



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 29, 2003

No. 16

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 29, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Tracy A. Carroll, Senior Minister, Community Christian Church, Camdenton, Missouri, offered the following prayer:

God of all nations and the United States of America, bless the House of Representatives as together they converse, contemplate and carve paths of peace, purpose and prosperity for all people. Remind each statesman and stateswoman of sacred trust.

Grant assurance of the goodness of people across this great land as we face various concerns in this generation. In gratitude for institutions of democracy, grant courage to stand and to build consensus.

Guard from partisanship and political pressure. Help each to listen to You and the voices of all people, until unity and harmony are discovered anew for the least and the greatest, immigrant and long-time citizen, orphan and secure child, widow and married, poor and rich, farmer and developer, mentally ill and capable teacher, investor and consumer, employed and unemployed, physically challenged and strong athlete, soldier and protestor, young and the aged, sorrowing ones and ones who rejoice.

Bless the personal lives of our leaders, O God, granting them moments of renewal in the midst of demanding days. Bless the people of the United States and all people in Your world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. RENZI 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain one 1-minute. The remaining 1 minutes today will begin at the end of the proceedings of today's session.

INTRODUCING GUEST CHAPLAIN, REVEREND TRACY A. CARROLL, COMMUNITY CHRISTIAN CHURCH, CAMDENTON, MISSOURI

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce to my House colleagues our guest chaplain, Reverend Tracy A. Carroll, minister of the Community Christian Church in Camdenton, Missouri.

Reverend Carroll was born in St. Joseph, Missouri, and still has many relatives in northern Missouri. After graduating from high school in Des Moines, Iowa, he attended Northwest Christian College in Eugene, Oregon, and later earned a Master's of Divinity from Texas Christian University.

Reverend Carroll is joined today by his wife, Colleen, who is also an ordained minister, working alongside her husband as an associate minister at the Community Christian Church. They have two children, Nathaniel, who is a senior at Camdenton, High School, and Tabitha, who is in the 7th grade at Camdenton Junior High School.

Reverend Carroll has devoted his life to the ministry for over 20 years and has served the Community Christian Church in Camdenton since 1992. In the time that they have lived in Camdenton, the Carrolls have become beloved members of the Lake of the Ozarks community. Both church members and members of the community at large talk about Reverend Carroll's compassion and his caring for others.

Reverend Carroll has been very active in community affairs, playing a major role in the Lake Area Ministerial Alliance and with the LAMB House, which provides food and clothing to those in need. He has been on the board of the Citizens Against Domestic Violence, worked with Habitat for Humanity, the Salvation Army, and many other community and youth organizations.

I would like to thank Chaplain Coughlin for his kind invitation to Reverend Carroll to offer the opening prayer, and I would like to thank both Reverend Carrolls for traveling to our Nation's capital to be with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 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.

H221

will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

—————

CONGRATULATING THE TAMPA
BAY BUCCANEERS FOR WINNING
SUPER BOWL XXXVII

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 31) congratulating the Tampa Bay Buccaneers for winning Super Bowl XXXVII.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 31

Whereas, on Sunday, January 26, 2003, the Tampa Bay Buccaneers dominated Super Bowl XXXVII, defeating the Oakland Raiders by a score of 48-21;

Whereas the 27-year-old Buccaneers franchise won the National Football League's World Championship in their first-ever Super Bowl appearance;

Whereas coach Jon Gruden, in his first year as head coach of the Buccaneers, led the team to the pinnacle of success;

Whereas the Buccaneers overcame adversity and defeated the Oakland Raiders, a team credited with possessing the number-one ranked offense in the National Football League;

Whereas throughout the season the Buccaneers were led by a number of players, most notably veterans Warren Sapp, Derrick Brooks and John Lynch, who banded together to form the number-one ranked defense in the National Football League;

Whereas owner Malcolm Glazer's unwavering dedication to bringing together the most talented coaches and players has resulted in the achievement of the most sought-after honor in professional football: the Vince Lombardi trophy;

Whereas the Buccaneers are an integral part of the Tampa Bay community;

Whereas the entire Tampa Bay community is proud of the Buccaneers and their extraordinary season and tremendous accomplishment;

Whereas this championship is especially satisfying to the dedicated Buccaneers fans who have loyally supported the team since their inception in 1976; a very long journey that has culminated in a Super Bowl victory and the recognition that the Buccaneers are the best football team in the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the World Champion Tampa Bay Buccaneers for their victory in Super Bowl XXXVII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a great day in the State of Florida. The jubilation, the celebration is still going on in the streets of Tampa and in large cities and small towns all over the Sunshine State as we rejoice in the victory of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers in the Super Bowl XXXVII, a decisive win, the second highest number of points scored in any Super Bowl.

The Buccaneers brought forth a talented offense and a legendary defense with undoubtedly several future Hall of Famers.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if we did not begin by recognizing the man who brought us to the top of that mountain, the youngest coach to ever coach a winning team in the Super Bowl, Jon Gruden, who built on the foundation laid by Tony Dungy and brought spirit, hope and promise to that team by repeating the same mantra: pound the rock, pound the rock, keep pounding away at the opportunities, keep pounding away at the other team's offense, seize the moments and capitalize on the other team's mistakes and weaknesses.

Those outstanding players who were there to back him up, under the visionary leadership of the owners, the Glazer family, were able to capitalize on an opportunity to bring the Tampa Bay area their first Super Bowl championship.

Mr. Speaker, the community spirit that was there, the fans who have suffered through a number of seasons of poor performances, of missed opportunities, they were well rewarded last Sunday afternoon in San Diego. Those fans who have scrimped and saved to purchase season tickets, they have endured a series of coaches, a series of top-notch draft opportunities. They have endured heart-breaking losses in the final seconds, and frankly, embarrassing losses at the beginning of the game for seasons on end. Their determination, their patience paid off; and so this victory, while it is incredibly sweet for the team, it is very altogether fitting and proper for the owners, the real victory is for the fans who have done so much and given so much to keep that team spirit alive, and the Tampa Bay area is, therefore, rewarded with this Super Bowl championship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Florida in consideration of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. Since the first professional football game in the United States took place in 1895 in the town of Latrobe, Pennsylvania, football has become one of America's favorite pastimes. As a matter of fact, it is so popular and so etched in the

minds and hearts of Americans, until many people stop whatever they are doing when it comes time for the Super Bowl.

The Buccaneers' magical season began at the Magic Kingdom, as the bucks held training camp at the Disney Wide World of Sports Complex. It ended on Sunday with the Bucs defeating the Oakland Raiders in Super Bowl XXXVII for the franchise's first world championship.

Buccaneers head coach Jon Gruden's, masterful coaching throughout the 2002 playoffs paid off in the Super Bowl as the Bucs always seemed to make the right call at the right time.

Facing the league's most potent offense in the first-ever Super Bowl match-up of the league's top-rated offense and defense, the Bucs surrendered just 269 yards, only 78 by the time Tampa Bay had built a 34-3 lead. The Bucs controlled the clock for over 37 of the 60 game minutes.

Joining the 1985 Bears as the only team in National Football League history to lead the National Football League in yards allowed, points allowed and interceptions in the same season, the Bucs racked up five interceptions and five sacks in stifling the Raiders' quarterback Rich Gannon.

The Buccaneers more than deserved the warm welcome when they returned home to a packed Raymond James Stadium on Monday night and victory parade through the town on Tuesday.

During the parade, thousands of fans lined the street and screamed their approval as the players drove by in convertibles and pickup trucks.

The Bucs were equally grateful. Manager Rich McKay said, "We have heard a lot about the Eagles fans and we have heard a lot about the Raiders fans. We have heard a lot about all these fans, but I think we all know who the best fans in the United States of America are, and they are the Buccaneers fans."

The Bucs and their fans were simply happy that the Bucs have become the world champs by a margin of 48 to 21, no less for the first time in the franchise's 27-year history.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) honoring the Tampa Bay Buccaneers.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and senior member of the Florida delegation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are rightfully proud in the Tampa Bay area of our team, the Tampa Bay Buccaneers; and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), my colleague from Tampa and my neighbor, for introducing this resolution calling attention to the tremendous success of the team.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to compliment both teams. I

know we had the Raiders, their team and their coach, and we had the Buccaneers, our team and our coach. They gave America, and especially America's sports fans, a tremendous Sunday afternoon. It was exciting. It was an exciting time and the challenge was real, and the Buccaneers really came through; and as my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), said, we had a dry season for quite a while, but we finally made it.

In the few seconds that I have left, I wanted to make this comment, that since I have been in the Congress, many people have told me to quit talking so much about national defense because I have been here preaching about a strong national defense ever since I came here many years ago; but I think Jon Gruden and the Tampa Bay Buccaneers proved there ain't nothing like a good defense.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House of Representatives and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings or other audible conversation is in violation of the rules of the House.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), my colleague and classmate, who is the originator of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I think, what is a relatively somber time in Washington as we debate issues about national defense and having a strong and smart defense, that it is appropriate that we take time to honor another collection of heroes whom I am terribly proud to speak on behalf of today.

□ 1215

As a lifelong resident of Tampa, and now a representative of the Tampa Bay area, as all of us will be that speak today, along with some other Floridians, I take tremendous pride in offering this resolution, with others, not to celebrate just a victory, because that is not exactly what happened on Sunday. The Bucs did not just win, I think they won with class and they won with style. It is not just about winning, it is about how you win, and the Bucs won the right way.

As a resident of the community, I am so terribly proud of each of these individuals, the attention that has come to them and will continue to come to them, about the personal sacrifices they have made to play their hearts out on the field, the terrific contributions they are making to our community as leaders, particularly with young people, and all kinds of scholarships and charities that I do not have time to talk about today. It just makes

me very proud and really speaks to why these people are leaders on the field and off the field.

The other important thing that has happened in my community, that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM), alluded to, is the tremendous solidarity this team has brought. It has brought together people of all walks of life, an important lesson for Congress to learn, about how you can get people to overlook differences of all kinds that we can imagine to focus simply on the goal, and celebrating victory that has been many, many years in the coming.

I would like to share a few facts about the history of the team for those people that are just beginning to pay attention to this truly amazing story about the Bucs' victory. Since 1976, when the Bucs started as an expansion team, the Tampa Bay area has embraced this team and cherished and supported the team through some very tough times. In the first season, the Bucs went 0 and 26. The former coach, John McKay, was asked after one game what he thought of the team's execution, and his response was, he was all for execution.

There were bright spots in those earlier years as well. Hall of Fame defensive lineman and current University of South Florida athletic director Lee Roy Selmon and the 1980 NFC championship team were a stellar performance for the Bucs, although the Bucs lost that game barely.

When Rich McKay, a former high school classmate of mine, took over the general manager position, and Tony Dungy, who is just a wonderful person and terrific coach, hit the field, things began to turn around. The owner of the team, Malchom Glazer, began to invest the money in the team that needed to be invested from the beginning. As a result, in the 6 years after that, the Bucs made the playoffs 5 times. They reached the NFC championship game in 2000 and became league leaders in Pro Bowl appearances over that time and began to build this incredible, strong and smart defense.

John Gruden, who has been mentioned, is a story that speaks for himself. He is a wonderful coach. He showed true genius on the field. The defensive coordinator, Monte Kiffin, showed how to play defensive football in ways that will be a model for years to come.

The game is over now. No matter what happens next, the Bucs will always be remembered as the winners of Super Bowl XXXVII. Nothing can ever take that away from them. I want to congratulate not just the team and the coaches, but all the players and coaches that came before them and laid the foundation that we are celebrating today, as well as all the players and fans that have really sacrificed to support this team.

I want to finally close by urging my colleagues to support the resolution, and I want to especially urge the Mem-

bers of Congress in the Oakland area to support this resolution. I know it was tough to lose to the Bucs, but, clearly, the Bucs demonstrated they were entitled to this.

A lot of people talk about the west coast and the Bay area as a very important part of the country. That has been true for a long time. The San Francisco, Oakland, Silicon Valley area is what we all think of nationally when we think of the Bay area in the west coast. But, guess what? The Bucs have helped us remember that part of the future of this country is another west coast, another bay area, and it is the Tampa Bay area. It is the west coast of Florida, as these terrific Members of Congress will speak to here today, all of whom are really overshadowed and humbled to be in the company of a wonderful group of players and competitors and citizens of Florida.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again would urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Palm Beach, Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time, and of course I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Congratulations to the Tampa Bay Bucs and all who live in Tampa Bay, St. Petersburg, and all the environs. As a fan of the Dolphins, and coming from southeast Florida, many of us obviously wished the Dolphins great success, the last team in Florida to win a Super Bowl until this outstanding victory of our west coast compatriots.

Governor Gray Davis will have to pay up the debt to our own Governor, Jeb Bush, so we are excited that we had two victories over this past weekend. But the thrill of competition and the teamwork that took place was evidenced in that outstanding, incredible, incredible victory.

I want to commend both gentlemen that serve us in Congress representing the west coast of Florida for their leadership on this resolution and for their taking time to honor the skills of the athlete. I think the gentleman from Tampa, Florida (Mr. DAVIS), spoke eloquently about the members of the team who give back to their community outside of their professional sports endeavors; that actually mentor the kids; that work in the educational environment; help in inner-city schools, and do things that display the kind of character we hope all professional athletes will emulate.

Oftentimes role models for young kids who are struggling to find a role model to look up to are those that make a lot of money and drive fancy cars. Many on the team take time out of their own lives and professional endeavors to help those children. So this is not only a victory for a team on the field, it is a victory for the kids off the field.

So as Tampa Bay will continue to celebrate this outstanding achievement of a phenomenal team, we in

southeast Florida are all proud Tampa Bay Buccaneers, too. Mr. Glazer is a resident of Palm Beach, so we kind of share the opportunity to have the owner of the team in our county, but we also have a chance now as all Floridians to articulate the kind of excitement we felt that night when the time ran out on the clock and we, in fact, had another Super Bowl championship to put in the case of history.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am sure that people throughout all America join with our colleagues from Florida in paying tribute to the Tampa Bay Buccaneers. I join with them in their enthusiasm, and urge swift passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was never a football fan until I moved to the Tampa Bay area. I think it was the contagious enthusiasm both from my husband and my grandchildren that converted me to become a Tampa Bay Bucs fan.

I rise today to congratulate the Tampa Bay Buccaneers for their outstanding performance and subsequent victory in Sunday's Super Bowl. The Super Bowl was the most watched Super Bowl ever in history. I do not know whether it is just because every television set in Florida was tuned in or not, but it was the most viewed Super Bowl in history.

The Buccaneers' victory of 48 to 21 over the Oakland Raiders came at long last to very, very patient Tampa Bay Bucs fans such as myself and my family, who endured many, many years of sticking with the Bucs even when they weren't winning. We knew it was just a matter of time, and that time came this past Sunday. The Buccaneer defense scored three touchdowns from five interceptions, and that was a Super Bowl record.

