *LIABILITY*.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall not occur until such data as the Commissioner of Reclamation certifies that all liability issues relating to the property (including issues of environmental liability) have been resolved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express strong support for H.R. 1870, the Fallon Rail Freight Loading Facility Transfer Act; and I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and my good friend, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), and the Committee on Resources for moving this bill expeditiously to the floor for a vote.

H.R. 1870 will privilege the city of Fallon, Nevada, the exclusive right to purchase approximately 6.3 acres of public land located in the downtown area of the city.

The Fallon Rail Freight Loading Facility Transfer Act will enable the city of Fallon to make the necessary long-term investments and capital improvements to the property to ensure the future viability of this important municipal asset is maintained.

Fallon is a rural agricultural community of approximately 8,700 residents located in northern Nevada approximately 70 miles east of the city of Reno. Since 1984, the city of Fallon has leased approximately 6.3 acres of prop-

erty from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation that it utilizes as a rail freight yard and loading facility. The city, the State of Nevada, the U.S. Department of Transportation, and the Southern Pacific Railroad have collectively invested a significant amount of money in this rail facility, providing more than 400 jobs in the community.

On January 1 of 2000, the long-term lease between the city of Fallon and the Bureau of Reclamation expired. As negotiations began for a new long-term lease, the city of Fallon and the bureau came to the common conclusion that it would be in the best interest of both parties to have ownership of this property transferred to the city of Fallon. The city would be able to make long-term investments to a facility that it owned without having to worry about renegotiating new leases and the possibility of losing access to the property. The Bureau of Reclamation would be able to divest itself from an asset that no longer serves a purpose to its core mission, allowing more of its scarce resources to be focused on the traditional roles of the bureau.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this transfer will be contingent upon the satisfactory conclusion of all necessary and environmental reviews, and it will be purchased by the city at fair market value.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1870 has strong support from Nevada's bipartisan congressional delegation. On behalf of the city of Fallon, I urge my colleagues to pass the Fallon Rail Freight Loading Facility Transfer Act, a bill which will create a win-win situation for everyone involved.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1870 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Fallon, Nevada, all right, title and interest in approximately 6.3 acres of property within the Newlands project. The city would like to use the property for a planned truck-to-railroad transfer structure. The bill reflects changes recommended by the Interior Department. It would require the city to pay fair market value without regard to the value of structures or improvements in the property. I urge adoption of the bill, and I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1870, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURNT, MALHEUR, OWYHEE, AND POWDER RIVER BASIN WATER OPTIMIZATION FEASIBILITY STUDY ACT OF 2001

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1883) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1883

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Burnt, Malheur, Owyhee, and Powder River Basin Water Optimization Feasibility Study Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. STUDY.

The Secretary of the Interior may conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak in favor of H.R. 1883.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility investigation for the Burnt, Malheur, Owyhee River basins in eastern Oregon. It is the next step in the United States Bureau of Reclamation process now that their initial study has been completed. The United States Bureau of Reclamation's earlier studies examined problems associated with such issues as excess nutrients in surface water, sedimentation, high-water temperatures, degraded fish habitat, low-stream flows and lack of adequate stream-side vegetation.

The feasibility study that H.R. 1883 authorizes would help find the most logical approaches to address these issues.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers and ranchers are the driving force behind this legislation. As they have proven over and over again, it is the farmers and ranchers who are some of our strongest environmentalists. They care deeply about the land and water that they use

to grow the crops that feed us all. This bill will set a process in motion that will allow the farmers to leave more water in stream while maintaining their current yields.

The bill is supported by the Burnt River Irrigation District, the Power Valley Water Control District, the Baker Valley Irrigation District, the Owyhee Irrigation District, the Owyhee Ditch Company, the Vale Oregon Irrigation District, and the Warm Springs Irrigation District. It is a simple, straightforward bill that deserves our support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1883. This bill is a simple and discretionary authorization to allow the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on water optimization in three river basins in northeastern Oregon. The bill would authorize appropriations as are necessary to carry out the study.

During the summer there is no remaining unappropriated water in these river basins. In low-water years, available water may be inadequate to supply junior water rights holders. The Bureau of Reclamation developed the multi-purpose irrigation facilities in these basins, but the projects are now operated by the local water users. Local interests want to continue the involvement of the Bureau of Reclamation to construct small-scale water management projects, and H.R. 1883 provides for the study of appropriate projects. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1883.

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his support of the legislation. I appreciate the assistance of the minority in helping us move this bill forward. It will be good for fish. It will be good for farmers. I urge passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1883.

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.

DESIGNATION OF GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NORTHWEST CAMPAIGN TRAIL FOR STUDY FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 1963) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route taken by American soldier and frontiersman George Rogers Clark and his men during the Revolutionary War to capture the British forts at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, Illinois, and Vincennes, Indiana, for study for potential addition to the National Trails System.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1963

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NORTHWEST CAMPAIGN TRAIL FOR STUDY FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL TRAILS SYSTEM.

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(41) GEORGE ROGERS CLARK NORTHWEST CAMPAIGN TRAIL.—The George Rogers Clark Northwest Campaign Trail, tracing the water route and overland route of the 1778 and 1779 expedition of Lieutenant Colonel George Rogers Clark and his Virginia militia against the British in which he captured the British forts at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, in what is now Illinois, and twice captured Vincennes, in what is now Indiana.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1963, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), would amend the National Trail System to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct the suitability and feasibility study for including the route taken by Colonel George Rogers Clark during the American Revolutionary War as part of the National Trails System.

Colonel George Rogers Clark, the older brother of William Clark of the famous Lewis and Clark expedition, led a daring and, some might say, suicidal mission 180 miles from Kaskaskia and Cahokia, Illinois, and I probably fouled that up, through flooded prairies and freezing temperatures in 1779 to capture British Lt. Colonel Henry Hamilton in Vincennes, Indiana.

Colonel Hamilton, also known as “hair buyer,” supported the Indian Nations west of the Appalachian Mountains by paying for the scalps of our pioneers.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this historic act, the British ceded what is now Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and the eastern portion of Minnesota to the United States. Mr. Speaker, this bill is supported by the majority and the minority of the committee and the administration. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1963.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1963, introduced by our colleague from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), provides for a study of the route used by George Rogers Clark and his troops during the military campaign of 1778 and 1779 in what is now Illinois and Indiana. From February 5 through the 23rd, 1779, Lt. Colonel George Rogers Clark and his Virginia militia marched 180 miles through freezing weather and flooded country side to defeat British Lt. General Henry Hamilton and his troops. During this campaign the Americans captured the British forts at Kaskaskia and Cahokia, in what is now Illinois, and twice captured Vincennes, in what is now Indiana.

The military campaign conducted by George Rogers Clark is regarded as an important event in the Revolutionary War.

The purpose of the trail study authorized by H.R. 1963 would be to determine whether portions of the route used in that campaign meet the criteria for designation as a national historic trail.

Mr. Speaker, the George Rogers Clark Northwest Campaign Trail would commemorate a historic march and campaign. I support a trail study of this important event in American history. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for his legislation, and I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1963, legislation I introduced to authorize the study to include the path taken by George Rogers Clark into our National Trails System.

George Rogers Clark was born in 1752, the second oldest of 10 children and the older brother of William Clark of Lewis and Clark fame.

□ 1315

During the Revolutionary War in 1778, Clark led his troops from Redstone, Pennsylvania, to Kaskaskia, Illinois, which is in the Congressional District I am privileged to represent. They surprised Kaskaskia on the night of July 4, 1778, and occupied the fort and town without a single shot being fired. Clark offered the French settlers in Kaskaskia the privileges of American citizenship and won the support of the French in the region. He also won the neutrality of the Native Americans.

This support was key as Clark led his troops on the final leg of their journey as they moved to overtake the British in Vincennes, Indiana. Banking on the element of surprise, Clark led his troops across what is now known as the State of Illinois, from Kaskaskia to Vincennes. The journey would normally take between 5 and 6 days, but because of the freezing flood waters, the journey took 18 days. At times in icy water up to their shoulders, it was

Clark's determined leadership that led his men through this incredible mid-winter journey.

Once arriving in Vincennes on February 23, 1779, Clark and his men forced the British to surrender just 2 days later on February 25, 1779. As a result of Clark's outstanding military achievements, the British ceded a vast area of land to the United States, which is now Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and a portion of Minnesota. His actions were paramount in the establishment of the upper Midwest.

The designation of the George Rogers Clark Trail would pay homage to an American hero who is seldom recognized for his contributions in American history. The designation would also promote tourism in three of Illinois' State historic sites and draw visitors to retrace Clark's historic path. Tourism is a growing and very important industry in southern Illinois, and establishing a national trail would be highly beneficial to the region.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to join me in authorizing a study to designate the route of George Rogers Clark during the Revolutionary War for potential addition to the National Trails System, and I thank the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for bringing this legislation to the floor today.

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that our side pronounced the names correctly.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1963.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous material in the RECORD on the four bills just considered, S. 1857, H.R. 1870, H.R. 1883, and H.R. 1963.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS ON HUNTING SEASONS FOR MIGRATORY MOURNING DOVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Pursuant to House Resolution 353 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 275.

□ 1319

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the 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, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

As the author of H. Con. Res. 275, I am pleased to present this legislation to provide badly needed relief to millions of dove hunters throughout the United States.

Mourning doves are the most widely distributed and harvested game bird in North America. Dove hunting is a cherished and honored tradition in this country. Dove hunters pay millions of dollars in excise taxes each year that are deposited in the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund. These monies are used to acquire and manage thousands of acres of critical wetlands that provide essential habitat for many species of migratory birds.

Under current law, the hunting season for doves and all migratory bird games is September 1 to March 10 of each year. I am not aware of the rationale for these arbitrary dates and there is little, if any, discussion as to why that period was selected. While these dates may be fine for dove hunters in Southern California, they have a long-term negative impact on sportsmen in dozens of northern States. In fact, because of rapidly changing weather conditions, it is not unusual to have a dove hunting that lasts less than a week or even just a day in States like Colorado, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, et cetera.

Furthermore, this is not simply a western States problem. I have been told that even States like Maryland have a very short dove hunting season.

The goal of this legislation is to allow all hunters a fair and equal opportunity to pursue doves. Under the

terms of this resolution, the Bush administration would be asked to begin discussions with the other signatories of the Migratory Bird Treaty with the goal of moving the season up from September 1 to the last week of August. Thirty-four northern States would be eligible for this earlier opening in the dove season.

I have been advised by wildlife biologists that the last week of August is the traditional week that doves are not sitting on their nests, and that by advancing the hunting season it would not have an adverse effect on migratory dove populations. In addition, game managers will be free to update any regulations necessary to allow for a lengthened season and this legislation would not affect those States that do not have a dove hunting season.

This measure is supported by a number of conservation organizations, including the Grand National Waterfowl Association, Quail Unlimited, Safari Club International, and the U.S. Sportsmen's Alliance.

In summary, all hunters should have an equitable chance to harvest this tasty but apparently thin-skinned little bird. This is a common-sense solution to a problem that has frustrated northern hunters for years.

I urge an "aye" vote so that all hunters can have an equal shot.

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

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

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, neither myself nor the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), have objected to H. Con. Res. 275. The nonbinding resolution of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), chairman of the committee, seeks to expand the hunting season for mourning doves in the United States.

As I have stated during consideration of the resolution in the Committee on Resources and again at yesterday's meeting of the Committee on Rules, the nonbinding context of the resolution does not make this a contentious matter at all.

Nevertheless, if a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush, I think it is worth repeating that even if this legislation were to pass, several important issues would have to be addressed nationally and internationally before the intent of the resolution becomes reality. Amending the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the underlying Convention for the Protection of Migratory Birds would not be routine. In fact, no one should underestimate the potential difficulties.

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the underlying Convention agreed to by the United States and Great Britain in 1916 are two of our Nation's earliest and most enduring conservation agreements; and, as I have

noted in previous discussion, the Convention and MBTA has been amended only once since 1916, and that change was to allow for the subsistence taking of birds and eggs in Alaska and northern Canada. Additionally, that amendment was agreed to only after 20 years of negotiation.

Opening the Migratory Bird Convention on the MBTA amendment for amendment for a single species would require the administration, the States, and our international partners to investigate the status of the entire continental mourning doves population. No one disputes that the population of mourning doves remains abundant across its range, and for many people, including hunters, that is indeed good news, because the bird is a species favored by sportsmen and women.

If time had been available, I would have preferred for the Committee on Resources to look into this issue a little bit more. However, this is just the type of critical biological question I am sure the Flyway Councils will want to investigate before recommending any action which could conceivably impact the population in a negative way.

There are other administrative and social considerations, but, frankly, there is little need to belabor the point.

In closing, I want to reiterate that I am supportive of H. Con. Res. 275, and I urge other Members to keep in mind the nonbinding nature of this resolution.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Housing Concurrent Resolutions 275.

For thousands of years before the first Europeans set foot on the continent of North America on the East Coast of Florida in 1513, Native Americans were already the great hunters and stewards of the New World that was to become America. They hunted, gathered and farmed as a way of life, which allowed them to live and prosper long before the great societies of Europe began to flourish. The native tribes of Florida fished in the great bays and estuaries, such as Tampa Bay, and hunted in the vast swamps and prairies up and down the Manatee River where Hernando De Soto landed to embark on the exploration of the new continent of America. The Native Floridian way of life depended on the game they hunted, the fish they caught and the crops they could grow. They only harvested what they needed and never took from the wild more than they could use. This was the birth of the American hunting tradition of being a steward of game and wildlife while engaging in the sport of hunting.

When Florida was acquired by the United States in 1821, Florida pioneering families, affectionately called "Crackers" for the sound their whips made when driving cattle, came to settle on the vast Florida peninsula to stake out a claim for a new life. They depended on the abundance of wildlife to support themselves and their growing families. What the Native Floridians taught the Florida pioneers was the same lesson that was taught to the Pilgrims at Plymouth hundreds of years ear-

lier; the reward of being good stewards of the land.

These basic truths, passed down through so many generations of Americans, Native and immigrant alike, are the values of stewardship and sportsmanship involved in hunting. The stewardship of the game populations that provide a bounty of food and sport is crucial in the survival of many game animal species. The gains achieved in the scientific management of game species can be linked to the efforts of hunters to maintain the populations and quality of the game they hunt. Populations of game animals have more than flourished through proper game management by concerned and devoted hunters. The populations of deer and turkey alone are far greater now at the beginning of this century than they ever were at the beginning of the last.

It is in a hunter's best interest to maintain game populations so that they may continue to practice the tradition they love. Licensed game hunters are deeply involved in game management on many levels. They pay taxes on their arms and ammunition, stamps and permits; funds that all go to help protect and maintain the sport that they hold so dear to their hearts. The rules and code that today's sportsmen follow, serve to protect and improve the quality of game species for generations to come.

In honor of the men, women and youth who continue to practice the time honored American tradition of hunting I urge the support of this legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member wishes to state for the RECORD that had there been a recorded vote on H. Con. Res. 275, he would have voted "nay" based on the concerns expressed by the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission.

According to the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission, dove populations have been declining and biologists are concerned that lengthening the hunting season could be detrimental. Also, many fledgling doves are still in nets around the time of the opening of the current annual hunting season. Extension of the hunting season could have an adverse effect on fledgling survival rates. It appears that further study is needed before a change such as this is made.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 275 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 275

Whereas the vast majority of mourning doves that hatch, fledge, and nest in States north of 37 degrees north latitude migrate south beyond the boundaries of those States before the national hunting season opening date of September 1, thus denying hunters in those States an equitable opportunity to harvest this species;

Whereas mourning doves are the most widely distributed and harvested game birds in North America;

Whereas current regulated hunting for mourning doves has been conclusively found to cause no significant effects on recruit-

ment of fledglings in mourning dove populations;

Whereas sportsmen have a strong commitment to the health, conservation, and enjoyment of wildlife, as demonstrated by the millions of dollars they have voluntarily paid over the past 70 years into the Federal Aid to Wildlife Restoration Fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.);

Whereas mourning dove hunting has been a cherished and honored tradition in the United States for generations;

Whereas migratory bird hunters provide millions of dollars to wildlife conservation and local economies; and

Whereas millions of hunters in States north of 37 degrees north latitude are currently unable to experience hunting conditions similar to conditions in other regions of the country with respect to game availability because of the current unfair hunting season restrictions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that, to provide a fair and equitable opportunity for individuals to hunt for mourning doves—

(1) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 should be modified to allow for mourning dove hunting during the last week of August in areas north of 37 degrees north latitude, as approved by the parties to the appropriate international agreement;

(2) such an extended hunting season will—

(A) improve hunting opportunities in the United States without causing negative impacts on mourning dove populations;

(B) through the sale of hunting permits, generate additional revenue that may be used for the better management and conservation of mourning doves and other wildlife species; and

(C) continue to provide for the conservation and enhancement of mourning dove populations;

(3) the United States should take immediate steps to begin discussions with the appropriate parties to ensure that all Americans have an opportunity to harvest migratory mourning doves in an equitable manner; and

(4) hunters in all States located north of 37 degrees north latitude and the wildlife management agencies of those States should support an earlier opening date for the mourning dove hunting season.

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

Are there any amendments to the text of the concurrent resolution?

Are there any amendments to the preamble of the concurrent resolution?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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, pursuant to House Resolution 353, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 275, the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR DEMOCRATICALLY ELECTED GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA AND ITS EFFORTS TO COUNTER THREATS FROM U.S.-DESIGNATED FOREIGN TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 358) expressing support for the democratically elected Government of Colombia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 358

Whereas the democratically elected Government of Colombia, led by President Andres Pastrana, is the legitimate authority in the oldest representative democracy in South America;

Whereas the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury, is required to designate as foreign terrorist organizations those groups whose activities threaten the security of United States nationals or the national security interests of the United States pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Whereas the Secretary of State has designated three Colombian terrorist groups as foreign terrorist organizations, including the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and the National Liberation Army (ELN);

Whereas all three United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations regularly engage in criminal acts, including murder, kidnapping, and extortion perpetrated against Colombian civilians, government officials, security forces, and against foreign nationals, including United States citizens;

Whereas the FARC is holding five Colombian legislators, a presidential candidate, and Colombian police and army officers and soldiers as hostages and has recently escalated bombings against civilian targets, including a foiled attempt to destroy the city of Bogota's principal water reservoir;

Whereas, according to the Colombian Government, the FARC has received training in terrorist techniques and technology from foreign nationals;

Whereas, since 1992, United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations in Co-

lombia have committed serious crimes against United States citizens, kidnapping more than 50 Americans and murdering at least ten Americans;

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration believes that members of the FARC and the AUC directly engage in narcotics trafficking;

Whereas individual members of Colombia's security forces have collaborated with illegal paramilitary organizations by, inter alia, in some instances allowing such organizations to pass through roadblocks, sharing tactical information with such organizations, and providing such organizations with supplies and ammunition;

Whereas while the Colombian Government has made progress in its efforts to combat and capture members of illegal paramilitary organizations and taken positive steps to break links between individual members of the security forces and such organizations, further steps by the Colombian Government are warranted;

Whereas in 1998 Colombian President Andres Pastrana began exhaustive efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the FARC and implemented extraordinary confidence-building measures to advance these negotiations, including establishing a 16,000-square-mile safe haven for the FARC;

Whereas the Government of Colombia has also undertaken substantial efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the ELN;

Whereas the United States has consistently supported the Government of Colombia's protracted efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the FARC and supports the Government of Colombia in its continuing efforts to reach a negotiated agreement with the ELN;

Whereas the United States would welcome a negotiated, political solution to end the violence in Colombia;

Whereas, after the FARC hijacked a commercial airplane and took Colombian Senator Jorge Eduardo Gechem Turbay as a hostage into the government-created safe haven, President Pastrana ended his government's sponsorship of the peace negotiations with the FARC and ordered Colombia's security forces to re-establish legitimate governmental control in the safe haven;

Whereas President Pastrana has received strong expressions of support from foreign governments and international organizations for his decision to end the peace talks and dissolve the FARC's safe haven; and

Whereas the Government of Colombia's negotiations with the ELN are continuing despite the end of the negotiations with the FARC: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) expresses its support for the democratically elected Government of Colombia and the Colombian people as they strive to protect their democracy from terrorism and the scourge of illicit narcotics; and

(B) deplors the continuing criminal terrorist acts of murder, abduction, and extortion carried out by all United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations in Colombia against United States citizens, the civilian population of Colombia, and Colombian authorities; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President, without undue delay, should transmit to Congress for its consideration proposed legislation, consistent with United States law regarding the protection of human rights, to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations and the scourge of illicit narcotics; and

(3) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of State

should designate a high-ranking official to coordinate all United States assistance to the Government of Colombia to ensure clarity of United States policy and the effective delivery of United States support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise in strong support of this resolution. In our ongoing war on terrorism, we have an extremely volatile situation in our own hemisphere that cannot be ignored any longer: the threat against democracy in Colombia.

Colombia has been beset by many years of violence that have culminated in numerous terrorist attacks in the past month. This oldest representative democracy in South America is under attack as we speak by terrorists known as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, otherwise known as the FARC, another violent left-wing group, the National Liberation Army, known also by its Spanish acronym ELN, and illegal right-wing paramilitary groups. The Secretary of State has designated all three groups as foreign terrorist organizations that threaten the security of the United States and our citizens.