Aside from congratulating the team, I would also like to congratulate John Gruden, the NFL's youngest coach. In his very first year, he took the Tampa Bay Bucs on to victory. We would be remiss if we did not also thank Tony Dungy, the former coach, because he was able to develop that team and develop the team to the point where their defense was so strong.

I would certainly congratulate all of the members of the Buccaneer team and as well to the Oakland Raiders. It was a hard-fought battle. Somebody had to win, and I am just darn glad that it was the Tampa Bay Bucs.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a seasoned ticket holder of the Tampa Bay Bucs since the beginning of their creation, I can only tell my colleagues that we are so thrilled over their victory, and I rise to congratulate the world champion Tampa Bay Buccaneers for their extraordinary victory in Super Bowl XXXVII.

This season the Bucs epitomized what Americans admire most in a champion. They won because of an incredible defense and an effective offense, which they built with outstanding talent and refined through extraordinary coaching.

This championship did not emerge overnight. It followed many years of grit and perseverance, during which the Glazer family, general manager Rich McKay, and former head coach Tony Dungy built a winner brick by brick.

Head coach John Gruden brought this sleeping giant to life. Like the leadership of this great body, he united a team of diverse talents and personalities behind his vision, flawlessly executing his championship blueprint through his team's discipline, dedication, and character.

On behalf of the citizens of southwest Florida, I congratulate Coach Gruden and the entire Bucs organization for a job very well done. They have made our Tampa Bay region very proud.

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

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous amount of pride from the Florida delegation in the Tampa Bay Buccaneers. We certainly are grateful to Tampa's hometown Congressman, the gentleman from downtown Tampa, Florida (Mr. DAVIS), for introducing this resolution. He serves with a great deal of class, just as the Buccaneers were victorious with class, and the fans have celebrated with class.

This team gives back to the community, and the community is rightfully joyful in this celebration today. All of us are so proud of the work the Glazer family and Coach Gruden has done, and so I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my strong support for this resolution and salute the Tampa Bay Buccaneers for winning Super Bowl 37.

The Buccaneers have proven themselves through the years. From their humbling 0-26 start in 1976 and winless first season and a half, the Bucs have evolved into a force with which to be reckoned—the Champions of Super Bowl 37.

As a Bucs season ticket-holder and longtime resident of the Tampa Bay area, I am proud to have witnessed the years of change and hard work that culminated in Sunday's triumph over the Oakland Raiders.

Former Coach Tony Dungy deserves much of the credit for this victory. He changed the character of the team by instilling in them a focus on community, character, and leadership. His hard work, and that of many other

coaches, players and team staff, created the solid foundation upon which today's Super Bowl Champion Buccaneers stand.

The youngest coach ever to win a Super Bowl, Jon Gruden has built upon that foundation and continued the legacy of hard work and responsibility. I commend him for leading the Bucs to their first-ever Super Bowl appearance and victory. The Buccaneers paid a hefty price for Coach Gruden, but it was a price well worth paying, because football's ultimate treasure, the Lombardi Trophy, is where it belongs—in Tampa Bay.

Certainly, no congratulatory speech would be complete without honoring the players themselves. Coming into the game as the underdogs, the Buccaneers stayed the course and fought hard to secure their championship. An outstanding defensive effort prevented the Raiders from gaining momentum. Tampa's defense returned three of a Super Bowl record five interceptions for touchdowns, dashing any hopes Oakland may have had in winning the title of World Football Champions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent part of the Tampa Bay area and to be here today to offer my congratulations to Coach Gruden and the players. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution honoring the Buccaneers for their hard work and their well-deserved Super Bowl title.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 31.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on House Joint Resolution 2, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.J. RES. 2, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 2) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 2, be instructed to agree to the highest level of funding within the scope of conference (1) for the programs within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, including advance appropriations in the Senate amendment, and (2) for veterans' medical care and to insist that, within the scope of conference, no item requested by the President for homeland security (as identified in the OMB submission titled "Homeland Security Funding") be funded below the level of the President's request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Article I of the Constitution states that no money can be drawn from the Treasury except by act of Congress.

□ 1230

That is the essence of the separation and balance of power in this government. It is the core function of this body. It is what makes this a legislative body, not a Soviet-style rubber stamp.

So let me ask what some Members might find to be a somewhat embarrassing question: How did the House of Representatives get through an entire session of Congress last year without ever even calling up for debate Senate appropriation bills that fund more than three-quarters of the government outside of the Department of Defense? Now I am not asking why we failed to pass the bills. There can be numerous answers to that question. I am not asking why we did not complete the conference report. That could easily be blamed on the intransigence or inaction of the other body.

What I am asking is how could we fail to even call up for debate on this floor, on this floor, the basic pieces of legislation to fund the government when that is our fundamental responsibility as an institution.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 108th Congress. This is the 215th year in which this body has gathered to perform our duties under the Constitution. As a result, it is quite difficult to do something in Congress that has never been done before, but I think this body in the last Congress actually succeeded in that respect. The House Republican leadership never even let these bills out of committee, never debated on the

House floor whether the amounts requested or the sums recommended by the committee were too much or too little, never allowed the elected representatives of the American people to vote on any of these matters.

The result, the party that is oh, so noisy in talking about accountability for teachers and schools is oh, so silent when it comes to the accountability of Members of Congress. You cannot be held accountable for the choices you never make, and that is the game that has gone on here for almost a year.

Mr. Speaker, how can there be a more fundamental breakdown of the institution? What a disgrace. What was it that we did all year that was so important we could not at least call these bills up?

I want to make it quite clear, there is one person in this institution who I am not referring to, and that is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has gone to the mat time and time again to try to get this House to meet its responsibilities. He has spoken on the subject often and eloquently, and it is in spite of his very considerable efforts that we find ourselves where we are today.

In my mind there is one issue at the bottom of this: the majority party leadership in this House abandoned its central responsibility under the Constitution and to the American people in order to get political cover on one issue. They love to talk the talk on education, but they are not willing to walk the walk. They are not willing to put their money where their mouths are. Oh, yes, they like to visit schools. They like to read to children when the cameras are around; and oh, they love to make TV ads about how important education is and how much they care about it. They like to vote for big, expensive authorization programs creating new major responsibilities for local boards to meet, and they like to promise huge sums of Federal money to pay for them. They love to do all of those things.

There is only one thing that they apparently cannot and will not do, and that is pay the bill afterwards. Now most people have seen a con artist in action, at least in the movies. They have the capacity to seem in almost every respect to be someone quite different from whom they really are. That is what the majority party has done over the last several years with respect to education. Of course, the only time they get caught at the game is when the appropriations bills are on the floor. That is the one point in time when all of the pretty images fall apart, all of photo ops, press releases and slick TV ads, that is the time when they do not run true; and that is why this day has been delayed for almost 8 months, well after the election, well after the opportunity of the American people to measure whether the rhetoric coming out of the Congress and this administration has anything whatsoever

to do with the reality as far as education is concerned.

Unfortunately, even now we do not have an appropriate bill in front of us. We do not have specific funding levels proposed for specific programs. We have the most confusing hodgepodge of numbers it would be possible to concoct, and a motion to go to conference on those numbers. That is an open invitation to have a small group of people bring back an all-or-nothing omnibus package so big and so complex and so late in the year that we can claim that we just had to vote for it, even though it is on a program-by-program basis 180 degrees at variance with what a large majority of this body claims to support.

Today I want to give this House an opportunity to send a different message to the conference. I want to give Members on the other side of the aisle who truly believe what they say about resources in the classroom, better teachers, small classes, stronger curriculum a chance to stand up and say to Mitch Daniels and their leadership here in the House that they are for real, that they insist on a bottom line that is much higher for education than the numbers that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), has been given to work with.

Our motion to instruct simply says that the allocation to the bill that contains education funding shall not be smaller when the bill comes back to the House than the sums contained in the Senate bill. If we take all of the increases the Senate says it would like to make in that bill, we find ourselves \$9.55 billion over the level the House has allocated to the Regula bill. Even after we subtract the remarkable across-the-board cuts contained in the Senate package, this bill is about \$5.7 billion above House levels. CBO has not scored it yet, and so we do not have precise numbers; but that is about where we believe the Senate ends up.

We are asking that the House direct its conferees to begin this conference by agreeing with the Senate on that overall funding level. It is not at the level of increase in our schools that we have provided in any of the last 6 years. It would mean that the result of all of the time and debate we spent in enacting No Child Left Behind would be to scale back the funds that we are sending to schools. It is not the level that we can and should provide, but under the rules we are working under it is the best we can do; and it is without any question the least we should do. I would simply note, by the way, that the bludgeoning-nature of the across-the-board cuts provided by the Senate has resulted in unacceptable damage to a number of other crucial activities in areas such as health and science.

There are two other parts to this motion. One is that the level of funds for homeland security activities in this package shall not fall below the levels requested by the President so far as it

is possible within the scope of the conference. Yesterday, I catalogued just how inadequate the President's budget is for homeland security, for port protection, for first responders. But the Senate's across-the-board cuts have taken more than a billion dollars from homeland security activities. Our intent is to restore those funds. It, at the very least, will make clear that the education funds will not be coming from homeland security.

Finally, we have a crisis in veterans' medical care. The across-the-board cuts in the Senate bill significantly exacerbates that crisis. We direct in this motion the conferees to go to the highest possible level for veterans' medical care that is within the scope of the conference.

I will be very blunt about this instruction. If anyone votes for it, they are setting parameters on the conference that do not permit the conference to come back within the allocation that Mitch Daniels and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) have established. This motion says to them that the line that they have drawn in the sand for education and other domestic needs is unrealistic. We need to move on and resolve these differences, and we need to support local schools. This is not the end of the process; this is step one.

If a majority of this body votes to agree with the Senate that we need this \$5.7 billion increase for education, and the Congress then agrees to a conference report that rejects the position taken by both Houses, the American people will then know exactly what is going on around here. They are going to know at that point exactly how phony all of these press releases and TV ads on education have been.

Mr. Speaker, no one should vote for this motion if they intend to vote for a later conference report that scales back funding for the very education programs we are trying to protect by this motion. That would be an act of hypocrisy that would be startling even by the standards of this town.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the effort that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is making here, and I would say that these are some of the items that we will definitely be dealing with as we go to conference.

But for those Members who have followed the budget and the appropriations process for fiscal year 2003, they will recognize that we really have accomplished somewhat of a miracle to be where we are today, ready to appoint conferees so we can go to conference with the Senate.

If we agreed with the bill that the other body has sent to us as an amendment to our continuing resolution, we could just agree to their amendment today and our business for fiscal year 2003 would be concluded, and I would tell Members that I do not think the

gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I could be happier if that were the case. But the fact is, as we study that bill, it is not a bill that we can agree with; so it is essential that we go to conference.

The Senate had to reduce the bills that they had reported from their committee by \$9 billion just to get to the top number that a majority of Members have agreed to. In addition to that, they are going to have to make some additional changes because even though they are at the top number, there are many things in the bills that our committee reported that are not in their bill, and they have included things in their bill that were not in our bill, so we have a lot of work to do.

So as we go to conference, we need flexibility. We need to be able to negotiate, to move, to make decisions, and to bring back to this House a responsible omnibus appropriations bill, for fiscal year 2003 and conclude the business for fiscal year 2003 because fiscal year 2004 is approaching us like a runaway train, and thus we will be beginning fiscal year 2004 activities almost immediately.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) does not need to have this motion to instruct conferees. He and I will lead a very strong conference team to meet with our counterparts in the other body. I will be speaking for the majority side, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be speaking for the minority side. He and I are partners. We will go into this conference knowing where we want to end up and knowing what we have to do to end up there.

We actually do not need a motion to instruct conferees. If for some reason the conference committee got bogged down, maybe we would need a motion to instruct, but I do not think that is going to happen. I have worked very closely with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and we believe that we have the ability to reach agreements on very difficult decisions. Because of that, I think today is not a good time to instruct conferees. I would say at a later date if that becomes necessary that maybe I would agree to it. Today I ask Members to reject this motion to instruct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after listening to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), it sounded like the gentleman was saying that the conferees would be himself and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I want to say if that is the deal, if there are going to be two conferees, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, I would urge the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to withdraw the motion to instruct because if those are the two Members, as the gentleman said, I would have complete confidence

in them. Pending that, if the gentleman would just confirm that he said the conferees will be himself and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), I am ready to go home.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) for his comments. At one point I actually suggested that we keep our side of the conference very, very small, meaning the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and myself, and maybe one other be conferees, but that did not work.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the "maybe one other" just ruined it.

□ 1245

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think I said all that needs to be said, and I would like to advise the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my friend, I really do not have any other speakers on the subject; so I am going to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, the hollow promises must end. Last night President Bush said, and I quote, "Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people." That was correct that he said that. Last year he said, "Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay." I think he was right to say that. The late fees, however, on those promises are piling up.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, not, by the way, members of the Committee on Appropriations, and not under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who does an extraordinary job in our committee, but some of my friends on the other side of the aisle are licking their chops at the smorgasbord of tax cuts that would fatten the wealthy and leave scraps for most Americans and force our children to pay the bill. But they do not want to spend resources now that are needed for Federal agencies to respond to terrorist threats. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) tried to bring that to their attention. Nor will they honor the bipartisan pledge to improve our educational system.

Within the limits of parliamentary procedures, we are limited in what can be offered in this motion. However, its purpose is critical. It is time to leave the hot air behind and the rhetoric behind and to live up to our commitment and the expectations of those who sent us here. It is time to live up to our commitment to indeed leave no child behind.

We made a promise to help schools implement reforms to meet higher

standards. We have asked States and local school districts to do the work, and we must show that we were serious, that we meant what we said, that we will put the Nation's money where the Nation's heart is. The House bill is \$5.7 billion less than the other body's funding for the No Child Left Behind Act. If we pursue that number, we will leave millions of children behind.

This is simply inadequate, inadequate to help local school districts meet the new mandates we insisted upon just last year. Title I is intended to help disadvantaged students meet high academic standards, a critical objective. Ten million children are eligible for Title I services. Again, the House only meets two-thirds of the \$16 billion we need. I say to my friends, that is saying to over 3 million children in America there is no room in this rich inn. The other body provides an additional \$500 million, and we ought to give them at least that level so that we leave no child behind.

The other body also provides \$2 billion more in IDEA grants, children with disabilities who seek an education. We promised the States we would participate; \$2 billion light are we. The House level provides less than half of the Federal contribution toward the added cost of special education that is authorized under IDEA. Again, we as the representatives of the American people need to ensure the fact that America lives up to its promises.

We must not forget our veterans either. Over 310,000 veterans are on waiting lists for medical care, and many veterans are waiting as long as 6 months for an appointment to see a doctor. To a person last night we stood and cheered and clapped with respect and appreciation for those who serve us in uniform both here and abroad. Should we do any less for them when they are through their active service but need the health care we have promised? It is an outrage to not do so. Freedom's defenders deserve better. We must fully fund VA medical care. We do not do it.