□ 1330

These groups regularly engage in criminal acts, such as murder, kidnapping, extortion and narcotics trafficking. They are currently holding captive dozens of Colombian security force officers, soldiers and civilians. The FARC and the ELN have kidnapped more than 50 Americans and have murdered 10 of our citizens.

Colombian President Pastrana invested his presidency, indeed his entire political fortune, in an attempt to negotiate peace with the FARC for the past 4 years. This protracted peace process ended February 20 when the FARC hijacked a commercial airliner and kidnapped a prominent Colombian senator, the leader of the Colombian Senate Peace Commission. The senator is now the fifth legislator being held captive by the FARC.

On that same day, President Pastrana ordered the Colombian military into the 16,000 square mile demilitarized zone that he ceded to the FARC in his efforts to negotiate peace. Since that time, the FARC has waged even more bloody terrorism against the Colombian Government, its democratic

institutions, and its civilian population.

In fact, in the past 5 weeks or so, there have been more than 120 separate terrorist attacks committed by the FARC, including numerous bombings, the kidnapping of a presidential candidate, and a foiled attempt to destroy the city of Bogota's principal water reservoir.

Colombia's elected representatives have been targeted by these terrorists. Seven members of the Colombian Congress have been killed in the past 4 years. This past weekend, yet another legislator, Senator Martha Catalina Daniel, was tortured and murdered.

The FARC and the paramilitary forces are destabilizing democracy in Colombia. Legislative elections are this month. Presidential elections are in May. Colombia is calling on the United States for help in defending itself against terrorism by providing intelligence-sharing, spare parts for equipment, and the unbundling of restrictions on equipment currently being used in counter-narcotics operations. The administration has decided to move forward to respond to some of these concerns. The administration must now quickly complete this policy review and work with Congress to help Colombia save itself from terrorism.

The global war against terrorism is our administration's highest priority. We are training troops in the Philippines, the former Soviet Republic of Georgia, and Yemen all in the name of fighting this global war. However, in the meantime, a conflagration is burning at the foot of the land bridge that joins North and South America.

It is imperative that we recognize the dire consequences of inaction in this horrific situation, not just for Colombians, but for the rest of the hemisphere. It is time to help the Colombian people defend themselves. As a major defender of democracy, we must try to bolster it wherever we see it seriously threatened, especially in our own hemisphere. Passing this resolution is an important first step. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for bringing forth this measure in such a calibrated and thoughtful fashion. I would also like to express my appreciation to our colleague on the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT),

for his enormous contributions to this effort.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia has entered a new and brutal phase in its history. The Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, better known by their Spanish acronyms, the FARC and the AUC respectively, and other illegal paramilitary groups have launched unprecedented campaigns of terror against the people and the democratically elected Government of Colombia.

I strongly deplore these criminal acts of murder, abduction, and extortion that the terrorist organizations have inflicted upon the people of Colombia and which the resolution and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) so richly describe. I wish to extend our friendship and our support to President Pastrana and his administration as they confront this menace.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution also calls upon the President to submit his legislative proposals for addressing the crisis in Colombia to Congress for our consideration and deliberation. Let me be clear with regard to this point. While I appreciate the horror of the vile acts which the FARC and the AUC are committing almost on a daily basis in Colombia, I believe that any substantial change in U.S. policy toward Colombia must occur only after we in Congress have had an opportunity to add our voices and our concerns.

Thus, while we have not made any ultimate conclusions on how to assist the Colombian Government better to deal with terrorism and narcotics, we certainly look forward to an active and spirited debate on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that future U.S. policy toward Colombia should be conditioned upon the Government of Colombia dealing with two very stubborn issues: first, the Colombian Government must decisively break all links with illegal paramilitary organizations, and it must launch a serious effort to combat them. According to the Colombian Commission of Jurists and international human rights groups, the paramilitaries account for over 75 percent of all combatant killings in Colombia. The just-released human rights report of our State Department echoes this fact and states: "Members of the security forces sometimes illegally collaborated with paramilitary forces last year." This link must be completely severed.

Second, the Government of Colombia must dramatically increase its own contribution to both the war and the peace effort. By most estimates, the army would need to at least triple in size to take on the FARC and the AUC effectively. Currently, the Colombian Army has about 130,000 members, but only 40,000 of them can be deployed into battle. The rest are at desk jobs or tied down to guarding static infrastructure like pipelines and power lines. The United States cannot fill this need alone, and we would be foolish to try.

Complicating matters, there are reasons to doubt the commitment of some of Colombia's political and economic elite to sacrifice for the war effort. For example, currently Colombian law excludes high school graduates, meaning all but the poor, from serving in combat units. I think that is an outrage.

Furthermore, U.S. policy toward Colombia should include more than counter-narcotics and, potentially, counterterrorism support. Colombia's long-running war is deeply rooted in historical, social, and economic causes that must also be addressed if any sustainable peace is to be achieved. Here, dramatic expansion of support to the provision of basic services to the Colombian people, but particularly in the long neglected rural areas, is absolutely paramount.

Mr. Speaker, Colombia and U.S. policy toward that country is at a crossroads. How we choose to help the people of Colombia confront not only terrorism but its sources as well will determine the quality of the lasting peace we hope will be able to help them build in the region. I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and I have been to Colombia many times on many occasions since I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere. I have seen a terrible situation unfold in that troubled nation. On my last trip in January, we met with President Andres Pastrana as he was forced to issue an ultimatum to the FARC in a last-ditch effort to get them to come back to the negotiating table.

No one has done more to hold the door open to a negotiated, political solution to end the violence in Colombia than President Pastrana. His perseverance and forbearance have made one thing clear: it is the FARC's willful disregard for the rule of law and human rights that led President Pastrana to make the decision to end the safe haven and send in Colombia's security forces to reestablish legitimate government authority.

Colombia today is a nation under siege by three terrorist organizations. Two of these terrorist organizations, the FARC and the ELN, have kidnapped over 50 Americans and murdered at least 10 Americans. The third, the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia, is a vicious, violent terrorist organization that indiscriminately murders Colombians. Individuals who aid those terrorists dishonor and discredit themselves and the institutions that they represent.

All three of these terrorist groups have been designated by the Secretary of State as foreign terrorist organizations because it has been determined that they are a threat to our Nation's

security. Terrorism in Colombia is financed by illegal trafficking in narcotics that kill and destroy the lives of our young people in the United States.

The FARC has, in essence, declared war on the Colombian people. This group is attacking Colombia's democratic institutions. Five Colombian legislators are being held hostage by the FARC. The FARC has been attacking the infrastructure. It attacks police stations with propane gas cylinder mortars that indiscriminately kill innocent people.

The Colombian Government is continuing its efforts to negotiate a peace agreement with the ELN, and we should support those efforts.

It is time, however, that we reassess our policy towards Colombia. This resolution expresses the sense of the House that the President, without undue delay, should transmit to Congress for its consideration proposed legislation, consistent with United States law regarding protection of human rights, to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations and the scourge of illicit narcotics.

We cannot afford to fail to help the people of Colombia in their darkest hour. Colombia is a democracy and an ally of the United States, and it is under attack by terrorist organizations funded by illegal drugs. Colombia is not asking us to send troops. The democratically elected Government of Colombia is asking that we make it possible for us to help them defend their democracy from these terrorists. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this reasonable, bipartisan resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), who has worked tirelessly on this issue and is one of the nationally recognized authorities on Colombia.

□ 1345

Mr. DELAHUNT. I thank the gentleman for his generous words and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as others have alluded to, almost 4 years ago, President Andres Pastrana embarked on what was truly a courageous effort to bring peace to his nation. He began negotiations with the FARC and the ELN, the country's two main guerilla groups. He did so because he realized that, after almost 40 years of conflict, a negotiated agreement was the only answer to end the violence.

These efforts focused world attention on Colombia. For the first time, the international community was brought directly into the negotiations. Hope prevailed that the brutal violence that has plagued that nation for decades would at long last end. I shared that hope. At President Pastrana's request, I myself went to the so-called demilitarized zone. I met with the FARC,

which is the largest party to this conflict.

I left, hopeful that the FARC was genuinely serious about the search for peace. They claimed that they were prepared to work to create a new Colombia that would embrace social and economic justice and bring peace to a population exhausted by violence.

Sadly, they have proven they were not serious. At great political cost, President Pastrana gave the FARC every opportunity to prove their good faith. But they, the FARC, could not summon the political resolve, the will, the courage, if you may, to choose peace. Sadly, they were not serious.

From an insurgency that once based its legitimacy on a promise of social and economic justice for all Colombians, the FARC have degenerated into criminal syndicates that traffic in drugs, that extort, that kidnap and that murder civilians. The FARC have failed to meet the challenge of peace. They have failed the Colombian people. So now I share what I know to be the profound disappointment felt by President Pastrana and the people of Colombia.

But, fortunately, the peace process with the ELN is still continuing. Like the FARC, the ELN claim to want to address the social inequities that are at the root of the conflict. But the ELN have actually proposed how to do that; and, at least at this point in time, they appear to have the will to make peace. However, tragically, even while negotiating, the ELN also continue their armed campaign of kidnapping and sabotage.

But what disturbs me most profoundly is the recent rapid growth of right-wing paramilitary groups, commonly referred to as the AUC. They commit more than 70 percent of the massacres in the course of the Colombian conflict, and their brutality knows no bounds of human decency. Their leadership readily admits to deriving most of their funding from drug trafficking. Klaus Nyholm, the head of the U.N. drug control program in Colombia, says that they are substantially more involved in the drug trade than the FARC.

Most significantly for U.S. policy, the AUC, as mentioned by the gentleman from California, the ranking member, have extensive links with the Colombian military, according to our own Department of State report that was issued this week. That explains the reluctance of so many of us in this body to provide unconditional military assistance to the Colombian armed forces.

While President Pastrana and Colombian armed forces chief Fernando Tapias deserve credit for taking steps to professionalize the military, unfortunately, far too many of these unsavory links remain. Until all relationships, at every level, between the military and the AUC are ended, the U.S. can and should condition its assistance.

Unbelievably, these paramilitary groups rationalize their acts of terrorism as what is needed to fight the guerillas. They say they traffic in drugs only to support that fight. They say that what they really want is peace. They even claim that they are the Northern Alliance of Colombia, ready to help the United States fight the FARC.

They are not Colombia's Northern Alliance. They are Colombia's al Qaeda.

Let us be clear. There is no place for an AUC in a democracy. In a democratic society, it is the exclusive role of the armed forces and the police, working under the legitimate government, to maintain public order, to defend the nation, and protect individual civil liberties. And there is a legitimate government in Colombia duly elected by the Colombian people. The AUC are not the answer to Colombia's problems. In a very real way, the AUC are cooperating with the FARC and the ELN in sending Colombia into chaos and more bloodshed.

We know what the FARC's position is. We have learned it the hard way. Now it is very important for us to be clear with both the ELN and the AUC. Let me say to them, now is the time to reveal your true selves, to show the world what you really want for your nation. You say you want peace. You put it on your websites. You make these public statements. Prove it. Declare an immediate, unilateral ceasefire and an immediate suspension of all criminal activities. Lay down your arms. You can do it today. Now.

That way, the Colombian military can concentrate its efforts on the FARC; and the world can see that the other parties to the conflict are willing to act for peace, not just talk about it.

So Senor Gabino, who is the leader of the ELN, and Carlos Castano, the leader of the AUC, now is the time, now, to decide which side you are on. Are you with the Colombian people who desperately want to end 40 years of horror? Or are you with those who would drown your nation in the blood of its own citizens?

This resolution today makes clear which side the United States is on. This is just the beginning of our debate. We still must have an extensive review, including hearings, on the details of any U.S. assistance, just as there should be a peaceful debate inside Colombia on how to address that country's very real problems, particularly its glaring social and economic inequities.

But there should be no doubt as to which side the United States is on. We are with the Colombian people.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, 6 weeks ago, I went with members of the Committee on Agriculture to Colombia. We were fortunate enough to have dinner one evening with President Pastrana at

his version of Camp David, which is in Cartagena. During that evening, we were able to get well acquainted. He described his being kidnapped by guerrillas a few years ago and all that he went through and the general lay of the land down there and his struggles with the FARC and the ELN and the AUC.

In the progress of that evening, what we learned is that there are roughly 600,000 acres of coca plants under cultivation in the country of Colombia. This allows them to provide roughly 90 percent of the cocaine that comes into the United States. As a result, FARC and these other vigilante groups are very well funded. I would imagine that their funding may exceed that of other legitimate enterprises within the country of Colombia. And so the people in Colombia have paid a great price.

Last year, we were told that 29,000 civilians lost their lives in this conflict. They are caught in between the various groups. In many cases, they have no place to go and no place to hide. As has been mentioned earlier, seven members of Congress have been killed in the last 4 years, and five lawmakers are currently hostages in that country.

So the present negotiations, or the negotiations that have gone on for the last 3 or 4 years, have broken down and now Colombia is basically under a reign of terror, where some of the things that we have seen around the world are now being perpetrated on the Colombian people. We have seen bridges blown up, water supplies such as in Bogota have been damaged and threatened.

So it appears at this time that the only solution is that the United States provide help. We already have provided quite a bit. But the big issue is helicopters, because the pilots that are doing the spraying of the coca to try to eliminate it are certainly under a great deal of duress.

So we need also some commitment from Colombia, but they need our aid.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), an indefatigable fighter for social justice in the hemisphere.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and appreciate all his work on behalf of human rights.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. I want to be very clear about my concerns regarding this bill and the critical crossroads confronting U.S. policy in Colombia.

Like every Member of this House, I support the democratically elected government of Colombia. I have met with President Pastrana, including in Colombia, and I am a strong supporter of his efforts for social and economic reform. Having traveled to Colombia, I know how very complex the society and the conflict are. I have seen the harm done to the Colombian people by the guerrillas, by paramilitary groups and by the Colombian army. I believe

very strongly that Congress should not rush to signal support that would increase our involvement in Colombia's escalating civil war.

The Colombian civil war has been going on for nearly 40 years. The armed actors remain nearly unchanged. Leftist guerilla groups battle the Colombian army for control of the territory, while right-wing paramilitaries increase their own involvement in the war and violence against civilians. All of these armed actors, including the Colombian military, have been involved in drug trafficking. All have a history of human rights abuses. Human rights groups continue to document the close ties between the Colombian army and the paramilitaries who commit the majority of human rights abuses in Colombia.

Colombia is hardly a new front in the war on terrorism. Terrible acts of terror, assassinations, kidnappings, bombings and disappearances, are part and parcel of their 40-year civil war. But Colombia is not part of the internationally supported campaign to dismantle and destroy al Qaeda and other international terrorist networks.

So let us not hide behind euphemisms. A so-called war on terrorism in Colombia is simply a set of code words to become even more deeply engaged in a counterinsurgency war that has been going on for nearly 40 years.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of President Pastrana, but the message we send today will be heard and acted upon more by his successor when elections take place in the coming months. The leading presidential candidate has long rejected any type of negotiations process, and he has the support of the right-wing paramilitary groups, the very groups we rightly are condemning today.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, our current policy in Colombia has been a failure. It has not stemmed the production of coca. It has not provided peasant farmers with alternatives to growing coca. It has not lessened the number of internally displaced people. It has not broken the ties between the Colombian army and the paramilitaries. It has not decreased the number of civilians who are victims of human rights abuses and violence. And it has not promoted the administration of justice.

The current attorney general, unlike his predecessors, is not an advocate for human rights. He has dismissed or stopped investigations on many of the cases involving high-level military and government officials. As a result, most of the key officers and prosecutors in the Justice Ministry responsible for investigating and prosecuting human rights and corruption cases have resigned or been forced out of office.

For our part, Mr. Speaker, and I say this sadly, the United States demonstrates its commitment to human rights by consistently waiving the conditions on our aid every 6 months because the Colombian military continues to fail to comply.

□ 1400

Now, in my view, Mr. Speaker, this resolution wants to give a green light to involve the U.S. more deeply and directly in Colombia's escalating civil war, and I simply cannot support this.

I have high regard for the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE); the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman BALLENGER). These Members have done a great deal to focus attention on human rights challenges in Latin America. But I must dissent, and I urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing this resolution.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 358, which expresses support for the Government of Colombia.

There were many in Colombia that criticized President Pastrana for making the peace process a priority above almost any other issue that faced the Colombian people, but none I think would criticize the commitment that he made to bringing peace to that troubled country. Now, rightly, in my opinion, he has called off the negotiations. He has moved troops into the demilitarized zone. He is facing a long struggle against a renewed urban terrorism campaign that is targeting the country's most important infrastructure assets.

But we are proceeding as nothing has changed, as if Colombia is only fighting a counternarcotics war. I believe we have to face several realities and counter with a clear U.S. policy in response.

The aggressive timetable that Plan Colombia was to follow, eradicating coca, providing alternative development, cannot be adhered to during a full scale war with the FARC and the paramilitaries. The alternative development plans were already failing from a lack of basic security for non-governmental organization workers and transport of alternative commodities, thereby putting the entire program at risk.

It is true that Colombia is a source of 90 percent of the cocaine in the United States; but conversely, the United States is Colombia's largest trading partner of legal industries. As such, it is in the interest of the United States to promote better stability in Colombia by helping it to address these longstanding approximate and more recent escalations.

I might remind my colleagues in the other body that of all the requests from the Government of Colombia, at the top of their list is the renewal of the Andean Trade Pact.

Because it shares borders with five other countries, Brazil, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia's instability is a threat to regional stability.

While only 3 percent of U.S. oil consumed comes from Colombia, 14 percent comes from neighboring Venezuela. Oil imports from South America play a vital role in our strategy to diversify the sources of U.S. oil.

The Colombian economy has faced a number of economic shocks that have limited its ability to contribute to Plan Colombia and the defense of its own people. Oil pipelines have been bombed, the price of oil has fallen, the price of coffee has fallen, foreign investment in Colombia has fallen. The internal shocks are only going to be made worse by the escalation of war.

Colombians have traditionally shown a long-term tolerance for violence, but this is changing; and we can see evidence of this in the popularity of presidential candidates in Colombia that strongly support countering the FARC guerillas.

The deteriorating economic conditions not only have threatened the Colombian Government's commitment to Plan Colombia, but the worsening unemployment only encourages the narcotics industry in Colombia. It has become a vicious cycle.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize the changed situation in Colombia and that we must respond by clarifying U.S. policy. Let us begin an open debate about our role in Colombia and not rely on State Department lawyers to look for loopholes in current law. This resolution begins that debate, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this carefully crafted and balanced resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the Colombian Army has made progress in this area, and, while not perfect, no one is. At least they are trying and have made good progress.

I also note that an alternative to a well-trained and respectful Colombian Army is the AUC, and that right-wing paramilitary respects no one's rights, engages in terrorism, illicit drugs, and kills innocent civilians.

No one here is proposing that we repeal the Leahy amendment that prohibits aid to the units of Colombian military that engage in human rights abuses. Leahy is existing law. The Leahy restriction will remain law and has my strong support, and human rights concerns will not be thrown out the window in a new Colombian policy.

I also note the counter-drug aid that we provided to the Colombian police, their antinarcotics unit, has been delivered and used in the last 2 years without even one allegation of a human rights abuse; I repeat, not even one allegation.

The Colombians can and will respect human rights if we help them and we

train them and we stand shoulder to shoulder next to them in the fight. The police antinarcotics unit is a case of study for engagement.

Absent a new U.S. policy, the right-wing paramilitaries will fill the void in Colombia, and the human rights of no one, especially civilians, will be safe. We can stay on the sidelines or help our neighbor. The answer is clear, especially since September 11. We need to fight global terrorism whenever and wherever it raises its ugly head.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this resolution on Colombia. I am troubled as to why we are voting on this resolution today. It concerns me that the purpose of this resolution is for the Congress to give this administration the green light to become more heavily involved in the civil war in Colombia.

I have the utmost respect for President Pastrana, but at the same time I am not in favor of expanding our involvement in Colombia by using our response to the terrorism threat after September 11 as a justification to participate in Colombia's civil war. The FARC might be on the terrorist list, but the reasons that have been given for our involvement in Colombia have been counternarcotics and not counterterrorism. I do not want to erase this important distinction.

Mr. Speaker, I read the Spanish press, and let me assure you that in Latin America and in my congressional district the support does not exist for having the United States exert its military power in Colombia. There are atrocities committed on all sides of this conflict.

Today, Secretary Powell testified before the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Subcommittee, on which I am the ranking member, and I told him that I understand that drug trafficking is a problem in Colombia, but that has never before been a reason to send American troops. Let me be clear that the new threat of terrorism is not and never should be a reason to change our policy toward Colombia.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word in support of the bipartisan resolution on Colombia and the need for a change in our policy, now before the House.

While, I have long followed events in Colombia, I long gave the benefit of the doubt to the Pastrana administration in Colombia with its protracted negotiations and its Switzerland sized DMZ safe haven provided the FARC, that naivete has finally ended, hopefully not too late.

The FARC has attacked cities, towns, police stations, bridges, dams, and power lines all across Colombia since the peace talks ended last month. Let there be no mistake, the FARC are terrorists, and I have been financed by illicit drug proceeds.

Along with their ELN terrorist friends in the last 10 years, the FARC and ELN have kidnaped 50 Americans in Colombia and killed at least 10 of them. Their trade in illicit drugs help take numerous American lives here at home as well from their illicit drugs. For example, it is noted that the DMZ, now abandoned in Colombia, was loaded with opium growth for heroin production eventually destined for American streets and communities.

Bogota, the capital of Colombia, is only 3 hours from Miami, and the beleaguered democratic nation of Colombia is up against the wall

from these narcoterrorists and right wing paramilitaries all financed with the illicit drug trade and all engaged in terrorism per our own U.S. State Department.

While our Nation is engaged in fighting global terrorism in Afghanistan, Yemen, Georgia, and the Philippines, we still maintain the fiction that the battle in Colombia in our nearby neighborhood is only about illicit drugs, and our aid has been limited to counternarcotics.

We have maintained the fiction of counternarcotics aid only for Colombia long enough. The same people who kidnap, blow up pipelines, and who kill Americans trade in illicit drugs to finance their other criminal and terrorist activities. Only our State Department maintains the drugs only fiction, on the ground the reality was different and the Colombian democracy slipped further and further away.

This resolution calls for our administration to take off its rose color glasses that President Pastrana and our State Department wore for far too long and let Colombian democracy slip away. It is time we get serious and fight terrorism and the illicit drugs that finances it in Colombia and threatens American national interests in our very back yard.

Protecting pipelines from terrorist attacks is but one way to help Colombia. It is not enough for a Colombian policy and as the Bob Novak column noted this week, it is a sorry excuse for a real antiinsurgency strategy in Colombia. We need to do more.

We must help the Colombian police antiskidnaping unites with helicopters to rescue victims, including Americans in the often hard to reach terrain. We ought to also restore the clarity we need by giving the anti-drug mission in Colombia mainly to the excellent antidrug police, who have a stellar human rights record.

Our assistance to the Colombian military should be antiterrorist assistance, and not operate under the failed antidrug fiction of the past. Let us bear in mind that no one here, nor anyone in Colombia has ever asked for, or called for American combat troops for Colombia.

The Colombians want and deserve the equipment and training they need to defend themselves and their democracy from the terrorist threat at their and at our door.

Accordingly, I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support and solidarity with the people of Colombia in their pursuit of stability and peace. Along with my colleagues, I condemn the horrible violence that has been inflicted on the Colombian people by the AUC, ELN, and the FARC. But, I cannot in good faith support a resolution that expresses praise to Colombia for improving its human rights record, when in fact it has eroded.

Many Member of Congress have joined me in expressing their profound concern to the Colombian Government over the many murders of trade union leaders that have gone without investigation or prosecution. The scourge of murders of trade unionists in Colombia is the highest in the world, thereby making Colombia notorious as the most dangerous place in the world to be a union member. The government of Colombia has over and over again demonstrated their unwillingness to pursue prosecution of these attacks on organized labor. Columbia's de facto immunity extended to these assassins has been

clearly condemned by the International Labor Organization, United Nations Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International, and our own Department of State.

Columbia can drastically reduce the violence against trade unionists. It begins with effectively halting the impunity enjoyed by these perpetrators, many of which have credible ties to the military and police. Columbia must aggressively prosecute these criminals and restore its people's confidence in justice.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution fall short in condemning the impunity enjoyed by human rights violators and the violence perpetrated against all levels of society, including organized labor. Many of my fellow Members have actively engaged the Columbian Government with these concerns but without success. Passing a resolution basically congratulating Columbia on improving its human rights record is wrong and counterproductive.

It is my hope that Columbia will choose to aggressively improve it's human rights record, so in the future we may pass a similar resolution, with unanimous consent.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House International Relations Committee and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I would like to state my strong objections to the manner in which this piece of legislation was raised. I was only made aware of the existence of this legislation this morning, just a couple of hours before I was expected to vote on it. There was no committee markup of the legislation, nor was there any notice that this legislation would appear on today's suspension calendar.

This legislation represents a very serious and significant shift in United States policy toward Colombia. It sets us on a slippery slope toward unwise military intervention in a foreign civil war that has nothing to do with the United States.

Our policy toward Colombia was already ill-advised when it consisted of an expensive front in our failed "war on drugs." Plan Colombia, launched nearly 2 years ago, sent \$1.3 billion to Colombia under the guise of this war on drugs. A majority of that went to the Colombian military; much was no doubt lost through corruption. Though this massive assistance program was supposed to put an end to the FARC and other rebel groups involved in drug trafficking, 2 years later we are now being told—in this legislation and elsewhere—that the FARC and rebel groups are stronger than ever. So now we are being asked to provide even more assistance in an effort that seems to have had a result the opposite of what was intended. In effect, we are being asked to redouble failed efforts. That doesn't make sense.

At the time Plan Colombia was introduced, President Clinton promised the American people that this action would in no way drag us into the Colombian civil war. This current legislation takes a bad policy and makes it much worse. This legislation calls for the United States "to assist the Government of Colombia protect its democracy from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations . . ." In other words, this legislation elevates a civil war in Colombia to the level of the international war on terror, and it will drag us deep into the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, there is a world of difference between a rebel group fighting a civil war in a foreign country and the kind of international

terrorist organization that targeted the United States last September. As ruthless and violent as the three rebel groups in Colombia no doubt are, their struggle for power in that country is an internal one. None of the three appears to have any intention of carrying out terrorist activities in the United States. Should we become involved in a civil war against them, however, these organizations may well begin to view the United States as a legitimate target. What possible reason could there be for us to take on such a deadly risk? What possible rewards could there be for the United States support for one faction or the other in this civil war?

As with much of our interventionism, if you scratch the surface of the high-sounding calls to "protect democracy" and "stop drug trafficking" you often find commercial interests driving U.S. foreign policy. This also appears to be the case in Colombia. And like Afghanistan, Kosovo, Iraq, and elsewhere, that commercial interest appears to be related to oil. The U.S. administration request for FY 2003 includes a request for an additional \$98 million to help protect the Cano-Limon Pipeline—jointly owned by the Colombian Government and Occidental Petroleum. Rebels have been blowing up parts of the pipeline and the resulting disruption of the flow of oil is costing Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian Government more than half a billion dollars per year. Now the administration wants the American taxpayer to finance the equipping and training of a security force to protect the pipeline, which much of the training coming from the U.S. military. Since when is it the responsibility of the American citizen to subsidize risky investments made by private companies in foreign countries? And since when is it the duty of American service men and women to lay their lives on the line for these commercial interests?

Further intervention in the internal political and military affairs of Colombia will only increase the mistrust and anger of the average Colombian citizen toward the United States, as these citizens will face the prospect of an ongoing, United States-supported war in their country. Already Plan Colombia has fueled the deep resentment of Colombian farmers toward the United States. These farmers have seen their legitimate crops destroyed, water supply polluted, and families sprayed as powerful herbicides miss their intended marks. An escalation of American involvement will only make matters worse.

Mr. Speaker, at this critical time, our precious military and financial resources must not be diverted to a conflict that has nothing to do with the United States and poses no threat to the United States. Trying to designate increased military involvement in Colombia as a new front on the "war on terror" makes no sense at all. It will only draw the United States into a quagmire much like Vietnam. The Colombian civil war is now in its fourth decade; pretending that the fighting there is somehow related to our international war on terrorism is to stretch the imagination to the breaking point. It is unwise and dangerous.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for the people of Colombia and ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

The people of Colombia have suffered through years of violence, deprivation, and discord. They have seen their country torn

apart in a violent war between their government and various rebel factions.

Despite the best efforts of President Pastrana, the murder and kidnapping of Colombian citizens, government officials, and even American visitors have increased. His efforts to reach a peaceful settlement have been rejected by the rebel groups.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has made a commitment to addressing the root cause of these problems in Colombia—the drug trade. Through Plan Colombia we are working with our Andean allies to destroy drug production and interrupt drug traffic.

Our assistance will help Colombia's Government lead the country and, eventually, end drug production and stabilize the Andean region.

As Colombia continues working to secure lasting peace, the United States should continue to offer support and assistance.

This resolution is an important expression of that support, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H.Res. 358.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT ON ITS BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 32, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]
YEAS—407

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

Cannon Hastings (FL) Meeks (NY) Smith (MI) Taylor (MS) Vitter
 Cantor Hastings (WA) Menendez Smith (NJ) Taylor (NC) Walden
 Capito Hayes Mica Smith (TX) Terry Walden
 Capps Hayworth Miller, Dan Smith (WA) Thomas Walsh
 Capuano Hefley Miller, Gary Snyder Thompson (CA) Watkins (OK)
 Cardin Herger Miller, George Souder Thompson (MS) Watt (NC)
 Carson (IN) Hill Mink Spratt Thornberry Watts (OK)
 Carson (OK) Hilleary Mollohan Stark Thune Waxman
 Castle Hilliard Moore Stearns Thurman Weiner
 Chabot Hinchey Moran (KS) Tiahrt Weldon (FL)
 Chambliss Hinojosa Moran (VA) Strickland Tiberi Weldon (PA)
 Clay Hobson Morella Stump Tierney Weller
 Clayton Hoeffel Murtha Stupak Toomey Whitfield
 Clement Hoekstra Myrick Sullivan Towns Wicker
 Clyburn Holden Nadler Sununu Turner Wilson (SC)
 Coble Holt Neal Sweeney Tancredo Udall (CO) Wolf
 Collins Honda Nethercutt Tanner Udall (NM) Wu
 Combest Hooley Ney Tanner Upton Wynn
 Cooksey Horn Northrup Tauscher Velazquez Young (AK)
 Costello Hostettler Norwood Tauscher Visclosky Young (FL)
 Cox Houghton Nussle Oberstar
 Coyne Hoyer Obey
 Cramer Hulshof Obey
 Crane Hunter Oliver
 Crenshaw Inslee Ortiz
 Crowley Isakson Osborne
 Culberson Israel Ose
 Cummings Issa Otter
 Cunningham Istook Owens
 Davis (CA) Jackson (IL) Oxley
 Davis (FL) Jackson-Lee Pallone
 Davis (IL) (TX) Pascrell
 Davis, Jo Ann Jefferson Pastor
 Davis, Tom Jenkins Paul
 Deal John Payne
 DeFazio Johnson (CT) Pelosi
 DeGette Johnson (IL) Pence
 Delahunt Johnson, E. B. Peterson (MN)
 DeLauro Johnson, Sam Peterson (PA)
 DeLay Jones (NC) Petri
 DeMint Jones (OH) Phelps
 Deutsch Kanjorski Pickering
 Diaz-Balart Kaptur Pitts
 Dicks Keller Platts
 Dingell Kelly Pombo
 Doggett Kennedy (MN) Pomeroy
 Doyle Kennedy (RI) Portman
 Dreier Kerns Price (NC)
 Duncan Kildee Pryce (OH)
 Dunn Kind (WI) Putnam
 Edwards King (NY) Quinn
 Ehlers Kingston Radanovich
 Ehrlich Kirk Rahall
 Emerson Kleczka Ramstad
 Engel Knollenberg Rangell
 English Kolbe Regula
 Eshoo Kucinich Rehberg
 Etheridge LaFalce Reyes
 Evans LaHood Reynolds
 Everett Lampson Riley
 Farr Langevin Rivers
 Fattah Lantos Rodriguez
 Ferguson Larsen (WA) Roemer
 Flake Larson (CT) Rogers (KY)
 Fletcher Latham Rogers (MI)
 Foley LaTourette Rohrabacher
 Forbes Leach Ros-Lehtinen
 Ford Levin Ross
 Fossella Lewis (GA) Rothman
 Frank Lewis (KY) Roukema
 Frelinghuysen Linder Royce
 Frost Lipinski Rush
 Gallegly LoBiondo Ryan (WI)
 Ganske Lowey Ryan (KS)
 Gekas Lucas (KY) Sabo
 Gephardt Lucas (OK) Sandlin
 Gibbons Luther Sawyer
 Gilchrest Lynch Saxton
 Gillmor Maloney (CT) Schaffer
 Gilman Maloney (NY) Schakowsky
 Gonzalez Manzullo Schiff
 Goode Markey Schrock
 Goodlatte Mascara Scott
 Gordon Matheson Sensenbrenner
 Goss Matsui Serrano
 Graham McCarthy (MO) Sessions
 Granger McCarthy (NY) Shadegg
 Graves McCollum Shaw
 Green (TX) McCrery Shays
 Green (WI) McDermott Sherman
 Greenwood McGovern Sherwood
 Grucci McHugh Shimkus
 Gutierrez McInnis Shows
 Gutknecht McIntyre Shuster
 Hall (OH) McKeon Simmons
 Hall (TX) McKinney Simpson
 Hansen Sken
 Harman Meehan Skelton
 Hart Meek (FL) Slaughter

Smith (MI) Taylor (MS) Vitter
 Smith (NJ) Taylor (NC) Walden
 Smith (TX) Terry Walsh
 Smith (WA) Thomas Wamp
 Snyder Thompson (CA) Watkins (OK)
 Souder Thompson (MS) Watt (NC)
 Spratt Thornberry Watts (OK)
 Stark Thune Waxman
 Stearns Thurman Weiner
 Strickland Tiahrt Weldon (FL)
 Strickland Tiberi Weldon (PA)
 Stump Tierney Weller
 Stupak Toomey Whitfield
 Sullivan Towns Wicker
 Sununu Turner Wilson (SC)
 Sweeney Tancredo Udall (CO) Wolf
 Tancredo Udall (NM) Wu
 Tanner Upton Wynn
 Tauscher Velazquez Young (AK)
 Tausin Visclosky Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Conyers
 NOT VOTING—26

Bentsen Kilpatrick Sanchez
 Blagojevich Lee Sanders
 Calvert Lewis (CA) Solis
 Condit Lofgren Traficant
 Cubin Millender Waters
 Dooley McDonald Watson (CA)
 Doolittle Miller, Jeff Wexler
 Filner Napolitano Wilson (NM)
 Hyde Roybal-Allard Woolsey

□ 1450

Mr. TERRY and Mr. CROWLEY changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50 on congratulating the United States Military Academy at West Point I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 50, I was conducting official business in my San Diego, California district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the District, I respectfully request a leave of absence from legislative business scheduled for today, Wednesday, March 6. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 48 on approving the Journal; “no” on rollcall No. 49, the motion to proceed to the previous question during the consideration of H. Con. Res. 275; and “aye” on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S.J. Res. 32.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was attending important business in my Congressional District on March 6th, which included activities relating to the Primary election in California.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 48, “no” on rollcall No. 49, and “yea” on rollcall No. 50.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker’s an-

nounced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

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

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

CEASEFIRE BETWEEN THE SRI LANKAN GOVERNMENT AND THE LTTE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor this evening to bring to the attention of my colleagues a historic peace initiative between the Sri Lankan Government and the LTTE.

On February 22, 2002, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka, the Honorable Wickremesinghe, and the leader of the LTTE, Mr. Prabhakaran, signed an agreement that established a long-term cease fire by both sides that signifies the beginning of peace talks and, simply, a new era of peace for war-torn Sri Lanka.

For nearly 2 decades now, there has been a civil war taking place between the Government of Sri Lanka and the LTTE, one of the world’s most dangerous guerilla groups. The cease fire was negotiated by Norway and will be overseen by Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark.

I am optimistic about this movement towards peace and feel the United States should extend its support for this agreement to end years of violent blood shed. Indeed, the LTTE will have to show great will to bring an end to its violent attacks that have claimed tens of thousands of innocent lives. However, the current global situation has provided a glimpse of hope that this cease fire will be a successful endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, since the September 11 attacks, there has been a desire throughout the world to move away from senseless violence; and clearly, we began a new campaign against terrorism. This new atmosphere may potentially foster improved relations between Sri Lanka and the LTTE. Additionally, the LTTE may have been more apt to agree to this peace agreement since their popularity and their financial support was waning through countries that formerly favored them or provided support.

We see this hope for peace in Sri Lanka is already coming to fruition. Since December, medicine, supplies and other goods are being shipped to Tamil Tiger-controlled areas. Shipment of goods to these areas has been under the control of the Sri Lankan Government, but the controls have been relaxed for the past several months.

Mr. Speaker, I should note that President Kumaratunga has been outspoken in her criticism of the terms of the cease fire. As President she has the power to suspend parliament and dismiss the government. If she is not satisfied with certain provisions within the peace agreement, the deal may be canceled.

The differences between the President and Prime Minister must be worked out so Sri Lanka can proceed with dealing with this deadly conflict between Sri Lanka and the LTTE. In any case, the Prime Minister has announced that any peace agreement would have to be supported by a referendum, which ensures that the people of Sri Lanka would be participating in the peace process.

In the upcoming months, it is important to watch closely how this peace process unfolds in Sri Lanka. The Prime Minister is willing to negotiate all forms of settlement with the LTTE, except for establishment of an independent homeland for the Tamil community.

I encourage the LTTE to shed its terrorist negotiating tactics and come to the table with the Sri Lankan Government and engage in a substantive debate that I hope will lead to a permanent cease fire, peace in Sri Lanka, and greater stability throughout the South Asian region.

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

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

FIGHTING HATE CRIMES IN AMERICA

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

Mrs. CAPP. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise on the floor of the House this afternoon.

Two weeks ago in my California district, which includes Santa Barbara, a 37-year-old man named Clinton Scott Risetter was brutally murdered, burned to death in his bed. Such a killing would be tragic under any circumstances. Yet this is particularly painful because Mr. Risetter was murdered because he was a homosexual. Let me say that even in a community as tolerant as Santa Barbara, intolerance still has an ugly and evil face.

I am heartened by much of what has transpired since the tragic incident. I am proud that local law enforcement agencies have responded swiftly and thoroughly. The police department and district attorney are working closely with the community, including gay rights organizations, for which I am pleased and very grateful. But I also believe that we must confront the ugly specter of hate crimes on a national, as well as a local, level.

Last year at this time, an important bill was introduced in the House, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. This bill, sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), would strengthen the Federal response to hate crime violence which is motivated by race, color, religion, or national origin. It would also expand the law to cover hate crimes committed against people because of their gender, sexual orientation, or disability, as well as to expand Federal jurisdiction to cover the most violent of these hate crimes.

As it stands now, Federal authorities cannot act on cases involving death or serious bodily injury based on gender, sexual orientation, or disability when local law enforcement is not available. Now fortunately this does not impact the case in Santa Barbara; but even so, many people throughout the country are left without any chance for justice when their own States fail to act.

So I am pleased that Santa Barbara has, as a community, responded with outrage and compassion to this recent event, the vicious hate crime which has occurred there. But as a society we must continue to confront what lies at the root of these horrendous hate crimes, and that is where our Federal legislation comes in and why it is so very important.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act would provide communities with important prevention tools, including grants to State and local programs designed to combat hate crimes committed by juveniles and training for local law enforcement officers in investigating, prosecuting, and preventing hate crimes altogether.

We cannot ignore the facts. Since 1996, hate crimes committed against individuals based on sexual orientation have increased nearly 28 percent. I will not remain silent on this issue. I am compelled to do whatever I can to prevent another hostile and tragic act on anyone because of his or her sexual orientation.

In a post-September 11 society, where tolerance and acceptance are strongly encouraged and promoted by our government and local communities, these types of crimes must not go unpunished or unexplored. Let us make the Hate Crimes Prevention Act a reality. Let us make a true commitment to every American citizen, be they gay or straight, Muslim, Christian, white, black, Hispanic or Asian. It should not take a brutal murder to jar the Congress out of acting out of common sense and basic human decency. It is

too late to save the life of Mr. Risetter, but it is not too late to take the kind of action which will honor his memory.

HONORING DEREK PARRA

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for cooperating with me in pressing calendar circumstances.

I have come to the floor because I will be inserting in the RECORD some detailed information about a young man from my hometown, San Bernardino, California, by the name of Derek Parra who won, among other things, a gold and a silver medal at the Winter Olympic Games, a fabulous young person who is an inspiration to our entire community. Not only has he made a difference to our community, he is impacting young people across the country.

It is my pleasure to mention, among other things, as I have done some homework on him, he is an employee of Home Depot. I have learned that Home Depot is doing a fantastic job of helping the Olympics by having employees who work for them have a good deal of flexibility in terms of their schedule and the way their jobs are funded, et cetera.

□ 1500

They have, in a very substantial way, demonstrated what the private sector can do to improve our ability to effectively impact a wonderful event such as the Winter Olympic games.

So my hat is off to Home Depot, and I hope all my colleagues will recognize these good works and encourage them across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the people of my hometown, San Bernardino, were specially thrilled by the Olympic heroism of Derek Parra, who became the first Mexican-American to win a medal at the Winter games when he took both a gold and silver medal in speed-skating. His story is one of making sacrifice and working tirelessly to achieve his life's dream of winning at the Olympics.

Derek Parra twice left family and home behind to pursue his dream—once moving to Florida to become an international star at inline skating races, and then again heading to Utah to train for speed-skating, a sport he had never tried as a child in sunny Southern California. Those who know San Bernardino recognize that hard-working spirit, and our hometown celebrated with daylong events that included a spirited parade and packed awards dinner.