Finally, with regard to homeland security, the Council on Foreign Relations reported last October that we are "dangerously unprepared to prevent and respond to a catastrophic terrorist attack on U.S. soil." The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pleaded with the President of the United States to respond to this vulnerability. The cost of addressing our vulnerabilities is a mere fraction of the President's \$674 billion tax cut.

I was elected to State Senate in 1966. Ted Agnew, who was then the county executive of Baltimore County, elected Governor that same year, and in the inaugural address he said this: That the price of progress far exceeds the cost of failure. The billions of dollars that were suggested by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) could save us tens of billions of dollars,

as the President said, in preventing just one catastrophic event.

I hope my colleagues will support this motion. I hope my colleagues will stand and say we promise and we talk, but this motion says we are also prepared to take the walk. I believe Americans are prepared to take that walk as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the new ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I have to say with respect to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) even if the conference was not just himself and the gentleman from Wisconsin, if it was just himself, many on our side would not be so nervous, but he is for all dedication not autonomous, less autonomous, less nearly autonomous than he used to be under the current regime, and we fear that the instructions he will be getting from the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue will outweigh commitments that we think ought to be made to the people we are here to serve.

I wish we were not dealing with all of these issues in one instruction motion, but it must be repeated again. The way in which this House leadership has chosen to deal with the appropriations process this year has been one of the most thorough degradations of the democratic process I have ever seen. And people have said, well, but the Senate did not pass a budget. What does that have to do with the constitutional right of this body to pass appropriations bills?

We, in fact, passed two appropriations bills for defense. There was no obstacle there, and there was no obstacle with the other appropriations bills except the political reality that by the time you get through financing two wars with three tax cuts, you do not have enough money left to meet fundamental social obligations.

And what the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to do and he says, in a burst of reasonableness, within the scope of conference, indeed I think that might be the part of it to which the other side objects the most, because staying within the scope of the conference has rarely been their practice in recent years, but the gentleman from Wisconsin has correctly in parliamentary terms framed his motion, and he says we would have liked even more in some of these areas. At least let us go to the level that the Republican-controlled United States Senate voted for.

What happens if we do not do that? Veterans get a good deal of rhetoric from this institution. I wish they got 25 percent as much help as they get rhetoric. In the New England region Category 8 veterans have been shut off altogether because we cannot afford it because we have got to do a big tax

cut, because we have other priorities. The gentleman from Wisconsin's motion is giving a chance to say do that.

I will say this: If people do not vote for the gentleman's motion, and if, as he stressed, even more importantly they do not vote for a conference report that reaches that level, if they vote for a conference report that has less than that, then any of them who then talk about how sorry they are that veterans' medical care is being cut are indeed guilty of the grossest form of hypocrisy, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said.

There are other areas we cannot touch here because of the unwillingness of the majority to let the normal process go forward. The Securities and Exchange Commission even at the Senate level will be substantially below what the President said they should get when he signed the corporate responsibility bill. The last time we debated this, the gentleman from Virginia, who is a subcommittee chairman, said to me, "I am introducing a bill to give them the money." He introduced the bill. It remains introduced. It has not been voted on. It has not been acted on.

Housing is also significantly underfunded, and there will be terrible problems in public housing, in Section 8.

But in the areas of the gentleman's motion, health care for veterans, research at NIH, and education, a failure not simply to vote for this instruction motion, because I am not sure that we may not be able to rope-a-dope here, in which people will vote for an instruction motion and then act contrary to it, and try and get coverage because they voted for the instruction motion, if we do not have an appropriation that at least reaches these levels for the National Institutes for Health, for education, for veterans care, then we will have really thoroughly failed in our obligation to the American people.

We passed an education bill, and we cheered for it, and now we have imposed on the localities without giving them the money. We have done this time and time again. The gentleman from Wisconsin's motion and its being taken seriously by the conference committee is the minimum that decency requires, and I wish I was not skeptical that we will achieve it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Obey motion because it keeps a promise with the American public. It keeps a promise with America's schoolchildren, and it keeps a promise with the parents of those children and the

teachers that teach them. And that promise was made by the President of the United States, that promise was made by the Congress of the United States, that in the process of enacting the most far-reaching reforms in the Federal role in education in this country, that we would fully fund the means by which the States and localities and school districts could carry out those reforms. But almost before the ink was dry, the President submitted a budget that, in fact, made cuts in that education promise.

Last night the President talked about the accomplishments that he had had. He talked about setting standards and having young children achieve those standards. That is the promise, but it is not happening. It is not happening in this country, and now it is even under greater threat because of the cuts that are taking place in education because of the economic distress in our country and the budgetary distress in our States.

The question for us is whether or not we will help these school districts carry out these reforms so that these children can have a higher level of achievement, a higher level of accomplishment, and a better chance of participating in the American dream. That is what the Obey amendment is about. That is what this vote is about. It is about whether or not this Congress will redeem that promise on behalf of America's schoolchildren.

We cannot have a freeze on those, as the House appropriations bill did. We cannot have the measly increase that the Senate has suggested. What, in fact, we need is to add this additional \$5.7 billion so that the promise of no child left behind is, in fact, a reality. And it is important because States are required under this law to do many things differently, many things better than they have done in the past, and we believe, and most educators believe, that the result will be that America's schoolchildren will have a higher level of accomplishment, will have a higher level of performance. By the same token, those very same independent observers of the American education system understand that if the resources are not there, this promise will be hollow.

□ 1300

The President made the promise, the President should keep the promise, and the Congress of the United States should help him to keep that promise by passing the Obey motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House refused to provide the financial assistance necessary to our local firemen and policemen and other first responders whose responsibility it is to be our first line of defense against terrorist attacks in communities throughout this country.

Today I would hope that the House would not take action to deny the

health care resources that American veterans need and deserve. I would hope we would not deny them the funds that those veterans need in order to avoid the kind of service cutoffs that we have seen the VA announce over recent weeks.

I know the name of the game on the part of the White House and the majority party leadership is to preserve every possible dollar on the table for tax cuts, a huge percentage of which are aimed at the most well-off 1 percent of the folks in our society who make more than \$300,000. I understand that that is the name of the game. But in my view, while I certainly wish those folks well and while I think they ought to share in the same tax cuts provided other people, I think that veterans need VA health care more than someone who is earning \$500,000 a year needs to have an extra jumbo-sized tax cut.

So I would simply ask Members of this House, do not, please, pose for political "holy pictures" by having photos at local schools, if the only thing you are willing to send those local schools is a new set of mandates without the money to help pay for them. Do not do that. School districts are in too big a squeeze and State governments with their financial problems are in too big a squeeze already.

All we are asking you to do is, within the possibilities presented by this conference report, we are asking you to vote for the maximum amount possible in order to come closer than we will otherwise come to meeting the promises so far unfulfilled of the No Child Left Behind Act.

I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make the case very strongly that a "no" vote on this motion to instruct does not deny any of the things that have been discussed today. It does not approve them; it does not deny them. A "no" vote allows us to have total flexibility as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I lead this conference committee into a final solution for fiscal year 2003.

I listened to the debate, and I have a hard time disagreeing with things that I have heard. But as I said, a "no" vote does not deny any of that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct. Let us go to conference, and let us bring the best bill that we possibly can back here for consideration by the House.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The question is on the mo-

tion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, 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 200, nays 209, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—200

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Abercrombie | Hall | Napolitano |
| Ackerman | Harman | Neal (MA) |
| Alexander | Hill | Oberstar |
| Allen | Hinchey | Obey |
| Andrews | Hinojosa | Ortiz |
| Baca | Hoeffel | Owens |
| Baird | Holden | Pallone |
| Baldwin | Holt | Pascarell |
| Ballance | Honda | Pastor |
| Bell | Hoolley (OR) | Payne |
| Berkley | Hoyer | Pelosi |
| Berman | Inslee | Peterson (MN) |
| Berry | Israel | Pomeroy |
| Bishop (GA) | Jackson (IL) | Price (NC) |
| Bishop (NY) | Jackson-Lee | Rahall |
| Blumenauer | (TX) | Rangel |
| Boswell | Jefferson | Reyes |
| Boucher | John | Rodriguez |
| Boyd | Jones (OH) | Ross |
| Brady (PA) | Kanjorski | Rothman |
| Brown (OH) | Kelly | Roybal-Allard |
| Brown, Corrine | Kennedy (RI) | Ruppersberger |
| Capps | Kildee | Rush |
| Capuano | Kilpatrick | Ryan (OH) |
| Cardin | Kind | Sabo |
| Cardoza | Kleczka | Sanchez, Linda |
| Carson (IN) | Kucinich | T. |
| Carson (OK) | Lampson | Sanchez, Loretta |
| Case | Langevin | Sanders |
| Clay | Lantos | Sandlin |
| Clyburn | Larsen (WA) | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Larson (CT) | Schiff |
| Costello | Leach | Scott (GA) |
| Cramer | Lee | Scott (VA) |
| Crowley | Levin | Serrano |
| Cummings | Lewis (GA) | Sherman |
| Davis (AL) | Lipinski | Skelton |
| Davis (CA) | Lofgren | Slaughter |
| Davis (FL) | Lowe | Smith (WA) |
| Davis (IL) | Lucas (KY) | Snyder |
| Davis (TN) | Lynch | Solis |
| DeFazio | Majette | Spratt |
| DeGette | Maloney | Stark |
| Delahunt | Markey | Stenholm |
| DeLauro | Marshall | Strickland |
| Deutsch | Matheson | Stupak |
| Dicks | Matsui | Tanner |
| Dingell | McCarthy (MO) | Tauscher |
| Doggett | McCarthy (NY) | Taylor (MS) |
| Dooley (CA) | McCollum | Thompson (CA) |
| Doyle | McDermott | Thompson (MS) |
| Edwards | McGovern | Tierney |
| Emanuel | McIntyre | Turner (TX) |
| Engel | McNulty | Udall (CO) |
| Eshoo | Meehan | Udall (NM) |
| Etheridge | Meek (FL) | Van Hollen |
| Evans | Meeks (NY) | Velazquez |
| Farr | Menendez | Visclosky |
| Fattah | Michaud | Waters |
| Filner | Millender- | Watson |
| Ford | McDonald | Watt |
| Frank (MA) | Miller (NC) | Waxman |
| Frost | Miller, George | Weiner |
| Gonzalez | Mollohan | Wexler |
| Gordon | Moore | Woolsey |
| Green (TX) | Moran (VA) | Wu |
| Grijalva | Murtha | Wynn |
| Gutierrez | Nadler | |

NAYS—209

| | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|
| Aderholt | Barrett (SC) | Bereuter |
| Akin | Bartlett (MD) | Biggart |
| Bachus | Barton (TX) | Bilirakis |
| Baker | Bass | Bishop (UT) |
| Ballenger | Beauprez | Blackburn |

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Blunt | Graves | Oxley |
| Boehler | Green (WI) | Paul |
| Boehmer | Greenwood | Pearce |
| Bonilla | Gutknecht | Pence |
| Bonner | Harris | Peterson (PA) |
| Bono | Hart | Petri |
| Boozman | Hastings (WA) | Pickering |
| Bradley (NH) | Hayes | Pitts |
| Brady (TX) | Hayworth | Platts |
| Brown (SC) | Hefley | Pombo |
| Brown-Waite, | Hensarling | Porter |
| Ginny | Hobson | Portman |
| Burgess | Hostettler | Pryce (OH) |
| Burns | Houghton | Putnam |
| Burr | Hulshof | Quinn |
| Buyer | Hunter | Radanovich |
| Calvert | Hyde | Ramstad |
| Cannon | Isakson | Regula |
| Cantor | Issa | Rehberg |
| Capito | Istook | Renzi |
| Carter | Janklow | Reynolds |
| Castle | Jenkins | Rogers (AL) |
| Chabot | Johnson (CT) | Rogers (KY) |
| Chocola | Johnson (IL) | Rogers (MI) |
| Coble | Johnson, Sam | Rohrabacher |
| Cole | Jones (NC) | Royce |
| Collins | Keller | Ryan (WI) |
| Cox | Kennedy (MN) | Ryun (KS) |
| Crane | King (IA) | Saxton |
| Crenshaw | King (NY) | Schroek |
| Culberson | Kingston | Sensenbrenner |
| Cunningham | Kirk | Sessions |
| Davis, Jo Ann | Klime | Shadegg |
| Davis, Tom | Knollenberg | Shays |
| Deal (GA) | Kolbe | Sherwood |
| DeLay | LaHood | Shimkus |
| DeMint | Latham | Shuster |
| Diaz-Balart, L. | LaTourette | Simmons |
| Diaz-Balart, M. | Lewis (KY) | Simpson |
| Doolittle | Linder | Smith (NJ) |
| Dreier | LoBiondo | Souder |
| Duncan | Lucas (OK) | Stearns |
| Dunn | Manzullo | Sullivan |
| Emerson | McCotter | Sweeney |
| English | McCrery | Tancredo |
| Everett | McHugh | Tauzin |
| Feeney | McInnis | Taylor (NC) |
| Ferguson | McKeon | Terry |
| Flake | Mica | Thomas |
| Fletcher | Miller (FL) | Thornberry |
| Foley | Miller (MI) | Tiberi |
| Forbes | Miller, Gary | Toomey |
| Fossella | Moran (KS) | Turner (OH) |
| Franks (AZ) | Murphy | Upton |
| Frelinghuysen | Musgrave | Vitter |
| Garrett (NJ) | Myrick | Walden (OR) |
| Gerlach | Nethercutt | Walsh |
| Gibbons | Ney | Wamp |
| Gilchrest | Northup | Weldon (FL) |
| Gillmor | Norwood | Weller |
| Gingrey | Nunes | Whitfield |
| Goode | Nussle | Wicker |
| Goodlatte | Osborne | Wolf |
| Goss | Ose | Young (AK) |
| Granger | Otter | Young (FL) |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Becerra | Hastings (FL) | Smith (MI) |
| Burton (IN) | Herger | Smith (TX) |
| Camp | Hoekstra | Tiahrt |
| Combest | Johnson, E.B. | Towns |
| Conyers | Kaptur | Weldon (PA) |
| Cubin | Lewis (CA) | Wilson (NM) |
| Ehlers | Olver | Wilson (SC) |
| Gallely | Ros-Lehtinen | |
| Gephardt | Shaw | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The Chair would advise Members that there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1324

Messrs. KINGSTON, TAUZIN, BARTON of Texas, SAXTON, KING of New York, and Mrs. BONO and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on rollcall No. 17, motion to go to conference on House Joint Resolution 2, because I am still recovering from surgery. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 17.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 29, 2003, I was unavoidably detained, and therefore unable to cast my floor vote on rollcall No. 17, the Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.J. Res. 2.

Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 17.

Stated against:

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 17 I was unavoidably detained as my pager did not work.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 17 I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote.

Had I been here I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, ROGERS of Kentucky, WOLF, KOLBE, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, ISTOOK, BONILLA, KNOLLENBERG, KINGSTON, OBEY, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that both of us are brand new in this job and this is the first time we are doing this, I want the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) to know that I am pleased to yield to him today and will be pleased to yield to him in days to come. I want him to stay leader; I would just like to change the designation, the adjective, but I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I appreciate his interest in changing my title, but that will not happen for another 2 years, at least.

Before I discuss next week's schedule, I would like to note for the gentleman and other Members of the House a very significant historical event that took place in the House of Representatives during this week back in 1815. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress was established back in 1800, and the Library was housed here in the Capitol, as many of us know, until 1814 when the British troops set fire to the building and destroyed most of the books in our collection. Retired President Thomas Jefferson graciously offered his personal library from Monticello as a replacement, and Congress purchased the library 188 years ago today for the sum of \$23,950.

Now, after the job he did in the Louisiana Purchase, one would have

thought Mr. JEFFERSON would have negotiated a little higher price from us, but, in any case, it was a great deal for America and a gracious gesture for our great champion of ideas.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the House will convene on Tuesday in pro forma session. On Wednesday we hope to consider the conference report on H. Res. 2, which will finish up the 2003 appropriations process. However, if the conference report is not ready for floor consideration, the House will need to consider another continuing resolution on Wednesday.

In addition, we may consider some measure under suspension of the rules. A list will be provided to all offices by Monday evening. There will be no votes in the House before 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, and on Thursday we expect to consider H.R. 395, the Do Not Call Implementation Act, to restrain rampant telemarketers, and finish with legislative business for the week by 1 p.m.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to answer any questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the information he has given to us. I understand we are coming back at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday and leaving no later than 1 p.m. on Thursday. I know the gentleman's party has its retreat. Ours is this week, as the gentleman knows.

I would ask the leader, Mr. Speaker, he indicates that the conference committee report may come back on Wednesday. If that is the case, does the gentleman have any information as to when the conference might meet?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, parties, both in the minority and the majority in both Houses, are speaking and talking to each other as we meet. Obviously, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in the House and the chairman in the Senate will do their own scheduling when the formal conference would be held.

We are hoping that, working with the minority and the ranking Members of both Houses, and working hard through the weekend, as hard as they can, that they will come to some sort of resolution next week. That is the schedule that the House would like to see happen; but we know, as all these things happen, it could leak and we would have to do another continuing resolution for another week. Hopefully, by then all the work would be done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Assuming that the conference report would be offered on Wednesday, assuming that work gets done, can the leader give us any information on the kind of rule under which that conference report would be considered? And I say that, Mr. Speaker, to the leader in the context that most members of the Committee on Appropriations, not to mention most Members of the House,

have not had the opportunity to see exactly what is in the bill. I think we just got the papers yesterday, so there has not been much consideration.

As the chairman, I am sure, knows, there will be a desire on, I am sure, both sides of the aisle, perhaps, to offer some legislative proposals to the conference committee report if they are made in order. Can the gentleman enlighten us as to what kind of rule the conference committee report might be considered under?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, as well as this gentleman, having served on the Committee on Appropriations, understands that this is a very unusual process that we are going through. In fact, I do not think we have gone through this process anytime that I have served on the Committee on Appropriations, so we are sort of feeling our way trying to get the appropriations done.

I remind the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations in the House passed out every one of the 13 bills out of committee, so we do have something to look at as to what at least the committee had done in the House; and they are trying to reconcile that with what the Senate did or what the other body did.

As far as bringing it back, it is the tradition of this House and has been the tradition of this House to bring back a conference report on an appropriations bill under a closed rule. To be honest, I do not know that we would want to change that.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Let me make a couple of comments.

First of all, the gentleman is almost right; we did 11 of the 13 bills. But the second largest bill, of course, as the gentleman knows, on discretionary spending, not only did we not do it, but it was not considered in subcommittee, much less in full committee, the Labor-Health bill, which is, of course, itself over \$125 billion in discretionary spending, and somewhere approximately \$300 billion, when we include the mandatory spending within that bill, as the gentleman recalls.

But as the gentleman makes the point, this is the most unusual procedure for the appropriations process that I have seen in my 20 years on the committee. It is the least involvement, I think, that members of the Committee on Appropriations in the House have had on the product that now is being sent to us by the Senate.

I know that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) on the Labor-Health bill introduced 2 days ago a Labor-Health alternative, which presumably will be used as a basis for that title of the bill to be conferenced. However, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, I would very much hope that in light of the extraordinarily unusual circumstances under which this appropriation bill is being considered, essentially emanating from the Senate,

which obviously from the House position is not what we want to see as normal practice, that the majority would very seriously consider, in the interests of democracy in this House, with a small "d," and in the interest of full debate on the priorities we are going to set forth in this bill that deals with over \$360 billion of discretionary spending, to have a rule that is not traditional, because we are not dealing with a traditional process.

I would hope that the leader, in discussions with the Speaker, with the majority whip, and with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), would consider a process which would allow Members to have a greater opportunity to express their views on this particular bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding again. The gentleman is correct in correcting me, that we only did 11 bills out of the committee. I do remind the gentleman that the chairman introduced a Labor-HHS bill, and it is my information that that is what they are working from.

Secondly, I would say that the conference committee as named has 12 Republicans and 10 Democrats on it, so the minority is very well represented on the conference committee, and will be, obviously, consulted and worked with in as open a manner as possible.

I would also point out the fact that conference reports are privileged resolutions, and it would be highly unusual for us to change the precedent and the rules governing privileged resolutions. So we are trying the best we can to accommodate any Member that is interested in what is going on in that conference, whether they be Democrat or Republican, by opening up the process as much as possible and having a process that Members can plug into so that their voices can be heard in the consideration of the conference.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman has said; but I am sure the gentleman also understands our consternation, because we are going on a retreat for 2 days. We are leaving here tomorrow morning. I ask the gentleman when the conference is going to occur. We really do not know when the conference is going to occur.

As the gentleman knows, like himself, I am a ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations. I have received no notice of a scheduled conference on this particular piece of legislation. I am one of the higher-ranking Members in the House. Therefore, I would think the gentleman and I would have access; but the more junior members of the Committee on Appropriations and those who do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations, while theoretically having some access to a conference, if the conference is never held, if there is no scheduled meeting, if they have no opportunity to participate in those deliberations, it is very difficult for them, short of acting on the floor, to consider this legislation.

So I would simply ask of the leader, Mr. Speaker, again in light of the extraordinarily unusual process that has been pursued over the last 12 months in dealing with the appropriation bills, and the fact that we did not bring the Labor-Health, one of the largest bills that our committee considers, to the floor or to full committee or to subcommittee for consideration, and yes, the chairman introduced a bill, but it was introduced by the chairman alone; it was not cosponsored by anybody else. That did not give us much input.

I will not belabor this point further, but I would hope and ask my colleagues, in light of the fact that this is the first substantive piece of legislation that we are going to consider, that it be considered with an opportunity for those of us who represent somewhere in the neighborhood of 49 percent of the people of the United States to have their voice heard meaningfully in the deliberations.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman makes a very good point. We want to be fair to all concerned. We want to have this as open a process as we possibly can make it.

I just want the Members of this body to know that we just received the paper from the other body last night, so it is going to take probably the entire time of the gentleman's retreat for the staff to go through that paper and get it ready for Members' consideration. Obviously, the Members that are interested in having an impact on this conference will probably have an opportunity, or I know they will have an opportunity, starting Sunday or Monday, to have input into that process. I offer to the gentleman that if anybody feels that they have been shut out of the process, our office is open and we are more than willing to work with them.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 2003; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 31, 2003, TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, January 31, 2003; and further, that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 31, 2003, it adjourn to meet at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, February 4, 2003.

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

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS ACCESSIBILITY ACT

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and I are introducing the Instructional Materials Accessibility Act, which makes sure that blind students will be able to enjoy an equal opportunity to a quality education.

It often takes months for a blind student to have the same materials as his or her sighted peers because of the cumbersome process needed to translate a textbook into Braille or other specialized format. This legislation will eliminate these delays by putting in place standards to assist States and school districts in delivering instructional materials to blind students.

I would urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

U.N. ABSURDITIES

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, for 12 years we have amassed a mountain of proof that Saddam Hussein has both weapons of mass destruction and the missiles he needs to launch them.

Right now, Saddam Hussein is violating a long string of binding U.N. resolutions. He continues to repeatedly violate the terms of the 1991 ceasefire, which amounts to a resumption of war.

As we heard last evening, our President is determined to stop Saddam Hussein before it is too late by disarming him of weapons of mass destruction. But over and over we hear the President's critics say that he should not act without the United Nations.

Now, President Bush agrees that the U.N. can be very helpful, but sometimes the U.N. does the wrong thing. Last year, the U.N. placed some of the world's worst human rights abusers on its Commission on Human Rights. Now, of all countries, Libya is going to chair that body.

If that is not bad enough, Iraq, Iraq is in line to take over the U.N. Conference on Disarmament. Could anything be more ludicrous?

President Bush should do the right thing with or without the United Nations.

COMMENDING INDIA ON ITS CELEBRATION OF REPUBLIC DAY

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with Indian Americans across the Nation in recognition of India's Republic Day, which was celebrated this last Sunday. Fifty-three years ago India's constitution, greatly influenced by America's Founding Fathers, was adopted to solidify its parliamentary democracy.

Today, India is the world's largest democracy, of over 1 billion people; and

the shared values of American and Indian people have never been more apparent. Our countries share a love of freedom; and both uphold the ideal of equality of all people, regardless of faith, gender, or ethnicity.

As the co-chair of the House India Caucus, along with the co-chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), I commend both President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, elected leaders of the world's two largest democracies, for continuing to actively cultivate strong ties between the United States and India.

URGING CONGRESS TO PASS THE PRESIDENT'S LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES, AND LEGISLATION HOLDING CRIMINALS RESPONSIBLE FOR HARMING UNBORN CHILDREN

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

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, last night the President of the United States challenged this Congress to tackle many problems facing our country, such as health care reform and economic growth. The President also urged Congress to pass legislation banning partial birth abortions and human cloning. All of these are extremely important goals.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that we will again pass a bill that will hold criminals responsible for harming unborn children. Last session we did pass such legislation, but under current Federal law an individual could attack a pregnant woman, injuring that woman and killing the child. While the assailant could be tried for the assault against the mother, no legal action is available under Federal law to address the murder of the child.

This is not the case in many States in this Nation. In fact, 24 States, including my home State of Pennsylvania, have passed unborn victims' laws.

□ 1345

These are effective laws that have been upheld by the courts on a number of occasions when they have been challenged. In fact, all legal challenges to such unborn victims laws have failed. And a number of Federal courts have turned away challenges to State unborn victims laws.

An expectant mother who loses a child as a result of an attack by a violent criminal before she gets to hold her child deserves recourse. Well, this recourse would never be a substitute for her terrible loss. I do not think it is too much to ask to have a similar unborn victims laws on the books. Last year we passed this act. I am confident we will pass this bill again.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under the Speaker's an-

nounced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN LUCIEN BLACKWELL

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

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today with a very heavy heart as the passing of a dear, dear friend of mine and a dear friend of a lot of people, former Congressman Lucien Blackwell.

Lucien Blackwell was a Korean decorated war hero. He was a Member of this body. He was a member of the Pennsylvania State Legislature, a member of city council, and he was a very famous labor leader. Lucien Blackwell was a champion for the little people.

Two things come to mind when you talk about Lucien Blackwell: He was a warrior, and he had passion. He was a warrior and a fighter for the people who could not fight for themselves, and he spoke for people who could not speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in my 18 years as a party chairman for the city of Philadelphia, he was my vice chair. He stood beside me for 18 years, and for 18 years there was never a motion on the floor that he did not make or he did not second. He was without question a man of integrity and a man who will be missed.

I was with him the day before he passed. We did our normal politicking and our famous back-room scheming, always to try to help somebody else.

I would not be here today if it was not for Lucien Blackwell. When this seat became vacant, the first congressional seat of Pennsylvania, he was going to fill it. He was going to come back and resume his career as a Congressman. And then 2 days prior to submitting the name, he said to me that he met with his family, was having breakfast with his granddaughters and grandsons, and they said to him, Pop-Pop, if you went back to Congress we could not be doing this with you. So he thought better of it. He thought better to stay with his family and not to come back to this body, and that is why I am here. He nominated me, and I took that congressional seat.

I feel a little responsible for allowing his family to have him for 5 more years, which is a very short time.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation, this body lost a good man. The State of Pennsylvania lost a good man. The city of Philadelphia and the labor movement lost a good man. His family, they lost a loving husband; his loving wife, city council lady Janey Blackwell. His family lost a father, a brother, a grandfather, a great grandfather. And, Mr. Speaker, I lost a good friend. He will never be forgotten, and for sure he can never be replaced.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN LUCIEN BLACKWELL

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to comment on the life and legacy of our former colleague Lucien E. Blackwell, who served as a Congressman for the Second District, and prior to that served for two decades as a member of the city council of Philadelphia, where he served as a chairman of the finance committee and moved through the council all of the critical and major pieces of legislation that impacted the growth and development of the city of Philadelphia as we know it today. And even before that service, he served as an elected official in the State legislature in Pennsylvania.

I remember almost three decades now ago when he led an effort with the late State representative David P. Richardson of Pennsylvania to clean up the conditions at our youth detention facility headquartered in our side of the State of the Youth Study Center on the parkway. He fought in the city council and passed the first major minority set-aside legislation once he found out that African American and women-owned businesses were getting less than 2 percent of the city procurement business, and created a program that opened a door for disadvantaged businesses to have an opportunity at the procurement in Philadelphia.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), has indicated, he started his public career, however, as a labor leader where he leveled the Longshoreman's Union in Philadelphia. And immediately prior to that he served our Nation in the Korean War conflict. He was a veteran of that conflict, and he won medals for his commitment and his service fighting with the Korean War veterans, and was a part of the effort to create an appropriate memorial for Korean veterans.

So Lucien E. Blackwell, who died suddenly at the age of 71, as it is reported, leaves now his wife, who is a city councilwoman in Philadelphia and a major leader in our city, and a host of children and grandchildren, who are going to in their own way make a mark and live up to the legacy of Lucien Blackwell.

And Philadelphians, Pennsylvanians, and all across this country people remember the passion of Lucien Blackwell, particularly his effort to be concerned about those who were considered in some quarters to be little people or outside of the mainstream of power. He fought with Maleek for ex-offenders. He fought to feed the homeless in Philadelphia, sometimes to the chagrin of the establishment. He fought to include labor fully in the discussions of economic development in our city, major building projects and every other respect.