While it is clear that Derek Parra meant to reach for his Olympic dream in any way he could, his time in Utah was made easier by The Home Depot, the national hardware chain that is known for its orange aprons. When he arrived in Salt Lake City, Parra landed a job in floors and walls at the West Valley Home Depot, which helped him provide for himself and his family during the year leading up to the Olympics.

The Home Depot company is justly proud that it has contributed to Parra's success, as well as that of fellow employee Tristan Gale, who won a gold medal in the women's skeleton event. In fact, the company has hired and given job flexibility to 140 Olympics and Paralympics hopefuls throughout the country in a display of corporate patriotism and civic involvement. Twenty of those hopefuls were in Salt Lake City.

The company's Olympic Job Opportunity Program offers full-time pay and benefits to athletes for a 20-hour week during competition and training seasons. Not surprisingly, Home Depot managers have found these dedicated athletes are also among their most hard-working employees and in most cases would be delighted to have them back after the competition has ended.

Home Depot has joined many other U.S. companies in sponsorships that have helped show the world that it is possible to stage a successful Olympics without losses to public coffers or excessive commercialization. But The Home Depot has taken this civic spirit to the next level, supporting those dedicated athletes who are the centerpiece of the Olympic Games.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you and my colleagues to please join me in praising the American spirit of determination that led Derek Parra to shock the world and win gold and silver medals in record-breaking times at speedskating. And also in praising The Home Depot for showing the world that American business can join with athletes like Derek to bring success and pride to them both.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRENSHAW). 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.)

TRIBUTE TO FALLEN HEROES IN THE WAR ON TERRORISM

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is written that, "If you owe debts, pay debts; if honor, then honor; if respect, then respect."

I can think of no more fitting time to apply this verse than today, 1 day after we as Americans watched the flag-draped caskets of seven U.S. servicemen being off-loaded from a C-130 transport plane at Ramstein Air Force Base in Germany. We owe these men of the United States Special Forces and the 101st Airborne a great debt of honor, a debt that words on this floor cannot even begin to repay.

A century and a half ago, Abraham Lincoln spoke on another battlefield where American soldiers had spilled their blood to preserve our liberty. In his address, Lincoln charges the survivors of the conflict as follows:

"It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work

which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Mr. Speaker, the soldiers who died in the mountains of Afghanistan laid down their lives for the same great task as the soldiers at Gettysburg, the preservation of our liberty and our very way of life.

Throughout our history, Mr. Speaker, America has faced enemies of her peace and her freedom. Two decades ago, President Ronald Reagan encouraged a country beset by terrorism. The words of his first inaugural address should steel the resolve of Americans today who face a similar intractable enemy.

President Reagan said, "As for the enemies of our freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it, but we will not surrender for it now or ever. And, above all else, we must realize no arsenal, no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have."

Mr. Speaker, it is especially poignant to me, as I see the sacrifices in the 101st Airborne, to reflect that twice in the last 6 months I traveled, at the invitation of Major General Richard Cody, to Fort Campbell, Kentucky, the home of the Screaming Eagles. There I met with officers and enlisted men of that fabled division, perhaps maybe even some of the very same soldiers that are coming home in the silence of death to their families, men who we can say without a doubt did not lack the will or moral courage to preserve our way of life.

I opened with a scripture verse. Allow me to close with one, Mr. Speaker. As we consider the lives of those who have had paid the ultimate price to secure our freedom, I am reminded of the verse that, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he should lay down his life for his friends."

And allow me to add these modest words on behalf of the people of eastern Indiana and a grateful Nation. To the grieving spouses, parents, children, and friends that these heroes have left behind, we commend them humbly for their sacrifice as families and for having in their midst those who have shown no greater love to that dream which is the United States of America.

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

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

LIBERAL BIAS IN AMERICA'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, it was reported last week that an invitation to author Doris Kearns Goodwin to speak at the University of Delaware's commencement exercises had been withdrawn. This invitation was pulled because Ms. Goodwin has admitted that her books contain many sentences, facts, even whole paragraphs plagiarized from other writers.

But today, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned as much about Ms. Goodwin's plagiarism or shoddy research as about what the invitation to her says about almost all of our colleges and universities.

It is well-known that Ms. Goodwin colors her history with a very strong liberal bias. We will soon be in the season of college and university graduation ceremonies. If my colleagues have ever looked at a list of commencement speakers, they have seen almost immediately that almost all come from a very liberal or left-wing background. Two or three years ago, Evergreen State college in Washington State even invited as its speaker a man who had been convicted of killing a policeman.

Conservative speakers are almost never invited to speak at commencement or graduation exercises. People who started businesses with nothing or very little, and thus tend to be very conservative, are almost never invited to speak. The only business leaders who are ever invited are those from extremely big business and who can safely be identified as liberal or at least very politically correct. I know there are always a few exceptions, but I would guess that liberals outnumber conservatives 50 or 100 to 1 as speakers at graduation ceremonies.

This reflects the fact that there is less true academic freedom, at least for conservatives, on U.S. college campuses than anyplace else in U.S. society today. College faculties, at best, have only a few token conservatives in fields that deal with political questions. Even professors in nonpolitical fields, such as English, often work in comments or assign books that show their liberal bias.

The very liberal bias of our national news media has been well documented and is not even questioned today. However, there is a much greater or stronger liberal or left-wing bias on most college and university faculties than even in the national news media. Conservative students, unless they are unusually courageous, learn very quickly to, many times, remain silent or not express their true opinions in statements they make or papers that they write.

Most colleges and universities have gone to great lengths to make sure minorities are well represented in their faculties and that they have diversity, and that is fine. But the most discrimination today is against conservative

professors and speakers, especially at very liberal schools like Antioch, Oberlin, the University of Colorado, and some of the Ivy League schools.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that colleges and universities around this Nation will strive for full diversity and true academic freedom by allowing at least a few token conservatives onto their faculties, or at least as graduation speakers.

IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY TO LATINO COMMUNITY

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the importance of Social Security and how it impacts the Latino population throughout this country.

We must remember that the initial intent and purpose of the Social Security retirement system was to help alleviate the poverty among our elderly Americans and to meet the retirement needs of all workers. We must not forget the severe poverty that our seniors suffered prior to Social Security. Social Security has become the single most effective Federal anti-poverty program in our history, lifting more than 11 million seniors out of poverty.

Latinos are critically affected by any proposed changes in the Social Security System. A significant segment of the workforce, Latinos, and especially Latinas, women, represent a disproportionate percentage of those who lack employer pension coverage. We, as Hispanics, tend to work in small companies, small businesses, which do not have pensions. We are underrepresented in government jobs and for that reason do not have a lot of the pensions that others do. More than other segments of the population, Latinos depend heavily on Social Security to live their senior years in dignity.

The Latino population is growing rapidly. Currently, Latinos constitute 8 percent of the total U.S. workforce, and by 2010 Latinos are projected to account for 13.2 percent of all the workers. From 1997 to the year 2020, the number of Latinos that are aged 65 will double.

Unfortunately, despite the gains in education and other areas, Latinos still remain concentrated in low-wage jobs that provide few benefits. While more than 51 percent of Anglos workers have employer pension coverage, the same is true for only one-third of the Latino workers. Accordingly, Latino retirees are more than twice as likely as Anglo retirees to rely solely on Social Security benefits as a means of economic support.

In addition, Latinos are less likely than Anglos to receive incomes from interest on savings and investments. For example, in 1998, of all the persons reporting interest income, only 5.3 percent went to Latinos.

I would like to also applaud the efforts of some groups that are looking at the impact that any changes in Social Security will have on women. While reforming the Social Security System, we have serious implications for women, and especially Latinas. The women in our community, Latinas, may be the most severely impacted of all populations. The Latinas are more likely than other women to work inside the home and are less likely than other women to have retirement savings accounts.

Moreover, Latinas are less likely than other workers to have access to private pension coverage, and they tend to receive the lowest wages of any group in the work force. Relying heavily on Social Security benefits, changes in marital status or the loss of a principal wage earner places Latinas in a particularly vulnerable situations.

Given the paramount importance of Social Security to Hispanic men and women, we must approach so-called reform efforts with caution, weighing the impact on this key, fast-growing population. I am concerned that the plans to privatize Social Security would drain needed resources from the Social Security Trust Fund and jeopardize benefit payments to retirees, the blind, disabled workers and survivors.

The leading plan proposed by the administration's hand-picked Social Security commission would drain \$1.5 trillion from the trust fund in just the next 10 years, money that is already being used for other purposes. Privatization of Social Security would require cuts in guaranteeing Social Security benefits. The President's Social Security commission recommended a privatization plan that cuts benefits for future retirees by up to 46 percent. Everyone would be subject to these cuts, not just workers who choose to have individual accounts, and Latinos would be hit the hardest.

Social Security privatization would expose individual workers and their families to greater financial risks. Under privatization, benefit levels would be determined by the volatile stock market, by the worker's luck in making investments, and by the timing on his or her decisions to retire. In light of the Enron disaster, we know the risks.

Latinos, who are, more than other groups, dependent on Social Security as a guaranteed income stream in retirement, would lose under privatization.

Other proposals, while well-meaning, would not help us reach our goal of ensuring future solvency. I ask that, as we look at Social Security, we make sure we look at its impact on special populations as well as the baby boomers and what we consider the baby echos, those kids of those baby boomers.

PRESIDENT BUSH STANDS TALL FOR DOMESTIC STEEL INDUSTRY

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

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a moment to applaud President Bush for standing tall in favor of our domestic steel industry. He has, at a very critical moment, stood up for steel. If we have a domestic steel industry in coming decades, I believe it will be because of this courageous action and an administration that was willing to listen to steelworkers, listen to steel producers, and also listen to all other interested parties in order to craft a creative policy. He clearly listened to those who were calling for substantial relief for an industry in crisis. It has been running the risk of being hollowed out by unfair trade practices.

It is obvious that the President carefully weighed the issue. His judicious decision will provide breathing space to the domestic steelworkers and the industry. Enacting tariffs of up to 30 percent for most steel products provides help for those hardest hit by unfavorable conditions in the steel market. This administration has stepped up to the plate for the American steel industry and its workers, something that previous administrations, regrettably, had been unwilling to do.

Without the concrete actions taken by this President, the industry was facing a meltdown. The President recognized that the American steel industry and its workers have done their part in recent years. This is something that critics do not really willingly acknowledge, but the fact is our steel producers have taken dramatic steps to reduce inefficient capacity and modernize operations to become among the most productive steel producers in the world, with as few as one-and-a-half man hours needed per ton of steel produced.

□ 1515

That is an extraordinary transformation of an industry that was very inefficient a few decades ago.

To achieve these advances in productivity, the U.S. steel industry reduced capacity by more than 23 million tons, closed numerous inefficient mills, and significantly cut jobs. The workers have endured their fair share of pain and suffering as the workforce was reduced by hundreds of thousands of workers in an effort to become the most efficient producers of steel. But we all know that when competing with the unfair trading practices of some of our competitors, it was simply not enough.

Let us understand, Mr. Speaker, what the President did was WTO compatible. It was based on remedies approved by the International Trade Commission, and it utilized our 201 process, which the WTO contemplated. While opponents of this 201 action are crying foul, saying the cost will be prohibitive, Mr.

Speaker, allow me to assure Members that their arguments are without substance.

According to a study by Professor Jerry Hausman, an economist at MIT, the assumptions from opponents such as the Consuming Industry's Trade Action Council were fundamentally flawed. Hausman's study, which unlike the CITAC study so often quoted in the media, accurately reflected the current steel market, showed the tariffs would cost the average consumer about \$2 a year and have no negative impact on the U.S. economy. This was a study of stronger remedies than were actually proposed by the International Trade Commission. Hausman's study showed that the section 201 remedies would provide a net benefit of \$9 billion a year to the U.S. economy. Steel constitutes only a small share of the total cost of most products that contain steel, so the cost to the consumer and the costs on a single consumer item would be minimal.

For a typical family car, the increase caused by the imposition of a 40 percent tariff would be about \$60, a 30 percent tariff in the tariff structure proposed by the President would be substantially less. For a refrigerator, the increase would be less than \$3.

Again, I have to congratulate the President for being engaged on these issues, looking past the cannot at the substance, and being concerned about many of the communities we have in places like western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia where people have built a living and built living wages around a steel industry that we need to have in this country for strategic reasons, and if we are going to maintain our industrial base.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has had the courage to take on this tough issue. We need to do more in Congress. We need to look at the issue of legacy costs. We need to look at ways potentially of participating in a global effort to rationalize the industry; but in the end, we can build on this 201 decision, we can build on the President's courage, and working with the administration, we have an opportunity to lay the groundwork for a strong, healthy competitive world-class American steel industry that is allowed to compete on a level playing field.

INTEGRITY ABOVE ALL

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Committee on Resources heard testimony from investigators and from the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife and others in regards to a scheme put forward by several Federal employees to alter a lynx study in the northwestern part of the Nation.

It is very important for us as government employees to maintain the integ-

rity of the process, and a part of that goes clear down to our field employees upon whom we depend very heavily to deliver a product that they are required by protocol to deliver. What do I mean by this? What happened is we had several biologists, Ray Scharpf, Mitch Wainright, Sarah LaMarr and Tim McCracken, Federal employees involved in a lynx study in the northwest part of this Nation. These are professional biologists or associated with professional biologists.

Their job was to go out and determine whether or not there was any evidence of lynx in a forest, to then determine whether or not further investigation was necessary. What these individuals did was go out and planted evidence. They planted evidence, just like a bad cop goes into a house and plants drugs. They planted lynx hair and submitted the lynx hair to the laboratory in hopes that the laboratory would assume that there were now lynx in this area that they had studied.

The average biologist that we have working for the Forest Service or for the Fish and Wildlife are people of high integrity. I cannot think of a biologist that I have met that I have not been fairly confident of the integrity and the standards that they rise to.

But in this case, these Federal employees brought a disgrace upon the United States Government and brought a disgrace upon these agencies by planting evidence and submitting false samples for a survey. Unfortunately, these employees are still employed by the Federal Government. Fortunately, we had a whistle blower. An employee on his last day called in the fact that false samples had been submitted to this survey.

My point in taking the floor today is that I appreciate the Members who attended the hearing today, and I especially appreciate the investigators who went out and came up with these conclusions. We know that these employees knew that what they were doing was wrong and outside their protocol, but they still carried out their actions.

Mr. Speaker, today we had a good hearing about it, and I think we will be able to install some fire walls that will prevent this type of scheme from happening again. In the meantime, it has unfortunately cast a small shadow upon the profession. What we need to do is assure that that profession has no shadow at all because their importance in our studies out there are absolutely critical. We depend on them very much, very much; and we have good reason to depend on them. They are the experts, but integrity comes first and above all.

STOP IMPENDING RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with several of my colleagues, to discuss the most pressing domestic issue of our time, that of Social Security.

Let me first begin by thanking my fellow freshman Democrat, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), for his leadership in organizing with me this Special Order about the impending raid of Social Security. I also want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her leadership and assistance in organizing our colleagues here today.

Our Nation faces incredible challenges; this we all know as we stand united in a war on terrorism. All of our thoughts and prayers are with our men and women in uniform today. This afternoon I stand before this House to talk about one of the most pressing domestic issues of our time, an issue that cannot be ignored even as we fight a war abroad, and that is Social Security.

Around the world as populations of developed countries grow older, the cost of paying for pension and health benefits rise. In the United States, more than 44 million people collect benefits from our Social Security system. Social Security represents one of the most important and depended-upon programs in this Nation's history.

Social Security is a great American success story, having reduced the percentage of poverty among our Nation's retirees from over 50 percent to 11 percent since the program's inception in 1935. Moreover, Social Security is not simply a retirement program; it is also a program that provides disability and survivor's benefits to over 13 million workers and their families.

Last year this House and this country had a 10-year estimated \$5.6 trillion unified surplus, which included \$3 trillion in non-Social Security surplus. But how times can change. In less than a year, \$4 trillion of that surplus is now gone due to tax cuts, the downturn in our economy, and the war effort.

The greatest tragedy is not simply the diminution of the surplus, but also the fact that the proposed budget now before us in this House diverts \$1.4 trillion of the Social Security trust fund and \$556 billion from the Medicare trust fund to pay for spending and new tax cuts.

I have supported and continue to support tax cuts, specific tax cuts, but not tax cuts that undermine our ability to honor our promises and commitments. I support, as do so many Members of this House, a fiscally responsible plan for our Federal budget, a plan that recognizes the current health of the Social Security trust fund, while also recognizing the need in the future to protect it.

Because of the current strength of the trust fund, we have an opportunity before us as a Nation that we will not have too much longer to protect the reserves that will be vital in ensuring the

program's survival for future generations. The question today is when are we going to stop talking about saving the Social Security trust fund and finally do it.

Legislation has been proposed, but no action has been taken. We continue to use duplicitous accounting to hide the real deficits this country faces in the coming years when the largest generation in American history, the baby boomers, begin to retire.

It is hard for me to understand how, in what is obviously the most successful and popular Federal program ever conceived, how it can be subtly cut and raided for short-term convenience. The time has come for us as a Nation and as a House to make the tough decisions to save Social Security for our children and for our children's children.

There is a very real and looming threat that we may not be able to meet all of the promised obligations unless we commit to make the prudent fiscal choices today. As I mentioned, we have been presented with a budget that proposes a spending deficit in the Social Security trust fund of \$1.5 trillion. Before we even begin the debate on long-term solvency of Social Security, I find it irresponsible that the Congress is being asked to force Social Security's obsolescence by raiding the trust fund and risking the fiscal health of a system that has been so successful. When, I ask, are we going to make the hard decisions of financial prudence?

I believe that we can achieve our long-term goals of preserving our Social Security system to prevent our Nation's seniors from falling back into poverty while also updating and reforming Social Security to meet the challenges of our modern era. It is true the baby boomers are rapidly approaching retirement. The oldest will be retiring by 2008, and it is true by 2021, the Social Security system will be taking in less revenue than it pays out in benefits. But as we proved in 1983 and as we can prove again today, we can save a program that has worked so well for so many for so many years, and it is incumbent upon us to make these tough decisions.

As the recent Enron debacle reminds us, it is critical to have a safety net in place, and a solvent one at that, to protect seniors when they retire. As workers across the country have watched their life savings, their 401(k)s lose 24, 35, even 50 percent of their value, and some regrettably have seen their 401(k)s and pensions evaporate altogether, it is critical that Americans know Social Security will be there to ensure that their minimum needs are met.

Mr. Speaker, in the last election perhaps the most used phrase was the Social Security trust fund would always remain in a so-called "lockbox" unable to be touched by the spending desires or tax cuts of some in Congress or of the administration. I do not believe any American argues against making sure that there are adequate resources

to fighting the war on terrorism or defending the home front. However, we cannot allow the Social Security trust fund to become the credit card on which we charge a smorgasbord of new spending for tax cuts.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, today is the day, finally, in which we stand on principle as a Congress to send a clear message to this generation as well as the future generations of retiring workers that there will be, forever, a solvent, secure and dependable public Social Security program in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) to also address this subject.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

I would like to begin by thanking my colleagues and friends, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), for joining me in focusing attention on this critically important issue. Together with a number of our esteemed colleagues, we are declaring that we will not accept a budget that jeopardizes Social Security or Medicare, programs that are essential to my constituents in Rhode Island and to Americans everywhere.

As we consider this year's budget, we have a choice, to preserve Social Security and protect our Nation's elderly from poverty, or divert funds for this program to less critical priorities. To meet the needs of our country's rapidly growing senior population, I choose to prioritize Social Security and Medicare and will fight for a budget that reflects that choice.

The administration's budget, on the other hand, raids \$1.5 trillion of the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, the very fund Congress voted five times to place in a lockbox to ensure its solvency. This choice is unacceptable to me, and it is unacceptable to the two-thirds of recipients who rely on Social Security for the majority of their income and the almost 20 percent who rely on it for their entire income.

Last year, the Congressional Budget Office projected a 10-year non-Social Security surplus of \$3.1 trillion. Just 1 year later, the projection has plunged to a deficit of \$742 billion. The administration uses a series of gimmicks and unrealistic assumptions to disguise the fact that the government will run a much larger deficit than its budget predicts, virtually guaranteeing that the Social Security surplus will disappear over the next decade, leaving 200 million Americans who currently rely on Social Security, or will in the future, with no financial security in their most vulnerable years. A raid on the Social Security Trust Fund today is a promise to cut Social Security tomorrow.

In Rhode Island, Social Security provides a vital lifeline for a significant percentage of the population. Rhode Island ranks fifth in the Nation for the

percentage of residents over 75 and sixth in the Nation for those over 65. In my district alone, 110,000 people rely on Social Security for their livelihood. These Rhode Islanders worry about whether Social Security will continue to be there when they need it, and they are tired of hearing promises from politicians that are not backed up with action.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my Democratic colleagues to fight to preserve Social Security's core structure and ensure that we do not revert to an era of overwhelming poverty among the elderly. We have a choice. I choose America's seniors. I choose a responsible, honest budget that does not sacrifice the most vulnerable among us. I know those Members who join me today have made that same choice. I urge the rest of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. I know the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) has worked hard on these issues over the last few months as well. We appreciate his comments on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) who has also worked passionately on these issues and whose words are always eloquent on this subject. Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I thank the gentleman for allowing us to talk about the important issue of Social Security. I also thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for his efforts. I know that we are all concerned. I also wanted to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), who is not here but I know who also is concerned and who might join us a little later as well as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON).

Let me just indicate that, when it comes to Social Security, it is one of the issues that hits home and it is one of the areas that we forget that, during the time prior to Social Security, we had the largest problems that we had regarding poverty among our seniors. This has been one of the best programs to alleviate poverty among our seniors. So I am pleased to stand today and make some comments as we reach this critical time of reviewing and dealing with the issue of how we respond to the difficulties that we find ourselves in.

As a country, we are often faced with challenging obstacles on our quest to do what is just. The resources we have at our disposal are not infinite, as we all recognize. At these critical moments Americans expect their leaders to stand strong and make decisions that reflect all that makes this country great. Our seniors are facing a dilemma, one that threatens the security and trust they have as they reach retirement. We must fight to preserve our Social Security Trust Fund and honor our country's commitment to our seniors.

The President's budget does not honor the commitment to our seniors

and, in turn, fails all Americans. The President's new budget raids the Social Security surplus to pay for other government programs, not just one year but every year for the next 10 years. Ultimately, the President's plan would spend \$1.5 trillion in Social Security surplus dollars to fund programs other than Social Security. This year alone, \$262 billion in Social Security surplus funds are redirected. In the year 2003, the President's budget projects using \$259 billion. All this money would be taken out of the trust fund and used to fund other programs.

One of the things that bothers me and irritates me is that we dealt with the tax cut and at a time right now when our first response should be in terms of defending our homeland, taking care of the war, we are choosing to respond to all the problems with a tax cut, when we ought to be telling those corporations they also have an obligation to pay for defending this country, and our seniors should not be carrying the burden for that to be occurring.

Now is the time for us to focus on a long-term budget plan that will recover as the economy recovers, returning us to an era where we can fully protect and even strengthen the Social Security Trust Fund. We need to recommit to the idea of Social Security surplus dollars only for Social Security and paying down the national debt. Our national debt now stands at \$3.4 trillion. Paying down the national debt will strengthen the financing of the Social Security Trust Fund over the long term and will allow us to keep our commitment to seniors.

Our seniors deserve better than a piece of paper which attempts to guarantee their rights to receive benefits. That piece of paper means nothing. You can tell that to our veterans who have been told that they should have access to health care and we have not delivered for them. This piece of paper also will mean nothing. What we need to do is do the right thing in our budget, be able to pay down debt and be able to take care of our seniors.

As we look, and I would hope that we just do not look at those that are now receiving those benefits but we reach out and look at those baby boomers that are getting ready to reach that age, because they have also paid into the fund. In addition to them, we all recognize that the kids of the baby boomers, what we call the baby echo, we also need to consider the baby echo.

As we move forward on Social Security, there are special populations, Hispanics, for example, one out of every three Hispanics only have another pension, while one out of two Anglos have other pensions. So there are certain special populations out there that get disproportionately hit and depend on Social Security much more than other populations, especially Hispanic women who are the ones that are hit the hardest and if there is any move to privatize will be in complete jeopardy.

One of the things, and I want to thank the Members that are here to-

night, because we need to talk about this. There is a great deal of talk right now, but what is transpiring and what is occurring already in the budget has a direct impact on our Social Security. I do not care, and I hate to see people come and talk about it and then they vote for those tax cuts that jeopardize not only our economy but the Nation as a whole and our fight in this war on terrorism. We are fighting this war on terrorism on the backs of our seniors.

Every single war we have had, we have always had a tax. When we had the Spanish American War, we had a tax on phones. When we had World War II, we had taxes. This is the only war that we have decided to give tax cuts to the wealthiest at the same time that we burden our seniors by taking their trust fund and their security from them. So it is unfair that we do this, but it is a good opportunity to begin to talk about where we are at.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to say a few words. I know we have some additional colleagues that have come on board. I thank the gentleman for his efforts.

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas for his impassioned words about the future of Social Security and the imperative on all of us, especially those of us with a real commitment to our seniors, and to remember that so many promises to our veterans were made more in rhetoric than in reality and that we should not do the same thing with Social Security. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding and my other colleagues who have commented.

It is easy for folks who have not been in this body over a period of time or who are not old enough to realize and remember some of our folks who have had it so tough. Those of us who understand history remember that Social Security is a retirement system that has really been a bedrock. It is really that foundation that a lot of the other retirement systems were built on. Whether a person has no other plan, whether they have a 401(k), a 201(k) or no K, we always start with Social Security. If you go to a retirement planner and they want to help you if you have money, they still want to start with looking at Social Security, because that is the foundation or bedrock.

It has been that way since President Roosevelt signed it into law in 1935. It has been one of the most successful government initiatives, lifting millions of seniors and working families out of poverty in the 20th century.

But there was a time before Social Security, I remember my history, when seniors suffered in abject poverty. Too many people could not afford the basic human needs of food and shelter, and even some died homeless on the streets, far more than we see today.

The creation of Social Security is one of the landmark achievements, as I have said, of the 20th century. Together, we declared that seniors should not be forced to live in Third World poverty here in America. Together, this Congress, I was not here, but this Congress did it, a previous Congress. The House and Senate, along with the President, said that we are going to make a compact and we are going to make it with our seniors, seniors like my mother and my mother-in-law, that we are going to deal with generation to generation. The younger generation is going to help the older generation, and you are not going to be left in poverty.

My mother-in-law lost her husband when she was, I think, a relatively young lady of 59. My dad lost his life early on. People forget the survivor benefit that the wives tap into. Yes, there is a disparity now in what women draw because they are not in the workforce as long, but there is that provision to make it available. You cannot buy it with any other insurance. Congress in my opinion does not have the right to break that contract.

There is no question that Social Security is facing a serious challenge. The system has been deteriorating over recent years in terms of money available. But we made a lot of progress in the 1990s when we had a full economy, we had a growing budget, we had money available. It seems to me I remember last year that we were talking about having surpluses as far as the eye could see. What a difference a year makes. Now we are looking at deficits as far as the eye can see. But over the next few decades, we must act and we must act to make sure that it is secure, that it is safe. Otherwise, we will not be holding up our end of that compact.

There are those, including the people who served on the President's commission, who feel that privatizing Social Security is the answer to this problem. I respectfully disagree. Last year, when the President appointed his commission on Social Security, that commission, I think, was stacked and stacked with members, every one, who wanted to privatize it.

□ 1545

Now, if you want to privatize, that is one thing; but do not do it to the folks without letting the people involved be involved in it. There should have been on that commission beneficiaries. There should have been minorities on it, there should have been women, there should have been seniors. In the end, the commission offered only three flawed plans to privatize Social Security and failed to provide any kind of plan to restore the solvency of the system.

In that regard, I cannot support any privatization plan that would jeopardize the retirement security of our seniors and working families, because for many families in America, that is the only security they have. The recent

Enron scandal clearly demonstrates that we cannot allow the retirement security of our working Americans to become the victims of unrestrained corporate greed and mismanagement.

Social Security was designed to be a safety net, a safety net, and a compact between generations, as I said earlier, not a privatized vehicle of massive wealth for some and massive poverty for others.

Some would say, well, you know, look at what the stock market has done. Look at those who had 401(k)s last year and 201(k)s this year, and some of them may have zero(k)s if they have it in the wrong stock. That is just absolutely not what Social Security was meant to be; and there are many problems, in my opinion, with privatizing Social Security.

First, if you take money out of the trust fund to put in private accounts, then you weaken the system. One of the plans offered by the President's commission would remove \$1.5 trillion, that is with a T, from the trust fund over 10 years.

Privatization also means benefit cuts. Another of the commission's plans would have reduced the benefits promised to future retirees by as much as 46 percent. Every privatization plan that I have seen thus far has what is called a "clawback" provision. That means in a privatized system beneficiaries will not receive both the full value of their private accounts and, along with that, their full Social Security benefit, so you lose something. That is not the commitment that was made.

In addition, a system based upon individual accounts would also disproportionately hurt women because they would suffer from low account deposits and likely lose their spousal benefits, because, for a lot of women, that is how they step up to higher incomes. Minorities would be literally short-changed because private accounts would erode the progressivity of the system. Finally, the transitional costs associated with privatization puts the system solvency and the retirement security of those who depend on it at risk at a much more rapid pace.

The majority in this House now proposes to issue what are called certificates to Social Security recipients. I call them sham certificates. That reminds me last year they also sent out letters, the administration did, to folks and said you are going to get a tax cut, \$300 or \$600. I held a town hall meeting a little over a month after those letters went out and this lady came in and she was quite upset. She had been expecting that \$600, she and her husband were. They did not tell her you had to pay so much in income taxes. They said you are going to get the check. She got \$3 and some change. She lost her job and had to sell her car to keep her family together.

This Congress has a responsibility not to play charades and sham games, not to be playing gotcha and ideology.

We have a responsibility to do the people's business. People who draw a Social Security check do not want games being played. They want their check, they want their money, and they want that contract and commitment to be there. People count on their Social Security benefits too, and these certificates would only be worth no more than the paper they are written on, because if the other stuff is not worth anything, it is sort of like the locked box. You know, you can lock a box, but what happened to the locked box? It is about having the integrity to tell people the truth and then following through and doing it.

We can find something better to do with the \$10 billion we are talking about using to send worthless certificates. Folks in my district learned the hard way to be skeptical when they are promised something that they know does not come through.

I, like my other colleagues who have been on the floor this evening, am willing to work with anyone in good faith to strengthen the bedrock that is Social Security; but we really must put aside partisan gimmicks and ideological differences, like certificates that are not worth the paper they are written on, or privatization plans that only make Social Security budgetary problems worse. We really ought to have a major study, if we are really serious about doing what we ought to do for the people, and bring the people to the table.

I was really disappointed last year that no one from this body was on the commission. If you are going to get something done, you ought to have Members of Congress involved who ultimately are going to have to be involved in the process. I urge all my colleagues in this House to get serious about Social Security reform if we are going to do it, because the time is here.

I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for putting together this Special Order this afternoon. This is an important issue. It is important not just to the people who are now drawing Social Security; it is important to a lot of folks who ultimately are going to be drawing it. But, more importantly, it is important to the young people who are paying into it. They have a right to know that we are going to keep that commitment and that contract that has been made over generations to them as they pay in. And it has to get beyond gimmicks, and who has got the best idea to play gotcha with or get ready for the next election.

It is about good policy, not good politics. It is about doing what is right for our seniors, people like my mother and mother-in-law and their friends and others like them all across America who depend on Social Security every month. If the stock market is up, they get their check. If the stock market is down, they get their check. They do not worry about where the stock market is. They know that the United States Government stands four square

behind the commitment it made, and we as Members of this Congress have that same solemn obligation that Members who have stood here before us had, and we cannot drop the ball now.

I thank the gentleman for putting together this Special Order and allowing me a few minutes to participate in it.

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his well-informed comments, and I also appreciate the fact that he brought up the ill-conceived nature of sending certificates to millions of seniors and Americans out there, certificates that provide no new rights and are not an enforcement mechanism for any existing rights, all at the cost of more than \$10 billion, all of this in a year when our budgets are strapped and so many very meritorious projects are going to have to go unfunded and left on the drawing room table. So I thank the gentleman for his comments and thank him for being here this afternoon as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to someone who is equally impassioned about the subject of Social Security, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON) for bringing us together for this very important discussion and also want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) for doing such a fine job in simplifying what could be a complicated debate.

I wanted to add my words this afternoon to the very important issue of Social Security, probably the premier program of the last century, that helped lift one-third of the Nation out of poverty. Even today, if you think about many of our seniors, certainly women, the majority receive checks in a month that average maybe around \$550, \$580 per month. Social Security for them is not pocket change; it is a lifeline. Without Social Security and Medicare, they simply could not survive.

So you would think America, during this period of the stunning collapse of Enron, would have learned an important lesson, and that certain Members of this Congress who are trying to tinker around with Social Security would have learned an important lesson, and that is that the vagaries of the market and the private sector's penchant for gambling with other people's money is no substitute, can never be a substitute, for the rock-solid guarantee of Social Security, an insurance program and a disability program. Any one of us, any one of our family members, can be struck by a disability. Social Security is the social safety net for this country.

Yet what we see in the Bush administration's proposal in the wake of Enron is not retirement security, but retirement insecurity. In fact, the lockbox that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) referenced, where

we all promised we would not touch the Social Security trust fund, in that in fact that trust fund would be there to pay dollars, the billions of dollars to our seniors across this country this year, next year, and as the baby boom generation retires, what the Bush administration is actually doing is taking these dollars and giving them away; and it is giving them away by the billions.

How is that actually happening? It is happening because this trust fund is being borrowed from now to pay tax rebates to some of the wealthiest and most profitable corporations in our country, not just this year, but over the next 10 years.

If you think about who is getting the benefit, let us take a look at Enron. If you look at the tax proposals that were passed here in this House, which I did not support, what they essentially meant was that we are taking money from the trust fund, and we are giving it to companies like Enron.

Enron, unless we stop it, is going to be getting rebates, rebates that basically are transfers from the trust fund which are the accumulated savings of the American people, taken out of every worker's check, and put there for their parents or grandparents. Those dollars are being transferred, not by the thousands, not even by the millions, but by the billions, which is the amount that is in the trust fund; and if you take Enron, for example, just in the years we are serving here, the first 3 years they probably will get \$350 million in rebates.

Guess where that comes from? It comes from the one source of accumulated savings that the American people have, and that is the Social Security trust fund. So my aunt in Toledo and maybe your grandmother in Chicago, those savings that are there are being transferred because of consolidated accounting.

The Republican Party has invaded the lockbox that we promised would be there in perpetuity. Overall, the numbers show that the Congressional Budget Office projected a 10-year non-Social Security surplus of \$3.1 trillion; and now, just 1 year later, that projection has plunged to a deficit of \$742 billion, almost \$1 trillion. So the surplus that had existed technically in the annual budgets has been turned almost overnight into a deficit, and the borrowing is continuing from the Social Security trust fund.

Now, Enron just does not get a little bit. I mean, \$350 million in rebates, that is one-third of \$1 billion. None of my relatives can even imagine how much money that really is. But that is what is going on here. And if there is any program that has marked the Democratic Party, and in fact it is one of the reasons I am a Democrat, is because of this Social Security program. It meant the difference for our grandmother between the poor house and being able to live out her final years in dignity. It was very meager, but at

least it was something. It was something. To see this program violated for the likes of a chief executive officer like Ken Lay is absolutely abhorrent to me.

If I look at other corporations that are benefiting and the money coming out of the Social Security trust fund and going to them, we can look at General Electric, because General Electric is one of the companies that is not just going to get millions. Enron is going to get millions; General Electric is going to get billions out of the Social Security trust fund.

With the changes in the alternative minimum tax, it means that all of these little tax breaks and loopholes that the very well-paid accountants from companies like Arthur Andersen can find for these large corporations, they are going to get rebates through the Social Security trust fund, which sounds incredible because we were supposed to have put it in a lockbox and not touched it, and yet it is being drawn down to give money back to really the wealthiest people in our country and the wealthiest interests.

□ 1600

And they are not having trouble. These companies like General Electric, they are not going bankrupt. Now, Enron went bankrupt because of wrongdoing, criminal wrongdoing, it appears. And many of these other corporations, take Chevron, take Texaco, we are not talking about pennies, we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. The Social Security Trust Fund is being invaded to give nearly \$200 million to Texaco, three-quarters of a billion dollars to Chevron. Think about that. Think about the transfer of wealth that is occurring.

So some people are saying, well, let a senior family or someone who is going to be of retirement age someday, let them put money aside. We just have to encourage responsibility in the American people. How do we do that on minimum wage? How do we do that when we do not earn a minimum wage? How do we do that when we have no health benefits?

Yesterday I sat in the Committee on Veterans Affairs thinking about this Special Order tonight and the fact that we were taking money out of Social Security Trust Fund to give it to some of the wealthiest corporations in the country, and we have a proposal from the Bush administration to charge veterans for prescription drugs. Now, we have always had a \$2 copayment for various prescriptions, and many of our veterans average 10 prescriptions per month. What the Bush administration is doing is raising that copayment to \$7 per prescription which, per month, would be \$70, with a cap annually of over \$850 for prescription drugs for veterans.

I am sitting there and thinking, well, is this not interesting. We hear all of these patriotic speeches on behalf of our military; and yet, when it comes to

serving those who have put their life on the line, then, as they are very elderly and unable to fend for themselves, they say, now you have to pay additional money for prescription drugs. Is that what Lincoln had in mind when he said we would care for the veteran, his widow, his orphan? Is that the promise? Was it a false promise that was made?

So what we see happening is, why are we charging for prescription drugs for veterans, for those who have created and preserved the freedom that we have here in this country? Why are we charging them? Because we have to borrow. We have to take the money that should be placed into paying for those pharmaceuticals for those who have served our Nation. We are giving it away. We are giving it away to Enron in rebates, we are giving it away to General Motors in rebates, we are giving it away to Chevron in rebates, we are giving it away to IBM in rebates. That is where the money is going.

So I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON), I am really very pleased that he has taken the leadership in pulling this together today, because this truly is; this is not a tangential issue for the Democratic Party, this is the core of the Democratic Party.

I was here in 1983 when we saved Social Security. It was the key issue in the election of 1992, along with the recession. We were able to reconstitute a healthy Social Security Trust Fund which served us well into this millennium. I am certainly one Member that will do nothing to weaken the system.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Democrat. I am proud to be holding the Social Security Trust Fund in our hands, and we literally do, and preserving it for the American people for this generation and generations to come.

I thank the gentleman again for giving this time this evening and urge him on in his efforts to inform the American public and to re-create that lockbox permanently.

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio for her comments today. She is quite right in saying that, if the American public is wise, the upcoming election will be about this important issue, the most successful social program the United States has ever had. A social program that once, in 1935 when seniors were the poorest group in America, has lifted them out of poverty, so that those people in retirement no longer have to worry about making basic ends meet. Indeed, the election and this entire debate about the future of Social Security is between those people who would preserve this important program and those people who, in the name of reform, seek to dismantle it.

It is so important that people watching this today and those people who are across America and are going to be casting their ballots recognize the importance of Social Security. It is not as

a 401(k) program is, it is not as a pension program is at a private business. Those programs are important; and I in Congress, along with my colleagues, have voted to make those more accessible to our retirees. We should encourage people to invest and to save on their own. But the genius of Social Security has been always that it is a program below which we allowed no one to fall, a safety net, below which no one was allowed to fall. We can make good on the promise of retirement and the harvest of a bountiful life.

SOCIAL SECURITY: AMERICA'S MOST IMPORTANT GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate being here today to continue the discussion on this important issue, the issue of retirement security for America's seniors.

There has been a lot of discussion about the need to have an honest debate. I think that is very important. But we cannot have an honest debate when we have one side who is just criticizing with no plan, and our side who has been working diligently to develop a plan to guarantee benefits for today's seniors as well as to improve the Social Security system and guarantee even higher benefits for the next generation.

It is important that we recognize that Social Security is America's most important government program. It is a sacred promise to the American people. It is a Social Security contract that we cannot ignore.

Social Security is a plan that Republicans believe in, and we think that it cannot only make Americans free and secure, but it can secure our future indefinitely if we plan correctly. But we cannot have an honest debate, again, with a side that is full of critics, but no plans.

The Democrats at this point have put forward no plan to improve and save Social Security in the future. This is something we must challenge every day.

About two-thirds of retired Americans get their primary source of income from Social Security. It is too important to leave to chance. So our purpose here today is to talk about Social Security as it is and how it needs to be, how we can guarantee the benefits for today's seniors and improve the program for tomorrow.

In order for that to happen, there has to be more truth about the current Social Security program. It will not do to give a lot of statistics and a lot of misrepresentations.

We just heard the gentlewoman speaking of money coming out of the trust fund to go to corporations. This simply is not true. We want to refute

these things today and tell Americans the truth about Social Security.

The first thing we need to do before we begin the debate is to stop this shameful frightening of senior citizens. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) was on the floor last night and talked about a secret plan to reduce benefits after the election. They say we do not need to issue a written guarantee to seniors. We must issue a written guarantee if the other side continues to say that this plan is in jeopardy, that their benefits are in jeopardy. One moment they are saying it is a rock-solid investment; the next moment they are saying that someone is going to take it away from seniors.

We have a plan to tell every senior citizen in writing that their benefits are guaranteed. The current Social Security program will meet the promised benefits of today's senior citizens. They do not need to worry that any reform plan will change that. The President has said that he will consider no plan that reduces benefits for current seniors or those near retirement. The plans introduced by Republicans, none of them reduce benefits for seniors. The plan that the Democratic side has, which is no plan, means that we will continue with the program that we know is going bankrupt.

We need to tell people the truth. The first part of that truth is to reassure our seniors that no one will reduce their benefits.

The next thing we need to do is to clarify for today's workers the true nature of this Social Security system. The other side has just suggested that it is the only accumulated savings program for many Americans. Yes, it is the only savings program for many Americans. The problem is that, even though over 12 percent of everything workers make goes into Social Security for their retirement, not one penny of that is saved for their retirement. All of that money is spent on current retirees, paying down debt, or other government programs. The current Social Security system is not set up in a way that allows it to accumulate savings.

So, again, we work all of our lives. Many Americans, 20 percent, who do not live over 65, lose everything they put into Social Security, because there is no accumulated savings.