Lucien Blackwell should be remembered by this House as not just a

former Member, but someone whose life of service honored the House by him being a Member here, and for all of his service to our country we should be grateful. And I would just like to say that for a lot of those people, the Linda Brickhouses, the Kentues at the grassroots political network, and all of the people he worked with, John Macklin on the disadvantaged business efforts, the minority business efforts, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), who he worked with shoulder to shoulder developing the political machinery in our city, at least in terms of the Democratic Party, but he also reached across the aisle and worked quite well with our Republican colleagues to make our city what it is today.

We are indebted. And I join my colleague from the First Congressional District in honoring his memory, his legacy, and I know that this House will find appropriate ways as we go forward to more formally recognize his service.

I thank the Speaker for allowing us this time.

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

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

CRISIS IN RURAL HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I have had an opportunity to speak to the Speaker, and it is an honor to do so. I speak on behalf of rural America, Mr. Speaker. It is an issue that is bipartisan. It is an issue that is of great concern to an awful lot of Americans.

Last night in his State of the Union Address the President said all seniors should have the choice of a health care plan that provides prescription drugs. I hope that the President's plan when it comes out takes the opportunity to address some of the weak points in Medicare and to truly provide access to prescription drugs for seniors throughout the United States, including in rural areas.

At the moment, Mr. Speaker, the formula for deciding how to reimburse medical providers discriminates against providers that are in rural areas. In my district we have had two rural hospitals close in the last 2 or 3 years. One closed, then reopened, and went through two or three different sets of management. We have had a number of rural hospitals that have struggled just to make ends meet.

This is caused in part by our funding formula under Medicare, and I hope the President in crafting his plan for prescription drugs and for Medicare re-

form will take into account the need to protect rural areas, to protect the citizens that are in rural areas, and to protect the economies of rural areas.

At the moment the funding formula for Medicare reimbursement discriminates against rural providers and benefits urban providers. That formula needs to be adjusted. I believe this matter has been addressed before in the House. I hope that the Rural Health Care Caucus will be presenting to the House a bill that will address this matter, and I also hope that the President and the House will support that bill. If the President could incorporate the concepts behind that bill, which during the last session was called the Rural Community Hospital Assistance Act, then I think the Medicare reform that is offered by the President could well address the crisis in health care that we see today in rural areas.

REPUBLIC VERSUS DEMOCRACY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Benjamin Franklin told an inquisitive citizen that the delegates to the Constitutional Convention gave the people a Republic, if you can keep it. We should now apologize to Mr. Franklin. It is obvious that the Republic is gone, and we are wallowing in a pure democracy against which the Founders had strongly warned.

Madison, the Father of the Constitution, could not have been more explicit in his fear and concern for democracies. "Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contentions, have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property, and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

If Madison's assessment was correct, it behooves those of us in Congress to take note and decide, indeed, whether the public has vantaged when it occurred and what to expect in the ways of turbulence, contention and violence, and above all else what can we and what will we do about it.

The turbulence seems self-evident. Domestic welfare programs are not sustainable and do not accomplish their stated goals. State and Federal spending and deficits are out of control. Terrorism and uncontrollable fear undermines our sense of well-being. Hysterical reactions to dangers not yet seen prompt the people at the prodding of the politicians to readily sacrifice their liberties in vain hope that someone else will take care of them and guarantee their security.

With these obvious signs of a failed system all around us, there seems to be more determination than ever to antagonize the people of the world by pursuing a world empire. Nation-building, foreign intervention, preemptive

war and global government drive our foreign policy.

There seems to be complete aversion to defending the Republic and the Constitution that established it. The Founders clearly understood the dangers of a democracy. Edmond Randolph of Virginia described the effort to deal with the issue at the Constitutional Convention: "The general object was to produce a cure for evils under which the United States labored; that in tracing these evils to their origins, every man had found it in the turbulence and follies of democracy."

□ 1400

These strongly held views regarding the evils of democracies and the benefit of a constitutional republic were shared by all the Founders. For them, a democracy meant centralized power, controlled by majority opinion, which was up for grabs and, therefore, completely arbitrary.

In contrast, a republic was decentralized and representative in nature, with the government's purpose strictly limited by the Constitution to the protection of liberty and private property ownership. They believe the majority should never be able to undermine its principle and that the government must be tightly held in check by constitutional restraints.

The difference between a democracy and a republic was simple. Would we live under the age old concept of the rule of man or the enlightened rule of law?

A constitution in and by itself does not guarantee liberty in a republican form of government. Even a perfect constitution, with this goal in mind, is no better than the moral standards and desires of the people.

Although the United States Constitution was by far the best ever written for the protection of liberty, with safeguards against the dangers of a democracy, it, too, was flawed from the beginning. Instead of guaranteeing liberty equally for all people, the authors themselves yielded to the democratic majority's demands that they compromise on the issue of slavery. This mistake, plus others along the way, culminated in a civil war that surely could have been prevented with clearer understanding and a more principled approach to the establishment of a constitutional republic.

Subsequently, the same urge to accommodate majority opinion while ignoring the principles of individual liberty led to some other serious errors. Even amending the Constitution in a proper fashion to impose alcohol prohibition turned out to be a disaster. Fortunately, this was rectified after a short time with its repeal.

But today, the American people accept drug prohibition, a policy equally damaging to liberty as was alcohol prohibition. A majority vote in Congress has been enough to impose this very expensive and failed program on the American people even without both-

ering to amend the Constitution. It has been met with only minimal but, fortunately, growing dissent. For the first 150 years of our history, when we were much closer to being a true Republic, there were no Federal laws dealing with the serious medical problem of addiction.

The ideas of democracy, not the principles of liberty, were responsible for the passage of the 16th amendment. It imposed the income tax on the American people and helped us usher in the modern age of the welfare warfare State. Unfortunately, the 16th amendment has not been repealed as was the 18th. As long as the 16th amendment is in place, the odds are slim that we can restore a constitutional republic dedicated to liberty. The personal income tax is more than symbolic of a democracy; it is a predictable consequence.

The transition from republic to democracy was gradual and insidious. Its seeds were sown early in our history. In many ways, the Civil War and its aftermath laid the foundation for the acute erosion that took place over the entire 20th century.

Chronic concern about war and economic downturns events caused by an intrusive government's failure to follow the binding restraints of the Constitution allowed majority demands to supercede the rights of the minority. By the end of the 20th century, majority opinion had become the determining factor in all that government does. The rule of law was cast aside, leaving the Constitution a shell of what it once was, a Constitution with rules that guaranteed a Republic with limit and regional government and protection of personal liberty.

The marketplace, driven by voluntary cooperation, private property ownership, and sound money was severely undermined with the acceptance of the principles of true democracy. Unfortunately, too many people confused the democratic elections of leaders in a Republic for democracy by accepting the rule of majority opinion in all affairs. For majorities to pick leaders is one thing. It is something quite different for majorities to decide what rights are, to redistribute property, to tell people how to manage their personal lives, and to promote undeclared, unconstitutional wars.

The majority is assumed to be in charge today and can do whatever it pleases. If the majority has not yet sanctioned some desired breach of action demanded by special interest, the propaganda machine goes into operation and the pollsters relay the information back to politicians who are seeking legitimacy in their endeavors. The rule of law and the Constitution have become irrelevant, and we live by constant polls.

This trend toward authoritarian democracy was tolerated because, unlike a military dictatorship, it was done in the name of benevolence, fairness, and equity. The pretence of love and compassion by those who desire to remold

society and undermine the Constitution convinced the recipients and even the victims of its necessity.

Since it was never a precipitous departure from the Republic, the gradual erosion of liberty went unnoticed, but it is encouraging that more and more citizens are realizing just how much has been lost by complacency.

The resolution to the problems we face as a result of this profound transition to pure democracy will be neither quick nor painless. This transition has occurred even though the word "democracy" does not appear in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. The Founders explicitly denounced it.

Over the last hundred years the goal of securing individual liberties within the framework of a constitutional republic has been replaced with incessant talk of democracy and fairness. Rallying support for our ill-advised participation in World War I, Wilson spoke glowingly of making the world safe for democracy and never mentioned national security. This theme has to this day persisted in all our foreign affairs. Neoconservatives now brag of their current victories in promoting what they call "hard Wilsonism."

A true defense of self-determination for all people, the necessary ingredient of a free society is ignored. Self-determination implies separation of smaller governments from the larger entities that we witnessed in the breakup of the Soviet Union. This notion contradicts the goal of pure democracy and world government. A single world government is the ultimate goal of all social egalitarians who are unconcerned with liberty.

Today, the concepts of rights and property ownership are completely arbitrary. Congress, the courts, Presidents and bureaucrats arbitrarily legislate on a daily basis, seeking only the endorsement of the majority. Although the Republic was designed to protect the minority against the dictates of the majority, today we find the reverse. The Republic is no longer recognizable.

Supporters of democracy are always quick to point out one of the perceived benefits of this system is the redistribution of wealth by government to the poor. Although this may be true in a limited fashion, the champions of this system never concern themselves with the victims from whom the wealth is stolen. The so-called benefits are short lived because democracy consumes wealth with little concern for those who produce it. Eventually, the programs cannot be funded, and the dependency that has developed precipitates angry outcries for even more fairness.

Since reversing the tide against liberty is so difficult, this unworkable system inevitably leads to various forms of tyranny. As our Republic crumbles, voices of protest grow louder. The central government becomes more authoritarian with each crisis. As

the equality of education plummets, the role of the Federal Government is expanded. As the quality of medical care collapses, the role of the Federal Government in medicine is greatly increased.

Foreign policy failures precipitate cries for more intervention abroad and an even greater empire. Cries for security grow louder and concern for liberty languishes.

A tax on our homeland form a massive increase in the bureaucracy to protect us from all dangers seen and imagined.

The prime goal of the concern of the Founders, the protection of liberty, is ignored. Those expressing any serious concern for personal liberty are condemned for their self-centeredness and their lack of patriotism. Even if we could defeat the al Qaeda, which is surely a worthwhile goal, it would do little to preserve our liberties, while ignoring the real purpose of our government. Another enemy would surely replace it, just as the various groups of so-called barbarians never left the Roman Empire alone once its internal republican structure collapsed.

Once it becomes acceptable to change the rules by majority vote, there are no longer any limits on the power of the government. When the Constitution can be subverted by mere legislative votes, executive orders or judicial degrees, constitutional restraints on the government are eliminated. This process was rare in the early years of our history, but now it is routine.

Democracy is promoted in the name of fairness in an effort to help some special interest group receive a benefit that it claims it needs or is entitled to. If only one small group were involved, nothing would come of the demands, but coalitions develop and the various groups ban together to form a majority, to vote themselves all those things that they expect others to provide for them.

Although the motivating factor is frequently the desire for the poor to better themselves through the willingness of others to sacrifice for what they see as a good cause, the process is doomed to failure. Governments are inefficient and the desired goals are rarely achieved. Administrators who benefit perpetuate the programs. Wealthy elites learn to benefit from the system in a superior fashion over the poor because they know how to skim the cream off the top of all the programs designed for the disadvantaged. They join the various groups in producing the majority vote needed to fund their own special interest.

Public financing of housing, for instance, benefits builders, bureaucrats, insurance companies and financial institutions while the poor end up in drug-invested, crime-ridden housing projects. For the same reason, not only do business leaders not object to this system but they also become strong supporters of welfare programs and foreign aid.

Big business strongly supports programs like the Export Import Bank, the IMF, the World Bank, foreign subsidies and military adventurism. Tax Code revisions and government contracts mean big profits for those who are well-connected. Concern for individual liberty is pushed to the bottom of the priority list for both the poor and the rich welfare recipients.

Prohibitions placed in the Constitution against programs that serve special interests are the greatest threat to the current system of democracy under which we operate. In order for the benefits to continue, politicians must reject the rule of law and concern themselves only with the control of majority opinion. Sadly, that is the job of almost all politicians. It is clearly the motivation behind the millions spent on constant lobbying, as well as the billions spent on promoting the right candidate in each election.

Those who champion liberty are rarely heard from. The media, banking, insurance, airlines, transportation, financial institutions, government employees, the military industrial complex, the education system and the medical community are all dependent on government appropriations resulting in a high-stakes system of government.

Democracy encourages the mother of all political corruption, the use of political money to buy influence. If the dollars spent in this effort represent the degree to which democracy has won out over the rule of law and the Constitution, it looks like the American Republic is left wanting. Billions are spent on the endeavor. Money and politics is the key to implementing policy and swaying democratic majorities. It is seen by most Americans, and rightly so, as a negative and danger. Yet the response, unfortunately, is only more of the same.

More laws tinkering with freedom of expression are enacted in hopes that regulating sums of private money thrown into the political system will curtail the abuse; but failing to understand the cause of the problem, lack of respect for the Constitution and obsession with legislative relativity dictated by the majority serve only to further undermine the rule of law.

We were adequately warned about this problem. Democracies lead to chaos, violence and bankruptcy. The demands of the majority are always greater than taxation alone can provide. Therefore, control of the monetary and banking system is required for democracies to operate.

It was no accident in 1913 when the dramatic shift toward democracy became pronounced that the Federal Reserve was established. A personal income tax was imposed as well. At the same time, popular election of Senators was instituted, and our foreign policy became aggressively interventionist. Even with an income tax, the planners for war and welfare knew that it would become necessary to eliminate

restraints on the printing of money. Private counterfeiting was a heinous crime, but government counterfeiting and fractional reserve banking were required to seductively pay for the majority's demands.

□ 1415

It is for this reason that democracies always bring about currency debasement through inflation of the money supply.

Some of the planners of today clearly understand the process. And others, out of ignorance, view central bank money creation as a convenience with little danger. That is where they are wrong. Even though the wealthy and the bankers support paper money, believing they know how to protect against its ill effects, many of them are eventually dragged down in the economic downturns that always develop. It is not a new era that they have created for us today, but more of the same endured throughout history by so many other nations.

The belief that democratic demands can be financed by deficits, credit creation, and taxation is based on false hope and failure to see how it contributes to the turbulence as the democracy collapses. Once a nation becomes a democracy, the whole purpose of government changes. Instead of the government's goal being that of guaranteeing liberty, equal justice, private property and voluntary exchange, the government embarks on the impossible task of achieving economic equality and micromanaging the economy and protecting citizens from themselves in all their activities.

The destruction of the wealth-building process, which is inherent in a free society, is never anticipated. Once it is realized it has been undermined, it is too late to easily reverse the attacks against limited government and personal liberty. Democracy, by necessity, endorses special interest interventionism, inflationism and corporatism. In order to carry out the duties now expected of the government, power must be transferred from the citizens to the politicians. The only thing left is to decide which group or groups have the greatest influence over the government officials.