We need to guarantee benefits to today's seniors, but for today's workers, we need to tell the Social Security Administration something very simple and something Americans already think that we are doing for them. We tell the Social Security Administration to start saving some of the money that workers are putting into the Social Security program. We do not need to privatize anything. The same Social Security system, the same structure, the same payroll withholding, can continue just as it is. The only difference is we begin to save some of that money for the future retirement of today's workers. We can do that without

compromising in any way the security and benefits of today's seniors.

There are several reform plans on the Republican side, and I want to talk about one today that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and myself have introduced here in the House. This is a plan that answers many of the questions that were posed by the other side, who has no plan. This plan is called the Social Security Ownership and Guarantee Plan.

Let us talk about the words "ownership" and "guarantee." Today's Social Security program, while it may be the only savings program for most Americans, saves no money for seniors. We need to start saving and allow individuals to own their Social Security retirement account. At the same time, we need to tell every American that no American will ever receive less from Social Security under the DeMint-ArmeY plan than they would have received under the existing plan. They have a choice not to leave the current plan at all. So they can stay where they are, or they can begin to save some of the money that is coming out of their paycheck for their retirement.

What will happen over the next 20, 30, 40 years is my children and folks in their 20s and 30s will begin to accumulate large sums of money in a personal Social Security account that guarantees them that they will have at least as good or better benefits than the current system. So instead of retiring after a whole life of putting money into Social Security, under the DeMint-ArmeY plan, Americans will retire with hundreds of thousands of dollars in a Social Security savings account that is theirs. It can be turned into a monthly income and can be used to pass on to their children and grandchildren.

We need to recognize that for many poor working Americans the only opportunity for them to leave something to the next generation is from Social Security, and the way Social Security is set up today, all of one's benefits die with them. They have no opportunity to pass along anything that one puts into Social Security.

The DeMint-ArmeY plan allows individuals to save, to invest in safe investments, in government bonds, and to have the money they need for retirement and money to pass on to the next generation.

Perhaps even more importantly, the DeMint-ArmeY plan recognizes that we need to set aside even more of the income for the working poor so that they will have enough when they retire to have their own income as well as money to leave. The DeMint-ArmeY plan allows folks at the lower income level to keep a larger part of their payroll withholding. They do not take out any more taxes. The taxes stay exactly the same. But they put up to 8 percent of their total salary into the savings account so that, when they retire, they will have something of their own.

This is a plan that helps the poor, it helps seniors, it helps America. Because what changes with this DeMint-

Armed plan is, when the next generation arrives at retirement, they are no longer dependent on the government for their income.

□ 1615

They do not have to listen every election that somebody is going to take their income from them, or there is some secret plan to reduce benefits. They will have their own retirement account, their own retirement income. Many Americans will be wealthy from the Social Security system.

There are a lot of folks trying to frighten us today, to say if this money is saved that somehow they will not be as secure. We need to remind Americans that if they have no savings and they are totally dependent on politicians to give them a retirement income, they are not secure at all. In fact, they will continue to be frightened and manipulated, like we have heard today.

It is critically important that we talk about the truth, that we debate real plans for Social Security reform, and that we do not continue the charade of the other side that nothing is wrong and nothing has to be changed. If we do not change Social Security, within 30 years benefits will be cut nearly 30 percent. Those cuts will continue, along with increases in payroll taxes over the years. That will happen in about 2038.

Social Security is a promise of the future. This is not a problem that we cannot solve. In fact, it is an incredible opportunity for us as a Congress to reshape the Social Security program in a way that makes people not only secure but makes them free and independent in retirement. It gives the poor an opportunity to save and pass along wealth to the next generation. This is the opportunity that we need to give to the American people during the debate on Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, not only for yielding to me, but for his leadership on the issue of Social Security reform in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has a responsibility to inform the American people that Social Security faces serious financial problems in the not-too-distant future. We cannot afford to sit idly by while our Social Security system continues to mirror corporations that have become insolvent, like ones that have made their way onto the front pages of America's newspapers.

At present today, there are four workers supporting every one beneficiary on Social Security. By the year 2020, that ratio will dwindle to two workers for every one beneficiary. Americans will either have to endure enormous payroll tax increases or support systemic reform.

I am here today, along with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and other colleagues, to stand

in support of systemic and visionary reform that even includes the idea of personal retirement accounts. Mr. Speaker, the personal accounts proposals that are being debated in Congress today are completely voluntary, and, I would offer and emphasize, completely safe. Investments would be made in highly diversified companies plus government and corporate bonds, a popular pension plan among many Members of Congress.

If it is an option for those of us in this Chamber, it should certainly be an option for American taxpayers. Let us give workers real ownership of their Social Security by making it free from the influence and political control of Congress.

But Mr. Speaker, let us move on to some of the myths from the left that are hovering above our Social Security system today, and it makes this Special Order and this time on the House floor so urgent and so important as a beginning in this debate.

Myth number one: the President's budget raids Social Security. I offer that this is absolutely false. The President has proposed a budget well suited to this unique moment in American history when our country is at war, our homeland and our citizens have been attacked, and our economy is weak. This budget is an appropriate blueprint to craft our response to the challenges before us. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Social Security trust fund continues to grow under the President's budget. It provides for every penny of current law benefits and full cost-of-living adjustments.

Myth number two: last year's tax cuts in some way threatened Social Security. Again, Mr. Speaker, this is entirely false. Last year's tax cuts have not affected the Federal Government's ability to pay benefits, and the trust fund remains unchanged.

Some of those in this debate can and will continue to point to tax cuts as a threat to Social Security, but the truth lies in the simple demographics of an aging population. Eliminating tax cuts will not improve worker-retiree ratios. It will not encourage seniors to delay retirement. It will not encourage workers to save more for their own retirement.

Myth number three: Social Security reform will somehow erode the trust fund. In fact, that, again, Mr. Speaker, is false. Research indicates that the creation of the proposals for personal retirement accounts actually increase benefits for retirees well above what the current Social Security system could ever imagine to pay. Without these accounts, today's workers could face as much as a 30 percent cut in benefits when they retire.

The research is accurate, and the myths have been dispelled. We as a body must now move in the direction of offering a plan; and the Republicans, Mr. Speaker, have a plan. We will save Social Security from its bankruptcy and the course upon which it is headed

in the next 20 years while guaranteeing that current retirees receive their promised benefits.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely imperative, and I extol the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and others in this Chamber who have said we as leaders in this country in both political parties should make an affirmative statement to the American people that we will meet our obligations in the Social Security system; that what people expect to receive from Social Security in income and in benefits they will receive, and no less. I believe the time has come for us to make this imperative statement clear to the American people, and perhaps this Congress will do so this year.

This leadership and this majority will ensure that workers are allowed to earn higher benefits than under current law, as we have before. We will give workers ultimately real ownership of Social Security when reform finally arrives. We will enable younger workers to build wealth through voluntary participation in their own personally owned accounts that they can pass along to their heirs. We will preserve the important disability and survivors components of the program. We will reduce the financial burden on children and grandchildren. We will improve the rate of return for all beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, the Good Book tells us that if anyone does not provide for his relatives, and especially for his immediate family, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever. I submit today that we must, in this country, make it more possible for more Americans to not only provide for themselves but to provide for their families.

We do that through strengthening Social Security today. We do that through strengthening the people's confidence in the commitments that this government has made to Social Security, that we will meet those commitments, that income and benefits from Social Security will remain firm, and we will also keep the promise of Social Security alive, Mr. Speaker, by being a reform Congress; by recognizing that if we simply allow Social Security to continue along its way, that it is headed for the shoals.

But if we will step in with the leadership that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) has provided in this Congress, that our majority leader continues to provide, and that other visionary leaders in this Congress have offered in this area, I am altogether confident that there will be one bright, shining day when we will have a Social Security system in America that builds wealth rather than dependency; a Social Security system in America that engenders confidence about those retirement years for all Americans; a bright, shining future when some day, Mr. Speaker, perhaps Americans would not look longingly to the Capitol dome hoping that their retirement security

would be in place, but rather, they could look to themselves. They could look to their own retirement accounts. They could look to a system, and they could look to statements with their own resources, and be confident on their future because of the resources that they have placed in that trust.

It is a vision, it is a long-term vision; but it begins, I submit today, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) has laid out so eloquently, it begins with a promise. It begins with strengthening the commitment that this Congress has to maintaining the income and benefits of Social Security at the level of expectation that Americans have today.

Once we reiterate this Congress's and this government's commitment to Social Security, once we have laid the foundation of confidence with the American people, then we will lead with reform that will ensure not only Social Security for our parents but also for our peers and for their children and for our grandchildren for years to come through much-needed reforms.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is so refreshing to hear someone dispel the myths; to talk about the need to guarantee benefits, to talk about real ideas that cannot only guarantee the benefits for today's seniors, but to guarantee that no American will ever receive less from Social Security than is promised by the current system.

This is leadership, and I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for being here today and helping us dispel the myths. We no longer need to listen to the fear tactics, to the manipulation.

Surely the other side does not want us to issue a guarantee because they do not want seniors to know that their benefits are safe, because in the upcoming election, Mr. Speaker, they want to run these ads that tell the seniors that someone is going to take their Social Security from them.

I can guarantee today's seniors that as long as President Bush is in the White House and the Republicans are leading the Congress, that no American will ever receive less from Social Security than is promised by the current system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for doing this Special Order.

If we can convey one message, it is that Social Security has real problems. I think the temptation in a political election year is for anyone that comes up with suggestions on how to solve Social Security, how to keep it solvent, to criticize them, to maybe win some points from seniors by scaring seniors that their retirement benefits might be in jeopardy with any change.

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of charts. This chart represents the complications of the increased cost of Med-

icaid, Medicare, and Social Security. So as we see, the percentage of the total gross economy of the country, which is now around 7 percent, is going to go to about 15 percent in terms of the cost of these particular programs. Trillions of dollars does not have a great deal of meaning for most Americans, and probably not for most Members of Congress; but the unfunded liability of Social Security right now in today's dollars is \$9 trillion. That means we would have to take \$9 trillion, put it in a bank account with a return of approximately 4 percent to accommodate the money that we are going to need over and above the FICA tax, the money coming in, the Social Security tax, to pay Social Security taxes in the future. That is if we do nothing.

So if there is one message that the gentleman has been so successful in conveying, and many of us have tried to pitch in, it is the fact that the cost of doing nothing is so much greater than trying to reform the program and get a better return on some of those dollars. This just represents the portion of Social Security as it consumes the current budget. So it is one of the biggest expenditures; 21 percent of everything that government spends is now spent on Social Security.

Here is the danger. The danger is not doing anything, and we will wait until the last minute and then increase taxes and reduce benefits. That is what this country has done several times since 1934, because this Congress, in very emotional, vulnerable areas such as Social Security, waits until the last minute. They wait until it is almost a catastrophe, running out of money, and then they do something. Here is the something that they have been doing is raising taxes.

□ 1630

On this chart you see in 1940 the rate was 2 percent on the first \$3,000; and the maximum tax was, of course, \$60 a year. By 1960 they raised the rate again to 6 percent on the first \$4,800. In 1980 they raised it to 10.16 percent on the first \$25,900; and in 2000 it is 12.4 percent. In 2000 it was on a base rate of 76,200. Today it is 86,000. So it is 12.4 percent of the 86,000. So as the number of workers has declined in relation or in the ratio to the number of seniors, then you charge those existing workers more and more.

So we have got that kind of demography facing this country. In 1940 there were about 40 workers for every one retiree. Today there are three workers for every one retiree. And they expect in the next 25 to 30 years it will be two workers for every one retiree. The tremendous burden on those two workers. And what we are suggesting now, nobody is suggesting privatization, privatization is a word that the demagogues use to try to scare people.

Every plan that I have seen by every Republican, including some of those that are joined in by Democrats, have

a Social Security program that gives the protection of benefits to current and future retirees. The challenge is can we get a little better return than no return at all on the money. Right now, with a little extra surplus coming from the Social Security tax, it is put into government bonds; and when interest accrues, another IOU is written but there is no real money. So in 2016 when the revenues coming in from Social Security tax are less than what is sent out to pay benefits, look, everybody needs to know there is no account with your individual name on it as an American worker that gives you any entitlement to Social Security benefits; and that should be obvious over the past years when we have simply increased taxes and reduced benefits.

If we can get some of that in individual workers' names and limit it to certain kinds of indexed accounts, that is what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) does in his bill, that is what I do in my bill, then you own it. If you die before you are 65, then it goes into your estate because it is your money. Right now if you die before you are 65, you get \$225-or-something death benefits.

Can we get a better return on the money? And how dangerous is it to keep putting this bill off? I chaired the bipartisan Social Security Task Force last session, and I introduced four Social Security bills since I came here in 1993 that were to keep Social Security solvent. Every term, every session over the last 9 years that I have introduced a bill, it had to be a little more drastic. And if we continue putting this off, then it is going to be that much more drastic later on.

It is going to cost a lot of money to pay benefits. We are going to pay benefits. The question is can we save almost 20 percent of the cost by changing the programs now and getting some real return on that investment.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for taking the time to understand the problems with the Social Security system and to tell the truth about it. But even more importantly, for taking the time to develop a plan to make Social Security better in the future. That is what has been missing in this debate, truth about the current program and a plan to make Social Security better in the future and to guarantee the benefits. That is what we need to bring to this honest debate that has been requested by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is a plan in truth.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman. I want to thank the Speaker. I want to thank everyone here for recognizing the importance of the Social Security program, but to also recognize that it is Republicans that have a plan to guarantee the future of Social Security. Our head is not in the sand as the other side's is. We are not denying that there is a problem.

We are recognizing the problem, but we are developing plans to guarantee

that no American will ever receive less from Social Security than is promised by the current program. And we want to put that in writing, and we want it put it down in a plan that will last.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMINT. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Just to emphasize the point, we talk about the magic of compound interest. I paid my grandson to come in and paint the fence. And I said, Look, will you put this \$36 in a Roth IRA? He said, Geez, Grandpa, I want to put this in an account and buy a car with it when I am old enough. So I explained to him, Look, if you put this \$36 in an IRA it doubles almost every 8 years. So I figured it out and projected it out so at age 65 he had \$70,000 that that money would be worth because of the magic of compound interest; and if he waited another 7 years to age 72, then it would be worth \$140,000. He said, Gosh, Grandpa, that is good; but could I just put most of it towards the car and a little bit towards the Roth IRA?

So the magic of compound interest is what can make today's workers that are modest or median income retire as rich people. That is what we are trying to do is having something more than just Social Security but promise the Social Security, but then have the opportunity with the magic of compound interest to have retirees gain even more in their retirement years.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, although I do think he should have paid his grandson more than \$36. But he makes an excellent point. If Americans knew that even the poorest worker, if we start now for those in their 20's and 30's, they will all have several hundred thousand dollars that is theirs that can be turned into a monthly income for their own retirement security, but even more importantly, to have some additional income for their retirement, to pay off a house, to help children or grandchildren. We need to help the poor of America develop wealth that they can pass on to the next generation and Social Security is that only opportunity.

We have plans to help them save more and at the same time guarantee that their retirement income will always be as much or more than the current Social Security system.

This has been a great start to the discussion. You will hear more from the Republicans because it is the Republicans that have the plans, and it is the Republicans that will tell you the truth.

SOCIAL SECURITY, WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH, AND PREVENTING RECIDIVISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TIBERI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I have been intrigued with some of the discussion that has taken place relative to Social Security and what we need to do with it. And I count myself as one of those who believe that our Social Security system, which was actually developed and generated by Democrats, a Democratic President, of course, undergirded much of it; and, of course, Democrats want to preserve and protect it.

I am one of those who believe that at all costs we must, in fact, protect and preserve our Social Security system as we have known it. But that is not what I really came to talk about this evening. As a matter of fact, I have two things that I am going to discuss.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Last month we praised our forefathers as we observed President's Day, and this month is Women's History Month. And as it gets underway, I want to recognize some of the outstanding women; women who dared to be first; women who strove for equality and social justice; women who not only broke ceilings but shattered spheres in pursuit of rights that should have been inalienable at the time, and whose contributions continue to pave the way and continue to inspire others.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, as you know I am from Chicago, a city that is rich in women pioneers and trailblazers in both the past and the present. One such woman that I would like to mention is Ida B. Wells, who founded the first black female suffrage club in Illinois as well as the first kindergarten in a black neighborhood.

Ida B. Wells was born in 1862, was a slave for the first 6 months of her life, and spent the remainder of her life fighting for civil and economic rights for African Americans and for others. Declaring that one had better die fighting against injustice than die like a dog or rat in a trap, Wells crusaded against lynching and segregation until her death in 1931.

Another outstanding Chicagoan and another outstanding pioneer in the suffrage movement was labor activist Sylvia Woods, who was a pioneer in civil rights, a woman that I got an opportunity to actually know. During World War II she held the union organization drive at Bendix Aviation. She spent much of the 1940's organizing the United Auto Workers Local 330 and formulating the UAB resolution against sex discrimination. Following the war, she assisted women who were laid off in Chicago and co-founded the National Alliance Against Racism.

However, at present there are future history makers who are also making a tremendous impact on the lives of citizens in Chicago and throughout the Nation. Exemplary individuals from today include Reverend Addie Wyatt, Reverend Willie Taplin Barrow, Dr. Johnnie Coleman, and Ms. Mamie Bone, as well as a number of others.

Reverend Addie Wyatt has the distinction of having had active involve-

ment with the three major movements of the 20th century: labor, civil rights, and women's rights. Her leadership roles in labor were the international vice president of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union, and she broke ground as the first female local union president of the United Packing House Food and Allied Workers and as international vice president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America.

One of the most eloquent spokespersons I have ever heard, Addie Wyatt also played a founding role in Operation Breadbasket and Operation PUSH, as well as her work with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., illustrates her commitment to civil rights.

Her involvement in the women's movement has also generated a number of worthy achievements. Reverend Wyatt is a founding member of the National Organization of Women and in the early days was appointed by Eleanor Roosevelt to serve on the Labor Legislation Committee of the Commission on the Status of Women. During her distinguished career, she advised Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Carter and other important leaders on these causes.

She and her husband, Reverend Claude Wyatt, currently serve as pastors emeritus of the Vernon Park Church of God in Chicago, which they helped to develop and which stands as a monument to their tremendous religious and spiritual leadership.

Reverend Dr. Willie Taplin Barrow is the co-chair of Rainbow/PUSH Coalition. She is well known for breaking barriers in a male-dominated profession. She is an ordained minister and on the Governor's Committee on the Status of Women in Illinois. She is a member of the Democratic National Committee, is a dynamic preacher and inspirational speaker, and travels all over the world motivating, stimulating, activating people to realize their own potential for not only self-sufficiency, but the potential that they have to help shape and mold the society of which they are a part.

Almost any Saturday morning you can encounter Reverend Barrow at Operation PUSH where she co-leads that organization along with its founders, the Reverend Jessie Jackson.

Another fine citizen of Chicago is Reverend Dr. Johnnie Coleman, sometimes referred to as the first lady of the religious community. She is the founding minister of Christ Universal Church where 4,000 people go to hear her words of wisdom and healing every Sunday.

□ 1645

To her credit, Reverend Coleman has several organizations in Chicago; the Universal Foundation for Better Living, Incorporated, the Johnnie Coleman Institute, and the Johnnie Coleman Academy, as well as a book of teachings entitled "Open Your Mind and Be Healed."

Also, an outstanding minister is Reverend Jennie Pettis, who is the founder and pastor of the Family Altar Evangelistic Church. In a relatively short period of time, the Reverend Pettis and her parishioners have built a brand new edifice, which they expect to inhabit during the spring of this year.

Chicago is a magnificent city, a tremendous city. I represent a Congressional District that is one of the most diverse in the Nation. It includes downtown Chicago, the Gold Coast, the Magnificent Mile, outstanding museums and universities, 23 hospitals, 4 medical centers, 4 medical schools, almost anything that one can imagine. But also in that landscape, of course, I represent Chinatown, I represent Greek Town, I represent what is called Little Italy, a great Italian community, and I represent the Ukrainian Village.

I also represent a large percentage of the public housing in Chicago, more than 68 percent; and as the chairperson of the Central Advisory Council, Ms. Mamie Bone fights for the residents of public housing. She currently serves as a member of the CHA Board of Commissioners and continues to champion and continues to work and advocate for the employment, security and safety of public housing residents.

Other individuals who provide leadership in public housing are people like Deverra Beverly, who is the chairman of the local advisory council at the Abta Public Housing Complex. Also, Ms. Cora Moore at Cabrini-Green, and Ms. Carolyn Willingham. Both provide tremendous leadership in the Cabrini-Green complex. Ms. Maner Wiley and Lorena Nellum at the Hilliard Homes. Ms. Gloria Williams at the Nazariah Safe Haven. Ms. Brenda Bolden in the Lawndale area. Ms. Cora Dillard in Robert Taylor. Ms. Deborah Martin and Ms. Mildred Dennis in Robert Taylor. Ms. Mary Baldwin at Rockwell Gardens. Ms. Francine Washington at Stateway Gardens. Ms. Beatrice Harris at Wentworth Gardens. And, of course, Ms. Shirley Hammond, who has developed a business in the Cabrini area and represents the senior housing on the north side of the city; and Ms. Martha Marshall, who represents the Senior Housing Central and has developed a business which is part of the business development activity for the area.