As the wealth of the nation dwindles, competition between the special interest groups grows more intense and becomes the dominant goal of all political action. Restoration of liberty, the market, and personal responsibilities are of little interest and are eventually seen as impractical. Power and public opinion become crucial factors in determining the direction of all government expenditures.

Although both major parties now accept the principles of rule of majority and reject the rule of law, the beneficiaries for each party are generally different, although they frequently overlap. Propaganda, demagoguery, and control of the educational system

and the media are essential to directing the distribution of the loot the government steals from those who are still honestly working for a living.

The greater problem is that nearly everyone receives some government benefit and, at the same time, contributes to the Treasury. Most hope they will get back more than they pay in and, therefore, go along with the firmly entrenched system. Others, who understand and would choose to opt out and assume responsibility for themselves, are not allowed to and are forced to participate. The end only comes with the collapse of the system, since a gradual and logical reversal of the inexorable march toward democratic socialism is unachievable. Soviet-style communism dramatically collapsed once it was recognized that it could no longer function, and a better system replaced it. It became no longer practical to pursue token reforms like those that took place over its 70-year history.

The turmoil and dangers of pure democracy are known. We should get prepared. But it will be the clarity with which we plan its replacement that determines the amount of pain and suffering endured during the transition to another system. Hopefully, the United States Congress and other government leaders will come to realize the seriousness of our current situation and replace the business-as-usual attitude, regardless of political demands and growing needs of a boisterous majority.

Simply stated, our wealth is running out, and the affordability of democracy is coming to an end. History reveals that once majorities can vote themselves largesse, the system is destined to collapse from within. But in order to maintain the special interest system for as long as possible, more and more power must be given to an ever-expanding central government, which of course only makes matters worse. The economic shortcomings of such a system are easily understood. What is too often ignored is that the flip side of delivering power to government is the loss of liberty to the individual. This loss of liberty causes exactly what the government does not want: Less productive citizens who can't pay taxes.

Even before 9-11 these trends were in place, and proposals were abundant for restraining liberty. Since 9-11 the growth of centralized government and the loss of privacy and personal freedoms have significantly accelerated. It is in dealing with homeland defense and potential terrorist attacks that the domestic social programs and the policy of foreign intervention are coming together and precipitating a rapid expansion of the state and an erosion of personal liberty.

Like our social welfarism at home, our foreign meddling and empire-building abroad are a consequence of our becoming a pure democracy. The dramatic shift away from the Republic that occurred in 1913, as expected, led to a bold change of purpose in foreign

affairs. The goal of making the world safe for democracy was forcefully put forth by Wilson. Protecting national security had become too narrow a goal and selfish in purpose. An obligation for spreading democracy became a noble obligation backed by a moral commitment every bit as utopian as striving for economic equality in an egalitarian society here at home.

With the growing affection for democracy, it was no giant leap to assume that majority opinion should mold personal behavior. It was no mere coincidence that the 18th amendment, alcohol prohibition, was passed in 1919.

Ever since 1913, all our Presidents have endorsed meddling in the internal affairs of other nations and have given generous support to the notion that a world government would facilitate the goals of democratic welfare or socialism. On a daily basis we hear that we must be prepared to send our money and use our young people to police the world in order to spread democracy. Whether it is Venezuela or Colombia, Afghanistan or Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Korea or Vietnam, our intervention is always justified with the tone of moral arrogance that it is for their own good. Our policymakers promote democracy as a cure-all for the various complex problems of the world. Unfortunately, the propaganda machine is able to hide the real reasons for our empire-building.

Promoting democracy overseas merely becomes a slogan for doing things that the powerful and influential strive to do for their own benefit. To get authority for these overseas pursuits, all that is required of the government is that the majority be satisfied with the stated goals no matter how self-serving they may be. The rule of law, that is constitutional restraint, is ignored. But as successful as the policy may be on the short run, and as noble as it may be portrayed, it is a major contributing factor to the violence and chaos that eventually come from pure democracy.

There is abundant evidence that the pretense of spreading democracy contradicts the very policies we are pursuing. We preach about democratic elections, but we are only too willing to accept some for-the-moment friendly dictator who actually overthrew a democratically elected leader or to interfere in some foreign election. This is the case with Pakistan's Musharraf. For a temporary alliance, he reaped hundreds of millions of dollars, even though strong evidence exists that the Pakistanis have harbored and trained al Qaeda terrorists, that they have traded weapons with North Korea, and that they possess weapons of mass destruction.

No one should be surprised that the Arabs are confused by our overtures of friendship. We have just recently promised billions of dollars to Turkey to buy their support for the new Persian Gulf War. Our support of Saudi Arabia, in spite of its ties to the al Qaeda, is fi-

nancing and training. It is totally ignored by those obsessed with going to war against Iraq. Saudi Arabia is the furthest thing from a democracy. As a matter of fact, if democratic elections were permitted, the Saudi Government would be overthrown by a bin Laden ally.

Those who constantly preach global government and democracy ought to consider the outcome of their philosophy in a hypothetical Mideast regional government. If these people were asked which country in this region possessed weapons of mass destruction, had a policy of oppressive occupation, and constantly defies U.N. council resolutions, the vast majority would overwhelmingly name Israel. Is this ludicrous? No. This is what democracy is all about and what can come from a one man, one vote philosophy.

U.S. policy supports the overthrow of the democratically elected Chavez government in Venezuela because we do not like the economic policy it pursues. We support a military takeover as long as the new dictator will do as we tell him.

There is no credibility in our contention that we really want to impose democracy on other nations, yet promoting democracy is the public justification for our foreign intervention. It sounds so much nicer than saying we are going to risk the lives of young people and massively tax our citizens to secure the giant oil reserves of Iraq. After we take over Iraq, how long would one expect it to take until there are authentic nationwide elections in that country? The odds of that happening in even 100 years are remote. It is virtually impossible to imagine a time when democratic elections would ever occur for the election of leaders in a constitutional republic dedicated to the protection of liberty anyplace in the region.

The tragedy of 9-11 and its aftermath dramatizes so clearly how a flawed foreign policy has served to encourage the majoritarians determined to run everyone's life. Due to its natural inefficiencies and tremendous cost, a failing welfare state requires an ever-expanding authoritarian approach to enforce mandates, collect the necessary revenues, and keep afloat an unworkable system. Once the people grow to depend on government subsistence, they demand its continuation.

Excessive meddling in the internal affairs of other nations, and involving ourselves in every conflict around the globe has not endeared the United States to the oppressed of the world. The Japanese are tired of us, the South Koreans are tired of us, the Europeans are tired of us, the Central Americans are tired of us, the Filipinos are tired of us, and, above all, the Arab Muslims are tired of us. Angry and frustrated by our persistent bullying, and disgusted with having their own government bought and controlled by the United States, joining a radical Islamic movement was a natural and predictable consequence for Muslims.

We believe bin Laden when he takes credit for an attack on the West, and we believe him when he warns us of an impending attack, but we refuse to listen to his explanation of why he and his allies are at war with us. Bin Laden claims are straightforward. The U.S. defiles Islam with bases on the Holy Land and Saudi Arabia, its initiation of war against Iraq, with 12 years of persistent bombing, and its dollars and weapons being used against the Palestinians, as the Palestinian territory shrinks and Israel's occupation expands.

There will be no peace in the world for the next 50 years or longer if we refuse to believe why those who are attacking us do it. To dismiss terrorism as a result of Muslims hating us because we are rich and free is one of the greatest foreign policy frauds ever perpetuated on the American people. Because the propaganda machine, the media, and the government have restated this so many times, the majority now accept it as face value, and the administration gets the political cover it needs to pursue a holy war for democracy against the infidels who hate us for our goodness.

Polling on the matter is followed closely and, unfortunately, is far more important than the rule of law. Do we hear the pundits talk of constitutional restraints on Congress and the administration? No. All we ever hear are the reassurances that the majority support the President; therefore, it must be all right.

The terrorist attacks are related to our severely flawed foreign policy of intervention. They also reflect the shortcomings of a bureaucracy that is already big enough to know everything it needs to know about impending attacks, but too cumbersome to do anything about it. Bureaucratic weaknesses within a fragile welfare state provide a prime opportunity for those whom we antagonize by our domination over world affairs and global wealth to take advantage of our vulnerability.

What has been our answer to the shortcomings of policies driven by manipulated majority opinion by the powerful elite? We have responded by massively increasing the Federal Government's policing activity to hold American citizens in check and make sure we are well behaved and pose no threat, while massively expanding our aggressive presence around the world. There is no possible way these moves can make us more secure against terrorism, yet they will accelerate our march toward national bankruptcy with a currency collapse.

Relying on authoritarian democracy and domestic and international meddling only moves us sharply away from a constitutional republic and the rule of law and toward the turbulence of a decaying democracy about which Madison and others had warned. Once the goal of liberty is replaced by a preconceived notion of the benefits and

the moral justification of a democracy, a trend toward internationalism and world government follows. We certainly witnessed this throughout the 20th century. Since World War II, we have failed to follow the Constitution in taking this country to war, but instead have deferred to the collective democratic wisdom of the United Nations.

□ 1430

Once it is recognized that ultimate authority comes from an international body, whether it is the United Nations, NATO, the WTO, the World Bank or the IMF, the contest becomes a matter of who holds the reins of power and is able to dictate what is perceived as the will of the people in the world.

In the name of democracy, just as it is done in Washington, powerful nations with the most money will control the United Nations policy. Bribery, threats and intimidation are common practices used to achieve a democratic consensus, no matter how controversial and short-lived the benefits.

Can one imagine what it might be like if true worldwide democracy existed and the United Nations were controlled by a world-wide, one man/one vote philosophy? The masses of China and India could vote themselves whatever they needed from the more prosperous Western countries. How long would a world system last based on this absurdity? Yet this is the principle that we are working so hard to impose on ourselves and others around the world.

In spite of the great strides made toward one-world government based on egalitarianism, I am optimistic that this utopian nightmare will never come to fruition. I have already made the case that here at home powerful special interests take over controlling majority opinion, making sure fairness in distribution is never achieved. This fact causes resentment and becomes so expensive that the entire system becomes unstable and eventually collapses.

The same will occur internationally, even if it miraculously did not cause conflict among the groups demanding the loot confiscated from the producing individuals or countries. Democratic socialism is so destructive to production of wealth that it must fail, just as socialism failed under communism. We have a long way to go before old-fashioned nationalism is dead and buried. In the meantime, the determination of those promoting democratic socialism will cause great harm to many people before its chaotic end and we rediscover the basic principle responsible for all of human progress.

With the additional spending to wage war against terrorism at home, while propping up an ever-expensive and failing welfare state, and the added funds needed to police the world, all in the midst of a recession, we are destined to see an unbelievably huge explosion of deficit spending. Raising taxes will not

help. Borrowing the needed funds for the budgetary deficit, plus the daily borrowing from foreigners required to finance our ever-growing account deficit, will put tremendous pressure on the dollar.

The time will come when the Fed will no longer be able to dictate low interest rates. Reluctance of foreigners to lend, the exorbitant size of our borrowing needs, and the risk premium will eventually send interest rates upward. Price inflation will accelerate and the cost of living for all Americans will increase. Under these conditions, most Americans will face a decline in their standard of living.

Facing this problem of paying for past and present excess spending, the borrowing and inflating of the money supply has already begun in earnest. Many retirees, depending on their 401(k) funds and other retirement programs, are suffering the ill effects of the stock market crash, a phenomenon that still has a long way to go. Depreciating the dollar by printing excessive money, like the Fed is doing, will eventually devastate the purchasing power of those retirees who are dependent on Social Security. Government cost-of-living increases will never be able to keep up with the loss. The elderly are already unable to afford the inflated cost of medical care, especially the cost of pharmaceuticals.

The reality is that we will not be able to inflate, tax, spend or borrow our way out of this mess that the Congress has delivered to the American people.

The demands that come with pure democracy always lead to an unaffordable system that ends with economic turmoil and political upheaval. Tragically, the worse the problems get, the louder is the demand for more of the same government programs that caused the problems in the first place, both domestic and international. Weaning off of government programs and getting away from foreign meddling because of political pressure are virtually impossible. The end comes only after economic forces make it clear we can no longer afford to pay for the extravagance that comes from the democratic dictates.

Democracy is the most excessive form of government. There is no "king" with an interest in preserving the nation's capital. Everyone desires something, and the special-interest groups, banding together, dictate to the politicians exactly what they want and need. Politicians are handsomely rewarded for being "effective," that is, getting the benefits for the groups that support them. Effectiveness is never measured by efforts and achievements in securing liberty, even though it is the most important element in a prosperous and progressive world.

Spending is predictable in a democracy, especially one that endorses foreign interventionism. It always goes up, both in nominal terms and in percentage of the nation's wealth.

Paying for it can be quite complicated. The exact method is less consequential than the percent of the nation's wealth the government commands. Borrowing and central bank credit creation are generally used and are less noticeable, but more deceitful, than direct taxation to pay as we go.

If direct taxation were accomplished through monthly checks written by each taxpayer, the cost of government would immediately be revealed, and the democratic con game would end much more quickly.

The withholding principle was devised to make paying for the programs the majority demanded seem less painful. Passing on debt to the next generation through borrowing is also a popular way to pay for welfare and warfare. The effect of inflating a currency to pay the bills is difficult to understand and the victims are hard to identify. Inflation is the most sinister method of payment for a welfare state. It, too, grows in popularity as the demands increase for services that are not affordable.

Although this appears to be a convenient and cheap way to pay the bills, the economic consequences of lost employment, inflated prices and economic dislocation make the long-term consequences much more severe than paying as we go. Not only is this costly in terms of national wealth, it significantly contributes to the political chaos and loss of liberty that accompany the death throes of a doomed democracy.

This does not mean that direct taxes will not be continuously raised to pay for out-of-control spending. In a democracy, all earned wealth is assumed to belong to the government. Therefore, not raising taxes, cutting taxes, or granting tax credits are considered "costs" of government. Once this notion is established, tax credits or cuts are given only under condition that the beneficiaries conform to the democratic consensus. Freedom of choice is removed, even if a group is merely getting back control of that which was rightfully theirs in the first place.

Tax-exempt status for various groups is not universal but is conditioned on whether their beliefs and practices are compatible with politically correct opinions endorsed by the democratic majority. This concept is incompatible with the principles of private-property ownership and individual liberty. In contrast, in a free society, all economic and social decision-making is controlled by private property owners without government intrusion, as long as no one is harmed in the process.

The vast majority of the American people have come to accept democracy as a favorable system and are pleased with our efforts to pursue Wilson's dream of making the world safe for democracy. But the goals of pure democracy and that of a constitutional republic are incompatible. A clear understanding of the difference is paramount, if we are to remain a free and prosperous Nation.

There are certain wonderful benefits in recognizing the guidance that majority opinion offers. It takes a consensus or prevailing attitude to endorse the principles of liberty and a constitution to protect them. This is a requirement for the rule of law to succeed. Without a consensus, the rule of law fails. This does not mean that the majority or public opinion, measured by polls, court rulings or legislative bodies should be able to alter the constitutional restraints on the government's abuse of life, liberty and property. But in a democracy that happens, and we know today that is happening in this country on a routine basis.

In a free society with totally free markets, the votes by consumers through their purchases or refusal to purchase determine which businesses survive and which fail. This is free-choice democracy, and it is a powerful force in producing and bringing about economic efficiency. In today's democracy by decree, government laws dictate who receives the benefit and who gets shortchanged. Conditions of employment and sales are taxed and regulated at varying rates, and success or failure is too often dependent on government action than by consumers' voting in the marketplace by their spending habits. Individual consumers by their decisions should be in charge, not governments armed with mandates from the majority.

Even a system of free market money, a redeemable gold coin standard, functions through the principle of consumers always voting or withholding support for that currency. A gold standard can only work when freely converted into gold coins, giving every citizen a right to vote on a daily basis for or against the government's money.

It is too late to avoid the turbulence and violence that Madison warned us about. It has already started. But it is important to minimize the damage and prepare a way for the restoration of the Republic. The odds are not favorable, but not impossible. No one can know the future with certainty. The Soviet system came to an abrupt end with less violence than could ever have been imagined at the height of the Cold War. It was a pleasant surprise.

Interestingly enough, what is needed is a majority opinion, especially by those who find themselves in leadership roles, whether political, educational or in the media, that rejects democracy and supports the rule of law within the Republic. This majority support is essential for the preservation of the freedom and prosperity with which America is identified.

This will not occur until we as a Nation once again understand how freedom serves the interests of everyone. Henry Grady Weaver, in his 1947 classic, "The Mainspring of Human Progress," explains how it works. His thesis is simple. Liberty permits progress, while government intervention tends always to tyranny. Liberty releases creative energy; government

intervention suppresses it. This release of energy was never greater than in the time following the American Revolution and the writing of the U.S. Constitution.

Instead of individual activity being controlled by the government or superstitious beliefs about natural and mystical events, the activity is controlled by the individual. This understanding recognizes the immense value in voluntary cooperation and enlightened self-interests. Freedom requires self-control and moral responsibility. No one owes anyone else anything and everyone is responsible for his or her own acts. The principle of never harming one's neighbor, or never sending the government to do the dirty work, is key to making the system tend to peaceful pursuits and away from the tyranny and majority-induced violence. Nothing short of a reaffirmation of this principle can restore the freedoms once guaranteed under the Constitution. Without this, prosperity for the masses is impossible; and as a Nation we become more vulnerable to outside threats.

In a Republic, the people are in charge. The Constitution provides strict restraints on the politicians, bureaucrats and the military. Everything the government is allowed to do is only done with explicit permission from the people or the Constitution.

Today, it is the opposite. The American people must get permission from the government for their every move, whether it is the use of their own property or spending their own money. Even the most serious decisions, such as going to war, are done while ignoring the Constitution and without a vote of the people's representatives in the Congress. Members of the global government have more to say about when American troops are put in harm's way than the U.S. Congress. The Constitution no longer restrains the government. The government restrains the people in all they do. This destroys individual creative energy, and the "mainspring of human progress" is lost. The consequences are less progress, less prosperity, and less personal fulfillment.

A system that rejects voluntary contracts, enlightened self-interests and individual responsibilities permits the government to assume these responsibilities. And the government officials become morally obligated to protect us from ourselves, attempting to make us better people and setting standards for our personal behavior. That effort is already in full swing. But if this attitude prevails, liberty is gone.

When government assumes the responsibility for individuals to achieve excellence and virtue, it does so at the expense of liberty and must resort to force and intimidation. Standards become completely arbitrary, depending on the attitude of those in power and the perceived opinion of the majority. Freedom of choice is gone.

This leads to inevitable conflicts with the government dictating what

one can eat, drink, smoke, or whatever. One group may promote abstinence, the other tax-supported condom distribution. Arguments over literature, prayer, pornography and sexual behavior are endless. It is now not even permissible to mention the word "God" on public property. A people who allows its government to set personal moral standards for all nonviolent behavior will naturally allow it to be involved in the more important aspects of spiritual life. For instance, there are tax deductions for churches that are politically correct, but not for those whose benefits are considered out of the mainstream.

□ 1445

Groups that do not meet the official politically correct standards are more likely to be put on the terrorist list.

This arbitrary and destructive approach to solving difficult problems must be rejected if we ever hope to live again in a society where the role of government is limited to that of protecting freedom.

The question I am most often asked when talking about this subject is why do our elected leaders so easily relinquish liberty and have so little respect for the Constitution? The people of whom I speak are convinced that liberty is good and big government is dangerous. They also are quite certain that we have drifted a long way from the principles that made America great, and their bewilderment continuously elicits a big "why?"

There is no easy answer to this and no single explanation. It involves temptation, envy, greed and ignorance, but worst of all humanitarian zeal. Unfortunately, the greater the humanitarian outreach, the greater the violence required to achieve it. The greater the desire to perform humanitarian deeds through legislation, the greater is the violence required to achieve it.

Few understand this. There are literally no limits to the good deeds that some believe need to be done. Rarely does anyone question how each humanitarian act by government undermines the essential element of all human progress: individual liberty.

Failure of government programs prompts more determined efforts, while the loss of liberty is ignored or rationalized away. Whether it is the war against poverty, drugs, terrorism, or the current Hitler of the day, an appeal to patriotism is used to convince the people that a little sacrifice, here and there, of liberty is a small price to pay.

The results, though, are frightening and will soon even become more so. Poverty has been made worse. The drug war is a bigger threat than drug use. Terrorism remains a threat, and foreign wars have become routine and decided upon without congressional approval.

Most of the damage to liberty and the Constitution is done by men and women of goodwill who are convinced

they know what is best for the economy, others, and foreign powers. They inevitably fail to recognize their own arrogance in assuming they know what is the best personal behavior for others. Their failure to recognize the likelihood of mistakes by central planners allows them to ignore the magnitude of a flawed central government directive compared to an individual or a smaller unit of government mistake.

C.S. Lewis had an opinion on this subject: "Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victim may be the most oppressive. It may be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some times be satiated, but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience."

A system that is based on majority vote rather than the strict rule of law encourages the few who thrive on power and exerting authority over other people's lives, unlike the many driven by sincere humanitarian concerns. Our current system rewards those who respond to age-old human instincts of envy and greed as they gang up on those who produce. Those individuals who are tempted by the offer of power are quick to accommodate those who are the most demanding of government-giveaway programs and government contracts. These special interest groups notoriously come from both the poor and the rich, while the middle class is required to pay.

It is not a coincidence that in the times of rapid monetary debasement, the middle class suffers the most from the inflation and the job losses that monetary inflation brings. When inflation is severe, which it will become, the middle class can be completely wiped out. The stock market crash gives us a hint as to what is likely to come as this country is forced to pay for the excesses sustained over the past 30 years while operating under a fiat monetary system.

Eric Hoffer, the longshoreman philosopher, commented on this subject as well. "Absolute power corrupts even when exercised for humane purposes. The benevolent despot who sees himself as a shepherd of the people still demands from others the submissiveness of sheep."

Good men driven by a desire for benevolence encourage the centralization of power. The corruptive temptation of power is made worse when domestic and international interventions go wrong and feed into the hate and envy that invade men's souls when the love of liberty is absent.

Those of goodwill who work to help the downtrodden do so not knowing they are building a class of rulers who will become drunk with their own arrogance and a lust for power. Generally only a few in a society yield to the urge to dictate to others and seek

power for the sake of power and then abuse it. Most members of society are complacent and respond to propaganda, but they unite in the democratic effort to rearrange the world in hopes of gaining benefits through coercive means and convince themselves they are helping their fellow man as well. A promise of security is a powerful temptation for many.

A free society, on the other hand, requires these same desires be redirected. The desire for power and authority must be over one's self alone. The desire for security and prosperity should be directed inwardly rather than toward controlling others. We cannot accept the notion that the gang solution endorsed by the majority is the only option. Self-reliance and personal responsibility are crucial.

But there is also a problem with economic understanding. Economic ignorance about the shortcomings of central economic planning, excessive taxation and regulations, central bank manipulation of money, and credit and interest rates is pervasive in our Nation's Capital. A large number of conservatives now forcefully argue that deficits do not matter. Spending programs never shrink no matter whether conservatives or liberals are in charge. Rhetoric favoring free trade is cancelled out by special interest protectionist measures. Support of international government agencies that manage trade such as the IMF, the World Bank, the WTO, and NAFTA politicizes international trade and eliminates any hope that free-trade capitalism will soon emerge.

The Federal Government will not improve on its policies until the people coming to Washington are educated by a different breed of economists than those who dominate our government-run universities. Economic advisors and most officeholders merely reflect the economics taught to them. A major failure of our entire system will most likely occur before serious thought is given once again to the guidelines laid out in the Constitution.

The current economic system of fiat money and interventionism, both domestic and international, serve to accommodate the unreasonable demands for government to take care of the people, and this, in turn, contributes to the worst of human instincts: authoritarian control by the few over the many.

We as a Nation have lost our understanding of how the free market provides the greatest prosperity for the greatest number. Not only have most of us forgotten about the invisible hand of Adam Smith, few have ever heard of Mises and Hayek and Rothbart, the individuals who understood exactly why all economic ups and downs in the 20th century occurred, as well as the cause of the collapse of the Soviet Union.

But worst of all we have lost our faith in freedom. Materialistic concerns and desire for security drive our national politics. This trend has been sharply accelerated since 9-11.

Understanding the connection between liberty, prosperity and security has been lost. The priorities are backwards. Prosperity and security come from liberty. Peace and the absence of war come from a consequence of liberty and free trade. The elimination of ignorance and restraints on do-goodism and authoritarianism in a civilized society can only be achieved through a contractual arrangement between the people and the government, in our case the U.S. Constitution. This document was the best ever devised for releasing the creative energy of a free people while strictly holding in check the destructive powers of government. Only the rule of law can constrain those who by human instinct look for a free ride while delivering power to those few, found in every society, whose only goal in life is a devilish desire to rule over others.

The rule of law in a republic protects free-market activity and private property ownership and provides for equal justice under the law. It is this respect for law and rights over government power that protects the mainspring of human progress from the enemies of liberty. Communists and other Socialists have routinely argued that the law is merely a tool of the powerful capitalists.

But they have it backwards. Under democracy and fascism, the pseudocapitalists write the laws that undermine the Constitution and jeopardize the rights and property of all citizens. They fail to realize that the real law, the Constitution, itself guarantees the rights and equal justice and permits capitalism, thus guaranteeing progress.

Arbitrary, ever-changing laws are the friends of dictators. Authoritarians argue constantly that the Constitution is a living document and that rigid obedience to ideological purity is the enemy that we should be most concerned about. They would have us believe that those who cherish strict obedience to the rule of law in the defense of liberty are wrong merely because they demand ideological purity. They fail to demand that their love of relative rights and pure democracy is driven by a rigid obedience to an ideology as well. The issue is never rigid beliefs versus reasonable friendly compromise. In politics it is always competition between two strongly held ideologies. The only challenge for men and women of goodwill is to decide the wisdom and truth of the ideologies offered.

Nothing short of restoring a republican form of government with strict adherence to the rule of law, and curtailing illegal government programs, will solve our current and evolving problems.

Eventually the solution will come with the passage of the liberty amendment. Once there is serious debate on this amendment, we will know that the American people are considering the restoration of the constitutional republic

and a protection of individual liberty.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, January 29, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Speaker's Room, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 401, section 1002(b) of the Intelligence Authorization Act, I hereby appoint to the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community: Representatives Zoe Lofgren (D-CA) and Maurice Sonnenberg.

Best,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

MEDICARE PRIVATIZATION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last night the President said that seniors deserve enhanced preventative benefits and prescription drug coverage.

Seniors do deserve these benefits. What they do not deserve is being patronized, manipulated, and short-changed, particularly when the quality of their health care and their future financial security are at stake.

When the President said that seniors happy with the current Medicare system should be able to keep their coverage just the way it is, we all applauded. What he obviously means is this: If they are unwilling to leave Medicare and join an HMO, then they actually do not deserve preventative benefits and drug coverage, and they will not get any.

The President has every right to push his privatization agenda, Medicare privatization, Social Security privatization, but not by co-opting an issue as emotional and as important as prescription drug coverage. The President cannot go unchallenged when he mischaracterizes Medicare as a failed program.

My friends on the other side of the aisle continue to lambast, continue to criticize, continue to ridicule the Medicare program as a failed program so that then they can justify their goal of privatizing it.

The President in his budget, in his orders from the White House at HHS, recently dropped provisions to serve the general public, the Medicare public, in seminars asking questions, learning more about Medicare so that when seniors were overcharged, they would have some recourse. The Presi-

dent and his people at HHS are doing all they can to cut those Medicare services to make Medicare function more poorly so that Medicare does not serve the public as well, justifying their privatization of Medicare.

The retirement safety net was not put in place by Democrats because we wanted to make the Federal Government bigger, and it should not be dismantled by conservatives just because they want to make Federal Government smaller. The safety net was put in place because the private sector could not make a profit offering health insurance to seniors; so they did not offer it. That is why when Medicare was begun in 1965 by a Democratic President, Democratic House, Democratic Senate, with only 11 Republicans supporting the vote on Medicare. That is why it was created, because 35 years ago 50 percent of seniors in this country had no health insurance. Today almost every senior has health insurance because of one of the greatest programs in American history: Medicare.

But what the President of the United States basically said last night as he sat in this Chamber looking in this direction, looking out at Members of Congress, looking at the Ambassadors, looking at his Cabinet, the Supreme Court, looking at people in the gallery, the President said basically if they want prescription drug benefits, they have got to join an HMO to get it. And that is the story of the President's Medicare privatization. If they want prescription drug coverage, if they want preventative care, then they have got to join an HMO, and that is the President's efforts to privatize Medicare.

So I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle. I ask people listening today in this Chamber to understand that the President's plan to privatize Medicare, that the President is using the prescription drug benefit to try to get his plans to privatize Medicare into place.

□ 1500

Again, Mr. Speaker, this whole debate is about the President saying if you want a prescription drug benefit, then you have to drop out of regular Medicare and join one of those HMOs. In some parts of the country there are no HMOs available. In many parts there are. It means you have to give up your choice of physician.

The President talks about choice, but when you are talking about real choice, it is all about fee-for-service traditional Medicare. You can choose your doctor, you can choose your hospital, you can choose your provider.

Under the President's plan, you have a choice. Your choice is stay in Medicare and not have a prescription drug benefit, or you can take a prescription drug benefit and join an HMO.