The last woman that I will mention, as we talk about outstanding Chicago women, is one of great historical significance. Jane Addams, the mother of social work, Nobel Peace Prize recipient, and an individual extolled by President Franklin Roosevelt as Chicago's most useful citizen.

Jane Addams established Hull House, Chicago's first settlement house for the underprivileged in 1889. Hull House quickly became an innovative place for gathering, learning, obtaining a free meal, gaining employment, and even organizing union activity. She later became a vocal advocate for women's suffrage and humanitarian causes in the early 20th century and reasoned that

"civilization is a method of living and an attitude of equal respect for all people."

She held leadership positions in several key organizations throughout her life, including the National Progressive Party and the International Congress of Women. Fortunately, Jane Addams was not destined to always be a suffragette, never a voter. She lived until 1931 and saw an American woman's right to vote become a reality in 1920.

In closing, Jane Addams also sagaciously stated that national events determine our ideas as much as our ideas determine national events. Indeed, Women's History Month is a national event which celebrates the ideas of our Nation and the spirit and triumph of the women's movement; and so it makes sense for us to stop, to pause, to realize and to recognize the tremendous contribution that women have made and continue to make in the development of this country.

REINTEGRATING EX-OFFENDERS INTO SOCIETY

I think I will shift at this time a bit, Mr. Speaker, and talk about an issue that I think is one of the most serious issues facing our country, and that is the issue of successfully reintegrating ex-offenders back into the normalcy of society; that is, successfully reintegrating ex-offenders back into normal life after they have been incarcerated, after they have served time and are now looking for a way to become, one might say, normal again.

On February 7, I introduced what is now called the Public Safety Ex-offender Self-sufficiency Act of 2002. The Public Safety Ex-offender Self-sufficiency Act amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reflect an ex-offender low-income housing credit to encourage the provision of housing, job training, and other essential services to ex-offenders through a structured living environment designed to assist the ex-offenders in becoming self-sufficient.

The United States Department of Justice, the National Institute of Justice, said in November of 2000 that in the United States, and I quote them, "There are virtually no systematic, comprehensive approaches to dealing with reintegrating ex-offenders." This is a comprehensive legislative initiative that will address recidivism, cost of crime to victims, and public safety. Let us see if we can make the case.

The problem of successfully reintegrating ex-offenders back into normal life is one of the major issues facing low-income and minority communities throughout the Nation. It is a serious public safety issue that requires serious public attention. While 5 percent of the world's population lives in the United States, 25 percent of the world's prison population are in United States' jails and prisons. Nationally, the United States Department of Justice reports that there are now over 2 million people in State and Federal prisons, more than a threefold increase since 1980.

This year, more than 600,000 people will leave prison and return to neighborhoods across the country. The problem of ex-offenders impacts all levels of our society. In 1998, there were 225,700 veterans held in the Nation's prisons and jails, 56,500 Vietnam War era veterans, and 18,500 Persian Gulf War era veterans. The Justice Department reports that 20 percent of those veterans in prison or jail reported seeing combat duty during their military service.

As of November 2000, 45,617 adults were incarcerated in Illinois prisons. During that same period, 29,120 were on parole. We have even looked at a study prepared by Claritas and commissioned by the Stein Family Foundation that 70 percent of men between the ages of 18 and 45 in one particular Chicago community are ex-offenders. In America, the poor and people of color are more likely to be incarcerated. Fifty-three percent of people warehoused in our Nation's prisons earned less than \$10,000 a year prior to incarceration.

Although the minority population is approximately 13 percent, 66 percent of the Nation's prison population are people of color. Nearly 4.6 million adult men and women were on probation or parole at the end of 2000, an increase of almost 70,700 during that year. While 52 percent of those on probation have been convicted of committing a felony, 46 percent were convicted of misdemeanors. Of the offenders on parole, 97 percent had been sentenced to incarceration of more than 1 year. According to the Soros Institute, 72 percent of those entering State prison for the first time were nonviolent offenders.

Studies indicate that the median education level of released prisoners is 11th grade. In addition, three-fourths of those reentering prison have a history of substance abuse. Not surprisingly, 16 percent suffer from mental illness.

According to the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice statistics, at the end of 2000 State prisons were operating between full capacity and 15 percent above capacity, while Federal prisons were operating at 31 percent above capacity.

As our Nation's prison population explodes and prison operating costs skyrocket, little is done to prepare these adults for reentry. In fact, the National Institute of Justice reports that 14 States have abolished discretionary parole and the parole boards that historically managed prisoner reentry.

There is a shortage of vocational, educational and substance abuse programs in prison. In fact, like States all over the country, Illinois recently cut the post-GED programs. According to the sentencing project, more than 100,000 prisoners are being released each year without any form of community correctional supervision.

□ 1700

The recidivism rate remains high, and studies show that a direct correlation between homelessness and recidivism exists. The Chicago Continuum of

Care reported that 6.5 percent of respondents noted that release from jail was a contributing factor for homelessness. In addition, 7.1 percent responded that release from incarceration was the primary factor for homelessness. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, 62 percent of those released from State prisons will be rearrested within 3 years, and 40 percent will be reincarcerated, including many for technical violation of parole.

In 1997, the Illinois recidivism rate for African Americans exceeded the national norm: blacks, 48.2 percent; whites, 35.7 percent; Hispanics, 30.9 percent; and others, 28 percent. A staggering 36.4 percent returned due to a new sentence. Ex-offenders that are truly interested in reintegrating back into community life, interested in finding employment and taking care of themselves and their families, locating housing, going to school, oftentimes have no place to go. There are very few second chances.

What happens to a man or woman who cannot find an employer willing to give them a second chance, refused TANF benefits, cannot receive subsidized housing, educational or medical assistance? We have seen over and over again that they return to prison. We hope to convince the Nation that by supporting these initiatives we begin the process of, one, saving ourselves; two, protecting our persons and property; three, reducing the human and capital costs of recidivism; and, four, we begin to seriously impact in a positive way the quality of life for everyone.

Neighborhoods across the Nation are absorbing the economic and social cost of reintegrating hundreds of thousands of ex-offenders back into society each year. In 1991, the Bureau of Justice reported that the cost of the justice system per resident was \$299. In 1996, the Department of Justice reported that the cost of crime to victims rises to approximately \$450 billion a year, or \$1,800 per man, woman, and child.

That is to say if we could find a way to seriously reduce crime, reduce recidivism, provide opportunities for these individuals to become self-sufficient, to learn a trade, develop a skill, go to school, get a job, then not only are we providing for them, but we are in reality helping all of America. According to a poll commissioned by the ACLU, people across the Nation are not satisfied with the current prison system. In addition, the poll released in July 2001 found that six in 10 Americans believe that it is possible to rehabilitate a nonviolent offender. Other key findings of the ACLU poll support alternative punishments for many nonviolent offenses. In addition, 69 percent of respondents believe that prisons should be required to teach skills. That is, individuals ought to be able to develop to the extent that when they leave a correctional facility they are in better shape than they were when they first went in.

As these men and women transition from incarceration to freedom, what they need most are comprehensive re-entry solutions. What they find instead are often cold stares, unreturned phone calls, and closed doors. The jobs are like an old man's teeth, few and far apart. Housing is scarce, and other social services are in most cases nonexistent for the serious and earnest men and women desirous of working to clean up their act and transition into productive citizens.

Mr. Speaker, with the implementation of this bill nationally, the recidivism rate just might decrease. Prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation are just as important as incarceration. These men, women, and children always must live in some communities. Increased public safety is a primary concern of communities and neighborhoods all over the country. In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, Ex-offenders Task Force representing a broad group, including representatives from national and local civil rights organizations, community-based organizations, ex-offenders, academicians, law enforcement officials, elected officials, community activists, faith-based organizations, block club residents, businesses and community residents, are all in serious collaboration to try and find direction and, hopefully, solutions.

The Public Safety Ex-Offender Self-Sufficiency Act addresses several serious needs and barriers this population must overcome in order to successfully reintegrate. Through the efforts of the task force, we confirmed that housing still remains a key barrier. In fact, secure and safe and affordable housing is a stabilizing force for the formerly incarcerated.

From Los Angeles to New York and in Chicago, ex-offenders are deterred from a fresh start, a second chance. These men and women face countless legal barriers. In Chicago, for example, ex-offenders are prohibited from living in public housing and from working in many public agencies. In Illinois, ex-offenders are prohibited from working in 57 occupational categories without some form of waiver. Nationally, ex-offenders that are convicted of drug offenses after 1996 are unable to receive Pell Grants.

According to a 1998 NACRO study, 13 percent of prisoners were homeless before their sentence, and 34 percent had lost homes because of prison. As a result, half the sample were therefore at risk of being homeless on release. The study also notes that prisoners that are released homeless are much more likely to offend or to reoffend. In addition, a housing research study, "The Housing Needs of Ex-Prisoners," identified three factors to determine whether ex-offenders succeeded in retaining their homes: one, the quality of family relationships; two, the availability of housing entitlements; three, current financial status.

The study also noted that ex-offenders face other problems in rehousing

which includes access to independent mainstream accommodations, arranging housing accommodations other than in hotels prior to release, and very few ex-prisoners agree to live in hotels or homeless shelters because of concern about recidivism.

But the issues are much broader than housing alone: Federal Pell Grants, expungement, jobs, health care. Through our legislative initiative, we are looking at reintegrating ex-offenders from a holistic perspective, trying to address factors while acknowledging that affordable and available housing is an overarching need. This legislation will help to meet that need. But the other thing about this legislation is that it is cost effective. It is not designed to just ask the government or somebody to provide grants. It really uses the low-income housing tax credit system that we are all familiar with where States receive credits based upon population.

In this instance we simply take the number of ex-offenders who are released to a particular State, and then provide credits to that State based upon its number of ex-offenders. Private developers will be encouraged to develop the housing that is needed which they must hold for 15 years. After 10 years, they will have recouped the money that they have invested so it makes good business sense, good business sense for the private developers who will develop the housing that is needed; good business sense for the communities who will have help in aiding their ex-offenders; and good business sense because it will help a category of individuals to become self-sufficient, contributing members of society who then will be in a position to give rather than to take, will be in a position to become substantial helpers, to make America become what America has the potential of being.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, I urge business and industry, I urge social workers and social scientists all to get behind this legislation because I believe that it could provide hope for the hopeless and help for the helpless.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I congratulate the gentleman for touching on an issue of enormous consequence that does not get the attention that it deserves, that is, we have in this country the largest per capita rate of incarcerated people; and I think the evidence as the gentleman has just indicated is very clear that we do not do a good job of reintegrating those people into society. The result is an enormous amount of pain, human destruction, and a great deal of expense to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to touch on, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) might be interested in this issue, is another issue that does not get a great deal of attention, and that is the increasing concentration of media ownership in the United States today.

In my view we cannot be a vibrant democracy unless the people get information, unless the people know what the most important issues are that are facing them. I fear very much that in recent years what we have seen is fewer and fewer large, multinational corporations own and control the media of this country. We are seeing huge corporations like General Electric, like Disney, like Rupert Murdoch's News Incorporated control major television networks. We have seen fewer and fewer large companies control radio outlets so that increasingly it is difficult for people in various communities to get local news because their local radio stations have been bought up by large national organizations.

□ 1715

We see in terms of newspapers and in magazines fewer and fewer large corporations controlling those as well.

I think people are not aware of the degree of corporate ownership of the media in this country and the fact that recent court rulings will make that situation even worse and allow fewer and fewer large companies to own more and more of the media.

Some of the largest media conglomerates in this country are AT&T, AOL Time Warner, the Liberty Media Corporation, Viacom, Walt Disney Corporation, the News Corporation, General Electric, Vivendi, Bertelsmann and Sony. And if you add together what these 10 corporations own, one would be absolutely amazed to the degree that they own television, radio, newspapers, magazines, book publishing, movie companies and so forth.

A concern that I have is that, given this corporate control over the media, the American people get relatively little discussion about some of the most important issues facing this country. For example, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that most Americans know that the United States of America today is the only industrialized nation on earth that does not have a national health care system guaranteeing health care to all people and yet we spend twice as much per capita on health care than any other nation. Some people may think national health care is a good idea. Some people may think it is a bad idea. But I wonder how much discussion there has been on corporately controlled media or on the radio stations pointing out that every other industrialized nation has a national health care system and we do not. That is an issue that should be discussed.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding. I would like to listen attentively to my friend from Vermont for just a couple of minutes, and then I would like to briefly, if the gentleman has time, respond to the question that the gentleman just posed.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, what are some of the most important issues facing the vast majority of the people? The President of the United States seems to think that the most important issue is that we give huge tax breaks to the wealthiest people in this country. In fact, as a result of recent legislation passed here, some \$500 billion over a 10-year period are going to be given in tax breaks to the wealthiest 1 percent, people with a minimum income of \$375,000 a year.

Maybe there are some districts in this country where that is the most important issue, but it is not the case in Vermont, I doubt it is the case in Chicago, and I doubt that it is the case in most districts in this country.

I will tell you what some of the issues are that the American people are concerned about. They are concerned about health care and wondering why 44 million Americans do not have health care and why we are the only major country without a national health care program while we spend twice as much as any other country per capita on health care. They are wondering about why pensions are being cut for working people all over this country, health care benefits are being cut for workers all over this country, while the CEOs of major corporations now earn 500 times what their workers earn.

There are some people who may think, hey, that is a good idea. No problem. No problem that the United States has the most unfair distribution of wealth and income in the industrialized world, where the wealthiest 1 percent own more wealth than the bottom 95 percent. No problem.

But I just met with paralyzed veterans in this country who were in my office saying, why can we not put more money into the Veterans' Administration so we take care of the men and women who put their lives on the line to defend this country? Some people think that taking care of veterans, putting money into education, putting money into child care, paying off our national debt, might be more important than giving huge tax breaks to millionaires and billionaires.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

Let me just say at the outset, as far as the first question that my friend posed about the control that the large media has had in preventing people from having the opportunity to engage in a debate on whether or not we should have a nationalized health care system, I would say very clearly, my friend from Vermont and I have together appeared on a number of fora on television programs that are provided because the technological advances that have been made in this country due to large investments that come from those in the media providing a

wide range of choices for the American consumer and the television viewer to engage in debate.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me reclaim the time from my friend. I have appeared on national TV programs, I am going to be on one tonight, as a matter of fact, but the issue of why the United States is the only country in the world without a national health care system has never been the topic of discussion on any program that I have been on and I doubt any program that my friend has been on.

Mr. DREIER. Let me give my friend a little bit of advice. I have found, from having appeared on the different CNN and Fox News Channel and MSNBC programs, you can provide whatever answer to whatever question you have. I know that my friend who is so committed to bringing up the issue as to whether or not we should have a national health care system, that he can engage in that debate regardless of what question that they are posing to him.

Mr. SANDERS. Taking my time back, my friend is right. I can probably get 15 seconds into the debate before a moderator jumps in.

Let me ask my friend a question. I am glad that he is here.

Mr. DREIER. If I could just raise one more issue before you pose that. That is, that we at this moment, and I know that as chairman of the Committee on Rules that we are not to address those who might be outside of this Chamber viewing it, but because of technological advances that have been made in this country due to investment that has taken place into a wide range of new and innovative and creative areas, we are able to have this coverage carried beyond this Chamber. I think that by virtue of our having a discussion right now on this issue that my friend raises is a very important one, that has come about because of the level of creativity that exists in the United States.

I should say that it is a complete mischaracterization to say that we are not committed from this side of the aisle or in a bipartisan way to dealing with the concerns of veterans, because we have dramatically increased the level of funding for veterans. At the same time, the focus on education and health care continues to be a priority.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Respectfully, the Chair would remind Members that the time is controlled by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. SANDERS. I appreciate my friend from California being here. This is a good discussion.

The issue that I wanted to pose is, yes, I can get on national shows and I occasionally do, but we have a problem. Let us talk about the radio for a second. I would characterize the United States as being kind of a centrist country, not right wing, not left wing, kind of centrist. In the last election, as you

know, Gore and Nader got more votes than did Mr. Bush and Mr. Buchanan, by a few million votes. Kind of a centrist country.

If you turned on talk radio today, would my friend agree with me that what you would hear is one extreme right winger after another right winger after another right winger? So that even a moderate or progressive voice, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and I are probably progressives, we know that our people are not going to have a radio station with Rush Limbaugh and his friends out there, Gordon Liddy and all these other folks out there.

But is it somehow interesting, I would think it is somehow interesting, that a country which is basically centrist, that one talk radio show after another is dominated by not right wingers but extreme right wingers.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

I would say the answer is, number one, it has to do with the market and the listenership. The fact is those programs would not be on were it not for the fact that there is a demand for that listenership. I would say that there are other programs that are out there that do, in fact, offer a perspective. I consider myself to be very progressive myself, I should say.

Mr. SANDERS. You are a progressive?

Mr. DREIER. I consider myself a progressive, yes.

Mr. SANDERS. If you are a progressive, then I would hate to see who is conservative, with all due respect.

Mr. DREIER. It all depends on the definition. But I will tell you that I clearly do believe that there are a wide range of opportunities out there for voices from any side of the issue in this country.

Mr. SANDERS. I have suggested to you, and you do not deny it, that in the last election more people voted for Gore and Nader than voted for the President and Mr. Buchanan, suggesting that we are somewhat of a centrist country. You say that the reason is the market.

Mr. DREIER. I did not say that. That is not what I said.

Mr. SANDERS. That is exactly what you said. These stations are there. They are listened to by the people. But I am suggesting that it is not the market. The people in this country want a variety of viewpoints. Talk radio is predominantly extreme right wing. It is extreme right wing because the stations are owned by conservative multinational corporations.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that point, that is just a preposterous claim, to say that it is based on the ownership. The programming that has come forward and the demand for more conservative talk radio is in large part due to a level of frustration that the American people have with

what is interpreted by many to be a leftward tilt for the control of what is called the mainstream media.

Let me just say, I am not one of those harsh critics who says that. I happen to believe that we need to do everything we can to encourage a free-flowing debate on a wide range of issues and concerns. But I will say this. I know full well that the ownership of the media out there does not play a role in the editorial comment when it comes to the talk show messages that are getting out there.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, let me suggest this, that ownership determines who the commentators are; and so in a sense you cannot discount the impact of ownership on what ultimately becomes the direction and content. I find that people listen to those stations more often that they relate to. And so if they relate to the right-wing station, that is where they are going to go. And so if the owner hires a right-wing commentator, then I would have to agree with the gentleman from Vermont, that ownership does play a role in what ultimately gets on.

Mr. DREIER. If my friend would yield on that point, I would say that there clearly is a leftward tilt by a lot of the ownership, then.

I represent Los Angeles. A lot of people in southern California spend a great deal of time in their automobiles. I will say that I, as I know my friends from both Vermont and Illinois, participate on these programs. There are a wide range of programs that are carried by people who my friend from Vermont would describe as progressive or very liberal. I am happy to participate on those shows. I can name them for you in Los Angeles.

Mr. SANDERS. There are a diversity of viewpoints. There is no argument about that. But I would say any objective look at what goes out there, say, in terms of talk radio, is that the tilt is not only right but extreme right.

Mr. DREIER. I disagree.

Mr. SANDERS. You would be hard-pressed to name national progressive radio talk show hosts. We could name one of the Limbaughs of the world ad nauseam on the right. But the bottom line is, as the gentleman from Illinois just indicated, when you have a multinational company like General Electric, what is General Electric's shtick? What do they do?

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman has asked the question, what does General Electric do? I am happy to tell you what they do.

Mr. SANDERS. If I could finish, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that all time is controlled by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DREIER. I suspect the gentleman from Illinois wants the gentleman from Vermont to continue.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. The bottom line here is that one has got to be very naive not to understand that companies like General Electric that spend millions of dollars on lobbyists here to take jobs to China, that send money to lower their taxes, that send money to build nuclear power plants, to increase military spending and so forth are not going to, within the confines of what they own, present that point of view and discourage discussion on a whole lot of other issues.

If you are a member of a trade union in America, you make 30 percent more than workers who are not in a trade union. Frankly, I have never seen that discussion on television or radio in my life, an enormously important issue like that. The growing gap between the rich and the poor is discussed far, far too little.

I am not going to deny that there are different points of view that are heard. But I think the bottom line is, no question, that corporate ownership of this country is growing in terms of the media and that we are hearing fewer and fewer points of view that represent working people, middle-income people and minority people.

□ 1730

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me totally disagree with the assessment that my friend from Vermont has just provided. For starters, I do not think I have ever owned a share of stock in General Electric, and I have no idea whether I have received contributions from their lobbyists here. I suspect some of them may have contributed to my campaigns.

But I happen to believe that companies like General Electric have dramatically improved the quality of life for the people in the United States of America, and I say that because it is very clear that consumer products, regardless of where they are manufactured in the world, that are sold here in the United States, the best quality at the lowest possible price, is something that is very good for the United States of America.

I know that we have the most productive workers on the face of the Earth; and when it comes to technology, the United States of America is on the cutting edge, creating a wide range of new technologies. This is one of the reasons that I was so proud to work on behalf of Trade Promotion Authority, so that we can pry open new markets around the world which will create an opportunity for goods and services here in the United States to be able to move into those economies in other parts of the world.