The Democrats' prescription drug plan is to include a prescription drug benefit inside traditional Medicare. Medicare works very well for the public. It works even better if there is a

decent voluntary prescription drug plan as part of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this House to reject these privatization plans and instead put a prescription drug benefit inside Medicare, and continue to serve the Medicare population as well as Medicare has in the past.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EHLERS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of accompanying the President on his trip to Grand Rapids, Michigan.

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. BRADY of Pennsylvania) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FATTAH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARSHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, February 5.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 31, 2003, 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:

280. A letter from the Administrator, Poultry Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Increase in Fees and Charges for Egg, Poultry, and Rabbit Grading [Docket No. PY-02-002] (RIN: 0581-AC10) received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

281. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement Vice Admiral Martin J. Mayer, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

282. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Joseph W. Ralston, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

283. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Public Housing Total Development Cost [Docket No. FR-4489-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC05) received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

284. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received January 6, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

285. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7797] received January 6, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

286. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Disclosure Required by Sections 404, 406 and 407 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 [Release Nos. 33-8138; 34-46701; IC-25775; File No. S7-40-02] (RIN: 3235-AI66) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

287. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule — Strengthening the Commission's Requirements Regarding Auditor Independence [Release No. 33-8154; 34-46934; 35-27610; IC-25838; IA-2088, FR-64, File No. S7-49-02] (RIN: 3235-AI73) received January 29, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

288. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicaid Program; External Quality Review of Medicaid Managed Care Organizations [CMS-2015-F] (RIN: 0938-AJ06) received January 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

289. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Plan Requirements for Small Municipal Waste Combustion Units Constructed on or Before August 30, 1999 [AD-FRL-6995-3] (RIN: 2060-AJ46) received December 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

290. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR): Baseline Emissions Determination, Actual-to-Future-Actual Methodology, Plantwide Applicability Limitations, Clean Units, Pollution Control Projects [AD-FRL-7414-5] (RIN: 2060-AE11) received December 4, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

291. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Nonattainment New Source Review (NSR): Baseline Emissions Determination, Actual-to-Future-Actual Methodology, Plantwide Applicability Limitations, Clean Units, Pollution Control Projects [AD-FRL-7414-5] (RIN: 2060-AE11) received December 23, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

292. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications

Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Review of the Commission's Broadcast and Cable Equal Employment Opportunity Rules and Policies [MM Docket No. 98-204] received January 7, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

293. A letter from the Acting Deputy Chief, WCB/TAPD, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Federal-State Jt. Board on Universal Service [Doc No. 96-45]; 1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Streamlined Contributor Reporting Requirements Associated with Admin. of Telecom. Relay Service, N. Amer. Numbering Plan, Local No. Portability, & Universal Service Support Mechanisms [Doc No. 98-171]; Telecom Services for Individuals with Hearing & Speech Disabilities, & the A.D.A. Act of 1990 [Doc No. 90-571]; Admin. of the N. Amer. Numbering Plan & N. Amer. Numbering Plan Cost Recovery Contribution Factor & Fund Size [Doc No. 92-237, NSD File No. L-00-72]; Number Resource Optimization [Doc No. 99-200]; Telephone No. Portability to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

294. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96-123] received January 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

295. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Standardized Advanced NUHOMS-24PT1 Addition (RIN: 3150-AG74) received January 6, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

296. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semi-annual report of the activities of the Office of Inspector General during the six month period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

297. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 to September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

298. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the semi-annual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

299. A letter from the Secretary, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

300. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

301. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

302. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting

the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

303. A letter from the Chair, Board of Directors, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

304. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the twenty-seventh Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up covering the period from April 1, 2002 to September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

305. A letter from the Inspector General, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

306. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

307. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

308. A letter from the General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

309. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

310. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

311. A letter from the Inspector General Liaison, Selective Service System, transmitting a report in accordance with the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

312. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

313. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

314. A letter from the President, United States Institute of Peace, transmitting a report in compliance with the Inspector General Act of 1978 as amended and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

315. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Increased Contribution and Coordinated Party Expenditure Limits for Candidates Opposing Self-financed Candidates [Notice 2003-3] received January 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

316. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Revision of the Charter Vessel and Headboat Permit Moratorium in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No. 021209298-2298-01; I.D. 120402C] (RIN: 0648-AQ59) received January 6, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

317. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Regulation and Effluent Limitations Guidelines and Standards for Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO's) [FRL-6921-4] (RIN: 2040-AD19) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

318. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 2003-7] received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

319. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2003-5) received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

320. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2003-6) received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

321. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Services's final rule — Rulings and determination letters [Rev. Proc. 2003-4] received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

322. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Exclusion of Gain from Sale or Exchange of a Principal Residence [TD 9030] (RIN: 1545-AX28) received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

323. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reduced Maximum Exclusion of Gain from Sale or Exchange of Principal Residence [TD 9031] (RIN: 1545-BB02) received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

324. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting

the Service's final rule — Rulings and determination letters (Rev. Proc. 2003-13) received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

325. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Gross Income defined (Rev. Rul. 2003-12) received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

326. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Election to Treat Trust as Part of an Estate [TD 9032] (RIN: 1545-AW24) received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

327. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Duration of COBRA continuation coverage (Rev. Rul. 2002-88) received January 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

328. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — LIFO Recapture [Notice 2003-4] received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

329. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Application of separate limitations to dividends from noncontrolled section 902 corporations [Notice 2003-5] received January 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

330. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Income, war profits or excess profits tax paid or accrued (Rev. Rul. 2003-8) received January 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 436. A bill to suspend the phase-in of additional tax reductions under the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 while the United States is in a state of war or on high military alert; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Ms. DELAUNO, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 437. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of Coltsville in the State of Connecticut for potential inclusion in the National Park System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. GRAVES):

H.R. 438. A bill to increase the amount of student loans that may be forgiven for teachers in mathematics, science, and special education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 439. A bill to create a system of background checks for certain workers who enter people's homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA):

H.R. 440. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to adjust the status of certain aliens with longstanding ties to the United States to that of an alien lawfully admitted to permanent residence, to promote family unity, to improve national security, to modify provisions of such Act affecting removal of aliens from the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COX, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WEXLER):

H.R. 441. A bill to amend Public Law 107-10 to authorize a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2003 in Geneva, Switzerland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WELLER):

H.R. 442. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Hope Scholarship Credit to cover fees, books, supplies, and equipment and to exempt Federal Pell Grants and Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants from reducing expenses taken into account for the Hope Scholarship Credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 443. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide equitable access for foster care and adoption services for Indian children in tribal areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 444. A bill to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to establish a Personal Reemployment Accounts grant program to assist Americans in returning to work; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 445. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to States to supplement State assistance for the preservation of affordable housing for low-income families; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 446. A bill to establish an Emergency Malpractice Liability Insurance Commission; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 447. A bill to establish an Office of Health Care Competition within the Department of Health and Human Services to administer the National Practitioner Data Base and to collect and make available to the public more information on medical malpractice insurance under that Data Base; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 448. A bill to modify the antitrust exemption applicable to the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. INSLEE):

H.R. 449. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to permit the use of unexpended allotments under the State children's health care program for an additional fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DUNN (for herself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 450. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to small businesses to provide health insurance to their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the at-risk rules for publicly traded nonrecourse debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey):

H.R. 452. A bill to direct the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to designate New Jersey Task Force 1 as part of the National Urban Search and Rescue System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GILLMOR (for himself, Mr. NEY, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 453. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act with respect to municipal deposits; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GRAVES:

H.R. 454. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide to employers a tax credit for compensation paid during the period employees are performing service as members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 455. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to use the Department of Agriculture's preferred Option 1B as the price structure for Class I fluid milk under Federal milk marketing orders, to provide emergency market loss payments to dairy producers for any calendar year quarter in which the national average price for Class III milk under Federal milk marketing orders is less than a target price of \$11.50 per hundredweight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 456. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide life imprisonment for repeat offenders who commit sex

offenses against children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 457. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale of a family farming business to a family member; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 458. A bill to provide for the use and distribution of certain funds awarded to the Gila River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 459. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide economic stimulus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. TANCREDO):

H.R. 460. A bill to establish Institutes to conduct research on the prevention of, and restoration from, wildfires in forest and woodland ecosystems of the interior West; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. HILL (for himself, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. SOUDER):

H.R. 461. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily exclude long-term capital gain from the gross income of individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. CARDIN):

H.R. 463. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit, to increase the rates of the alternative incremental credit, and to provide an alternative simplified credit for qualified research expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 464. A bill to provide relief to teachers, administrators, and related services providers from an excessive paperwork burden, and to reduce time spent by teachers on non-instructional activities, as required under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WELLER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H.R. 465. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow allocation of small ethanol producer credit to patrons of cooperative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Mr. SXTON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. HOLT):

H.R. 466. A bill to amend the Federal Law Enforcement Pay Reform Act of 1990 to adjust the percentage differentials payable to Federal law enforcement officers in certain high-cost areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Ms. LEE, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 467. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that foods containing spices, flavoring, or coloring derived from meat, poultry, other animal products (including insects), or known allergens bear labeling stating that fact and their names; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 468. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act relating to freshness dates on food; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 469. A bill to provide an enhanced penalty for threatening to kill, injure, or intimidate an individual, or to cause property damage, by means of fire or an explosive on school property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 470. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the 7-year restriction on eligibility for widow's and widower's insurance benefits based on disability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 471. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the two-year waiting period for divorced spouse's benefits following the divorce; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 472. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for full benefits for disabled widows and widowers without regard to age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 473. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to credit prospectively in-

dividuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 474. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in widow's and widower's insurance benefits by reason of delayed retirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 475. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, 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 Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. STRICKLAND):

H.R. 476. A bill to provide that service of the members of the organization known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 477. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Duwamish Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 478. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the rules for involuntary conversions of livestock sold on account of weather-related conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 479. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize Army arsenals to undertake to fulfill orders or contracts for articles or services in advance of the receipt of payment under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 480. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 747 Broadway in Albany, New York, as the "United States Postal Service Henry Johnson Annex"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. McNULTY:

H.R. 481. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to grant the State of New York

authority to allow tandem trailers to use Interstate Route 787 between the New York State Thruway and Church Street in Albany, New York; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 482. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange certain land in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. REHBERG, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide involuntary conversion tax relief for producers forced to sell livestock due to weather-related conditions or Federal land management agency policy or action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSE (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 484. A bill to make certain amendments to the Homeland Security Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security (Select), and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Science, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 485. A bill to provide for a Federal program to stabilize medical malpractice insurance premiums; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. VITTER:

H.R. 486. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to establish restrictions regarding the qualifications of physicians to prescribe the abortion drug commonly known as RU-486; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 487. A bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 488. A bill to limit the issuance of student and diversity immigrant visas to aliens who are nationals of Saudi Arabia, countries that support terrorism, or countries not cooperating fully with United States antiterrorism efforts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 489. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide prospectively that wages earned, and self-employment income derived, by individuals who are not citizens or nationals of the United States shall not be credited for coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under such title, and to provide the President with authority to enter into agreements with other nations taking into account such limitation on crediting of wages and self-employment income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BACA, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 490. A bill to improve access to printed instructional materials used by blind or

other persons with print disabilities in elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PICKERING (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ALEXANDER):

H.R. 491. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to clarify the adjustments to be made in determining export price and constructed export price; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the standard mileage rate for charitable purposes to the standard mileage rate established by the Secretary of the Treasury for business purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 493. A bill to repeal the sunset on the increased assistance pursuant to the dependent care tax credit provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 and to make the credit refundable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a full deduction for meals and lodging in connection with medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. KOLBE):

H.R. 495. A bill to approve the settlement of the water rights claims of the Zuni Indian Tribe in Apache County, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. DUNN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to defer recognition of reinvested capital gains distributions from regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

H.R. 497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend all motor fuel taxes for six months, and to permanently repeal the 4.3-cent per gallon increases in motor fuel taxes enacted in 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 498. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employees of county and local governments and of schools to maintain medical savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 499. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit against income tax for tuition expenses incurred for each qualifying child of the taxpayer in attending public or private elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STUPAK:

H.R. 500. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a permanent increase in payment amounts under the Medicare Program for home health services furnished in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of

such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 501. A bill to establish a student loan forgiveness program for nurses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 502. A bill to require identification that may be used in obtaining Federal public benefits to meet restrictions ensuring that it is secure and verifiable; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. CUBIN):

H.R. 503. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the production of oil and gas from domestic marginal wells and to extend the credit for alternative fuels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 504. A bill to provide for the reclamation of abandoned hardrock mines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, 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. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 505. A bill to establish the Northern Rio Grande National Heritage Area in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 506. A bill to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

H.R. 507. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain public domain lands in trust for the Pueblos of San Ildefonso and Santa Clara; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 508. A bill to provide that, in establishing wage schedules for certain prevailing rate employees with respect to whom the Government is currently experiencing recruitment and retention problems, rates of pay for comparable positions in the nearest, most similar wage area shall be taken into account; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.J. Res. 16. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of consecutive terms that a Member of Congress may serve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. LANTOS):

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution honoring Czech Republic President Vaclav Havel; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BLUNT,

Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KIND, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BASS, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution urging the President to request the United States International Trade Commission to take certain actions with respect to the temporary safeguards on imports of certain steel products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURR:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the election of Libya to the chairmanship of 59th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that Social Security reform measures should not force State and local government employees into Social Security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEINER):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution condemning the punishment of execution by stoning as a gross violation of human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon):

H. Res. 41. A resolution congratulating the University of Portland women's soccer team for winning the 2002 NCAA Division I national championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. KLECZKA):

H. Res. 42. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a postage stamp should be issued honoring American farm women; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 43. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to post on the official public Internet site of the House of Representatives all lobbying registrations and reports filed with the Clerk under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES:

H. Res. 44. A resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of the United States Armed Forces military working dog teams for the part they have played in the Nation's military history; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURR, Ms. WATSON, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KLINE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. McNULTY):

H. Res. 45. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in remembrance of the victims of the peacekeeping mission in Beirut, Lebanon, from 1982 to 1984; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H. Res. 46. A resolution honoring the life of Al Hirschfeld and his legacy; to the Committee on Government Reform.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 509. A bill for the relief of Lindita Idrizi Heath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 510. A bill for the relief of certain aliens who were aboard the Golden Venture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 13: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. BELL.

H.R. 14: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 24: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 107: Mr. BARTON of Texas and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 108: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 110: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 111: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERRY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BURR and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 115: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 120: Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 133: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 156: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 157: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 161: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. NEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. REGULA, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 167: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 172: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 193: Mr. GOODE and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 203: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 207: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 208: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 235: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 254: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 282: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. HART, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 284: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 290: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 295: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 296: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 302: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 307: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 312: Mr. JANKLOW.

H.R. 342: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 361: Mr. TERRY, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 368: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 373: Mr. FROST and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 383: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 412: Mr. OSE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. WAXMAN.