When it comes to the issue of ownership, I am convinced that with cable television, with the multifarious radio programs that are out there representing a wide range of views, and I know from having talked with many of the owners, they do not exercise control over much of the programming.

Some of them may be more sympathetic than some of the others; but I will tell you, we happen to believe that the editorial pages of the New York Times and Washington Post have a leftward tilt, and I think the success of talk radio on the conservative side is in large part a response, a response, to a level of frustration that many Americans have felt over the message that has come from the New York Times and the Washington Post editorial pages.

So I happen to believe that we have some wonderful, wonderful things taking place in this country; and we need to do more to encourage creativity. And the idea of having the government clamp down, jeopardizing the opportunity to pursue new technologies, which it will take investment to do, would just plain be wrong.

I have to go upstairs, but I thank my friend for yielding; and I very much appreciate the opportunity to engage in this discussion and look forward to again another free-flowing debate with hundreds of thousands of people following us as we talk about whether or not we should have a national healthcare system.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Reclaiming my time, I think both gentlemen would, in fact, have to agree that in our country and in a democracy like ours, we live often by the golden rule; but we also have to acknowledge that whoever has got the most gold, most often makes the rules. And I am afraid that too much of the gold is becoming concentrated in too few places, which really means that corporate ownership is becoming too powerful; and when it does, then it makes for a skewed democracy or a more one-sided decision-making process, and it needs to be balanced off a little bit, which really means that more people need to become part of the ownership of America, rather than too few people owning too much.

If that is the thesis that the gentleman from Vermont is promoting, then I would agree with him, and yield for further amplification.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend said it very, very well. This is a great Nation, and we have enormous things to be proud of. But I remain very, very concerned that fewer and fewer people own more and more of our economy, own more and more of our media, while, at the same time, the average person that the gentleman and I represent are working, in many cases, longer hours for lower wages just to keep their heads above water.

But the point of my remarks tonight was not just to talk about the economy and ownership in the economy, but was to talk about the media; and my deep concern is that the American people are not hearing all points of view; that corporate ownership of the media is preventing a large segment of ideas which represent the thinking of many, many Americans from getting out there, and I think that is not good for our democracy.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the gentleman, and, reclaiming my time, I would have to agree. I would even go beyond just the media. I mean, one of the reasons, for example, that I am so much in favor of employees reaching the point where they exercise more ownership of where they are and where they work is because the more you spread the ownership, the more you open up the process; and the more open the process, the greater the potential for this commodity that we call democracy. I think that is what we are constantly striving for, a more democratic Nation, where more people are engaged and are part of the decision-making.

I want to thank the gentleman for coming down.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank my friend for allowing me to participate.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3090, ECONOMIC SECURITY AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2001

Mr. DRIER (during special order of Mr. DAVIS of Illinois), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-367) on the resolution (H. Res. 360) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3090) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PRICE SUPPORT PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural industry in the United States over the last 100 years has contributed a great deal. As we develop this year's farm bill, we are now trying to decide, number one, how much should we pay in terms of tax subsidies to farmers, tax dollars going into subsidies to farmers, to make sure that the agricultural industry in the United States survives.

Farmers are facing record low prices compared to the last 20 years. In fact, in terms of what a bushel of wheat would buy, the wheat price today is much lower than it was 50 years ago.

What kind of policy do we want in the United States? We are now in a subsidy war, if you will, with other countries. Other countries have decided they are going to do anything necessary to keep their farmers operating, so they are subsidizing their farmers in these other countries substantially. Their extra production from Europe, from these other countries, go into what would otherwise be our markets, so the resulting overproduction from all over the world results in low commodity prices, and the low commodity prices today would not keep most farmers in business.

Subsidies in the United States represent about 17 percent of the gross income of the average farm. The average net income of an average farm is around 6 percent. So, again, without the subsidy payments, most farms in the United States would lose money every year.

Now, the irony is that farmers do not like to have this subsidy check coming from the government. They would much rather have a real marketplace, where there was real competition throughout the world, where they could compete and make good money farming. And make no mistake, our farmers in the United States can compete, if you will, excuse the expression, on a level playing field, with any other agricultural producers in the world in most commodities.

Our challenge right now is the Senate has passed one farm bill, and the House has passed another farm bill, substantially different in the concepts of where they want agriculture to go and what they want in the farm bill. That includes rural development, that includes the environment in rural areas, that includes the WIC program for food for infants and pregnant mothers, that includes the Food Stamp program.

Just as a footnote here, let me say how we have changed the U.S. Department of Agriculture over the last 50 years. USDA, that part of USDA that is involved in production agriculture, with farmers, now represents only about 25 percent of the total budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

I am here tonight to talk about payment limitations to some of the huge mega-farmers in the United States. The Senate in their bill had provisions that incorporated a level of payment limitations in the hope that some of the large mega-farms would have some kind of a cap, some kind of limit on the payments they received, so there would be more money for what I would call the average mainstream farmer in the United States and some of the other programs in the agricultural bill.

We passed an agriculture bill back in 1996 that pretty much everybody supported. All of the farm organizations thought it was a good idea. What that was is the Freedom to Farm, and it was a phase-out of government subsidy programs. So over 7 years, the subsidy payments to farmers went down and down, and then in the eighth year farmers were supposed to produce strictly for the market.

What happened is the economy in Asia was tremendously disrupted and their purchases went down, and we had a glut of extra farm production; so prices went down, and even with the one subsidy phase-out payment, farmers were going broke, going out of business, going bankrupt.

Now we are developing this new farm legislation, and the question before us is should we have payment limitations on how much money any one farm operation can receive in payments from the Federal Government.

Let me give you one statistic. Right now, the top largest 5 percent of the farms receive 49 percent of the payments. Five percent almost receive half of all the payments. Some have suggested, look, we do have limits on payments. The fact is that we do not have real limits of any kind on price support payments.

Let me just spend a minute on price supports. In our farm programs, what we have is we say to a farmer that to cover at least their fixed costs, that we will guarantee a certain price, and if the market is less than that particular price, government will make up the difference between the current market price and what the Congress has thought to be a price that will at least cover most of the fixed expenses of that particular farm producing that particular crop.

Just for the record, let me throw in those price support payments. The national average now on rice is \$6.50 a hundred weight; cotton is \$52.9 cents a pound; wheat is \$2.58 cents a bushel; soybeans are \$5.26 a bushel; and corn is \$1.89 a bushel.

So for example, on corn, at \$1.89 a bushel, if the current market price is \$1.79 in that particular county, then the government will come up with an extra 10 cents per bushel for those farmers.

In terms of my interest in this area, I am a farmer from Michigan. I was born and raised on a family farm. I was on the United States Department of Agriculture State Committee in Michigan as its chairman. I came to Washington when Earl Butz asked me to come to Washington to help phase out some of the complicated farm programs in 1970, and we went from a stack about 10 feet high of program regulations for farmers down to maybe a stack a foot high of those regulations for farmers, and sold a lot of the storage bins that the Federal Government had that tended to depress prices for farmers even more.

We did not have problems with the kind of payment limitations in those years because the price of the commodity was higher than the support price. We had crazy programs for diversions and set-asides; and ever since 1934 when we first started farm programs, it has tended to be farm programs that had more benefit for the big, richer, larger farm operations.

□ 1745

So a big, larger farm operation has a lower per unit cost of production; and, therefore, the difference in price to make it up was a little more beneficial to them in terms of adding to their profit than a small family farm that had a larger unit cost of production.

So what happened from 1934 through the 1960s and into the 1970s is the very small farms went out of business, and the medium-sized farms thought, well, if I buy that small farm and I work maybe another couple of hours a day, I can make a little more money for my

family so that my kids have some of the same advantages as my city cousins.

Well, it tended to be progressive; and, pretty soon, what was considered a large farm was considered a small farm and the larger farms bought out those smaller farms. Now, over the last 60 years, we have gone from an average of about 40 acres, 50 acres per farm to 460 acres per farm.

Let me just give my colleagues a report from the Environmental Working Group that went to the U.S. Department of Agriculture and got all of the payments to all of the farmers and the farm operations in the United States. As my colleagues will recall, I mentioned earlier that 5 percent of the farms are now receiving 49 percent, almost 50 percent of farm payments that go out. If we were to have the kind of payment limitations that are in the Senate bill, it would save between \$2 billion and \$3 billion.

I am going to move away from the mike and just write these numbers in. According to the Environmental Working Group, these are the top recipients of farm program payments between the years 1996 and 2000. I think everybody that is watching might be able to see that. They are Riceland Foods, \$49 million; Farmers Rice Corporation, \$38.2 million; Harvest States Co-op, \$28.1 million; Tyler Farms, \$23.8 million; Producers Rice Mill, \$19 million. These are the mega farm operations. These are the huge landowners. These are not the 400 or the 500 or the 1,000 or the 2,000 or the 3,000 or the 4,000 acre farms. These are the 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, 70,000, 80,000 acre farms.

What I am suggesting in this short debate this evening is that my colleagues work to have a farm program that is more fair to the mainstream farmers of our country and to limit the kind of payments as we have a limit in the Senate bill. Some of the pressures, of course, come from the big operations that are getting these large payments.

Bear with me a minute and let me just go through a scenario of why there is no cap or limits on farm payments, and that has disturbed me quite a lot over the years, because we sort of fool people into saying there is a limit on price support payments. Because, in the law, it says there is going to be a limit on price support payments of \$150,000 per farmer. That is what the law says. So a lot of organizations have tended to say, well, we have payment limits on price support.

Here is what happens. It is a little complicated. But once we hit the \$150,000 limit, then we have another program that is called a Nonrecourse Loan Program. So any farmer can take his rice, corn, wheat, cotton, soybeans in and give the government the title to that crop. The government will give him a loan that is equal to the price support payment, and then that farmer has the option of forfeiting on that loan and keeping the money, which gives that farmer exactly the same

benefit as the price support payment in the first place. So it is sort of one can do an end run and still collect millions of dollars in price support payments.

I would just urge my colleagues and I would urge the conferees from the Senate and the House to look at the kind of payment limitations that still can be fair to farmers, that still offer some loan provisions to those farmers so that we do not have to glut the market at harvest time.

I spent 5 years as a deputy administrator for farm programs with Earl Butz, and then went back home to the farm. Anyone that thinks that it is not tough, making money on a farm, has not spent a lot of time on the farm. Farmers put in those 14- and 15-hour days. They work very hard. They are desperate to try to have the kind of provisions and services and piano lessons and the ability to send their kids to college. They are trying hard in working those extra hours to try to accommodate their family in the same kind of living as their city cousins. It has been very tough.

So we are losing a lot of our farmers, and we continue the trend of farmers and farms getting bigger and bigger.

I want to make it clear that the limitation amendment will only affect the very largest of recipients. For instance, the average acreage that would have to be taken in the last 2 crop years to reach the limit that the payment limitation sets was over 6,000 acres of corn. So, again, the average farm is 460 acres, but to reach the payment limitation in relation to the price over the last 2 years was 6,000 acres of corn, almost 5,800 acres of soybeans, almost 2,000 acres of cotton and 13,000 acres of wheat, 17,000 acres of rice.

I would note that the average farm size again is 450 acres. So these are very large farms to reach that limit.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all Americans to work with us in terms of supporting American farmers. I have suggested that, number one, we want to try to talk these other countries into reducing their subsidies, because subsidies tend to encourage overproduction that has a chain reaction of extra supply, lowering the price, and so farmers end up receiving that much lower price from the markets. So we need to work together cooperatively with other countries.

But I think it is very important that we keep our agriculture industry, we keep and we do what is necessary in these farm programs that we are going to develop over the next several weeks to make sure we have a strong agricultural industry that can continue to provide the highest quality food in the world at the lowest percentage of take-home pay of anyplace in the world.

Again, we produce the highest quality of food at the lowest percentage of take-home pay of anyplace in the world. That efficient production in agriculture has allowed so many people that used to work on the farm producing food to try to survive to go into

industry and manufacturing and now into the new information technology. So the agricultural industry that has been the most efficient of any industry; if we take the automobile industry or computers or anything else, the increase in productivity of American agriculture has surpassed almost every other industry.

In conclusion, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I ask all of my colleagues to join with me when they talk to conferees and encourage them to come up with a payment limitation that is fair to all farmers, but not to give in to some of the pressure groups and the large, huge mega farm operations that are trying to put pressure on our conferees to continue unlimited payments without restrictions. Of course, let me add to that the grain marketers who tend to make a certain profit per unit of production also gain from having large volumes produced. So those industries, the grain industries, the cotton, rice, et cetera, those industries do not want the kind of payment limitations that is going to result in fewer bushels or pounds being produced because that is where they have their margin and markup on profits.

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a challenge. I hope we can overcome that challenge, and I hope we can have the kind of payment limitations that helps make sure that we do not have a nation of huge mega farms.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. LEE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today before 4:30 p.m. 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. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1857. An act to encourage the negotiated settlement of tribal claims.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 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:

5748. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Florida [Docket No. 01-020-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5749. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Mexican Hass Avocado Import Program [Docket No. 00-003-4] (RIN: 0579-AB27) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5750. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Limited Ports of Entry for Pet Birds, Performing or Theatrical Birds, and Poultry and Poultry Products [Docket No. 01-121-1] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5751. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Unshu Oranges From Japan [Docket No. 99-099-2] (RIN: 0579-AB17) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5752. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—States Approved To Receive Stallions and Mares From CEM-Affected Regions; Rhode Island [Docket No. 01-055-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5753. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition of Beef From Argentina [Docket No. 01-032-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5754. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interstate Movement of Swine Within

a Production System [Docket No. 98-023-2] (RIN: 0579-AB28) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5755. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Transportation of Equines to Slaughter [Docket No. 98-074-2] (RIN: 0579-AB06) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5756. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Horses From Iceland; Quarantine Requirements [Docket No. 00-010-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5757. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 01-081-1] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5758. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Citrus Canker; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-036-3] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5759. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 01-092-1] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5760. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Phytophthora Ramorum; Quarantine and Regulations [Docket No. 01-054-1] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5761. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commuted Traveltime Periods: Overtime Services Relating to Imports and Exports [Docket No. 01-111-1] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5762. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Animals Destroyed Because of Tuberculosis; Payment of Indemnity [Docket No. 00-106-1] (RIN: 0579-AB29) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5763. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Export Certification; Canadian Solid Wood Packing Materials Exported From the United States to China [Docket No. 99-100-4] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5764. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health

Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Chronic Wasting Disease in Cervids; Payment of Indemnity [Docket No. 00-108-1] (RIN: 0579-AB35) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5765. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of Germany, Italy, and Spain Because of BSE [Docket No. 01-008-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5766. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of the Republic of San Marino and the Independent Principalities of Andorra and Monaco [Docket No. 01-008-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5767. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—District of Columbia; Movement of Plants and Plant Products [Docket No. 00-085-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5768. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of The Netherlands and Northern Ireland With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease [Docket No. 01-031-3] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5769. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change in Disease Status of France and Ireland With Regard to Foot-and-Mouth Disease [Docket No. 01-031-2] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5770. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—States Approved To receive Stallions and Mares From CEM-Affected Regions; Rhode Island [Docket No. 01-055-01] received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5771. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Termination of the Designation of Argentina as a Participant Under the Visa Waiver Program [INS No. 2188-02; AG ORDER No. 2561-2002] (RIN: 1115-AB93) received February 22, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5772. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, Agency For International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5773. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5774. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a re-

port pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1870. A bill to provide for the sale of certain real property within the Newlands Project in Nevada, to the city of Fallon, Nevada; with an amendment (Rept. 107-366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 360. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3090) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery (Rept. 107-367). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. McINNIS:

H.R. 3857. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat nominally foreign corporations created through inversion transactions as domestic corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H.R. 3858. A bill to modify the boundaries of the New River Gorge National River, West Virginia; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3859. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Allyl Cyclo Hexyl Propionate (Allyl hexahydro phenylpropionate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3860. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methyl Cinnamate (methyl-3-phenylpropenoate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3861. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on NeoHeliopan Hydro (2-Phenylbenzimidazole-5-sulfonic acid); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3862. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Sodium Methylate Powder (Na Methylate Powder); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3863. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzyl Acetone (Methyl-phenylethyl ketone); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3864. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Globanone (Cyclohexadec-8-en-1-one) (CHD); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3865. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Agrumex (o-t-Butyl cyclohexanol); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3866. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetanisole (Anisyl Methyl Ketone); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3867. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methyl Acetophenone-para (Melilot); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3868. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Majantol (2,2-Dimethyl-3-(3-

methylphenyl)propanol); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3869. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on NeoHeliopan MA (Menthyl Anthranilate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3870. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Allinat (Allyl isosulfocyanate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3871. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Frescolate (5-Methyl-2-(methylethyl)cyclohexyl alpha-hydroxypropanoate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3872. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Thymol (alpha-Cymophenol); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3873. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Phenyl Propyl Alcohol (Benzyl ethyl alcohol); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3874. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Benzyl Cinnamate (Benzyl beta phenylacrylate); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3875. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Trimethyl Cyclo Hexanol (1-Methyl-3,3-dimethylcyclohexanol-5); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 3876. A bill to establish the San Rafael Western Frontier National Heritage Area in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 3877. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to clarify rules for determining whether certain agent-drivers and commission-drivers are employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEUTSCH:

H.R. 3878. A bill to enable the residents of the Bayshore Manor assisted living facility in Key West, Florida, to continue to receive supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 3879. A bill to provide wage parity for certain Department of Defense prevailing rate employees in Alabama; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GRUCCI, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. KING, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H.R. 3880. A bill to provide a temporary waiver from certain transportation conformity requirements and metropolitan transportation planning requirements under the Clean Air Act and under other laws for certain areas in New York where the planning offices and resources have been destroyed by acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. TANGREDO):

H.R. 3881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in studies relating to enlarging Pueblo Dam and Reservoir and Sugar Loaf Dam and Turquoise Lake,

Fryingpan-Arkansas Project, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3882. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reform the Medicare physician payment update system through repeal of the sustainable growth rate (SGR) payment update system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MASCARA):

H.R. 3883. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on N-Cyclohexylthiophthalimide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. FRANK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3884. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent corporations from avoiding the United States income tax by reincorporating in a foreign country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3885. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a tolerance for the presence of methyl mercury in seafood, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 3886. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct a feasibility study for applying airport bubbles as a method of identifying, assessing, and reducing the adverse environmental impacts of airport ground and flight operations and improving the overall quality of the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 3887. A bill to establish a public education and awareness program relating to emergency contraception; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 3888. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the National Forest System lands underlying the George Kirkpatrick Dam on the Ocklawaha River near Palatka, Florida, and related lands to the State of Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 3889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for teachers and principals who work in certain low income schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAN MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Con. Res. 339. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding

the Bureau of the Census on the 100th anniversary of its establishment; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H. Con. Res. 340. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Meningitis Awareness Month; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PETRI, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. FORD):

H. Con. Res. 341. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Federal funding of the Peace Corps should be doubled to \$550,000,000 by 2007, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the people of the United States should be encouraged to rediscover attractions in the States in which they live; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GOSS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H. Res. 358. A resolution expressing support for the democratically elected Government of Columbia and its efforts to counter threats from United States-designated foreign terrorist organizations; to the Committee on International Relations. considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H. Res. 359. A resolution providing amounts for further expenses of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the second session of the One Hundred Seventh Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. UPTON):

H. Res. 361. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the restoration and protection of the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on International Relations, Resources, and 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. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 362. A resolution congratulating the 2002 United States Olympic Team, Salt Lake City, the State of Utah, the Salt Lake Organizing Committee, the International Olympic Committee, athletes from around the world, and all the security personnel who participated in the 2002 Olympic Winter Games in Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 68: Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 250: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 325: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 476: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 563: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 745: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 792: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 839: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 853: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 997: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 1117: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1186: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1211: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1307: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 1401: Mr. SIMMONS.
H.R. 1535: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1636: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 1667: Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1718: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 1720: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1763: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PASCARELL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1810: Mr. MATSUI and Mr. PASCARELL.
H.R. 1904: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATSON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 1979: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 2037: Mr. QUINN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 2073: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 2125: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2235: Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 2406: Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 2487: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2531: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2592: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 2721: Ms. LEE and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2799: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2820: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 2868: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2874: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2941: Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 3026: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 3058: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 3083: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3183: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3230: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3231: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 3244: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 3279: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 3298: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 3321: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3331: Mr. HOFFFEL.
H.R. 3397: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3450: Mr. OWENS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3479: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 3481: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 3524: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3533: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 3547: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 3569: Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 3605: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3612: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 3624: Mr. AKIN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 3626: Mr. TERRY and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3639: Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 3657: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3661: Mr. ENGLISH and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 3670: Ms. CARSON of Indiana and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3675: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI,

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3676: Mr. FRANK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 3679: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3710: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 3733: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 3741: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 3762; Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. HART, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WALSH, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3792: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3803: Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 3833: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 3839: Mr. TIBERI.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. LATOURETTE,
 H. Con. Res. 238: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. HOBSON.

H. Con. Res. 320: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H. Con. Res. 328: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Con. Res. 334: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H. Con. Res. 225: Ms. WATSON.
 H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. WALSH and Mr. SHUSTER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 3693: Mr. LAHOOD.