



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2003

No. 36

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 6, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOEL HEFLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: Lord, Creator of the world and Redeemer of Your people, work in and through each of the Members of this 108th Congress. Help them to be creative in their thinking and persevering in their service, all the while, reconciling differences and difficulties between people. May everything that this Congress undertakes to serve the needs of the American people begin with Your inspiration. May all their work be continued with Your help and reach a happy conclusion under Your guidance.

For You were with us in the beginning, You are with us now, and You will be with us forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PUTNAM 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and work of Mr. Fred McFeely Rogers

The message also announced that in accordance with section 1928a-1928d of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Assembly during the One Hundred Eighth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 276h-276k of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Eighth Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 276l of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, appoints the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group conference during the One Hundred Eighth Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute at the end of legislative business.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for approximately 12 minutes, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1015

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.

□ 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.

H1643

MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES
ACT OF 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of March 4, 2003, I call up the bill (H.R. 13) to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of H.R. 13 is as follows:

H. RES. 13

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Museum and Library Services Act of 2003".

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

"(1) DETERMINED TO BE OBSCENE.—The term 'determined to be obscene' means determined, in a final judgment of a court of record and of competent jurisdiction in the United States, to be obscene.;"

(2) by striking paragraph (4);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

"(3) FINAL JUDGMENT.—The term 'final judgment' means a judgment that is—

"(A) not reviewed by any other court that has authority to review such judgment; or

"(B) is not reviewable by any other court.

"(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means any tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska native village, regional corporation, or village corporation (as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)), which is recognized by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.;" and

(5) by adding after paragraph (5) (as so redesignated) the following:

"(6) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.—The term 'Museum and Library Services Board' means the National Museum and Library Services Board established under section 207.

"(7) OBSCENE.—The term 'obscene' means, with respect to a project, that—

"(A) the average person, applying contemporary community standards, would find that such project, when taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest;

"(B) such project depicts or describes sexual conduct in a patently offensive way; and

"(C) such project, when taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.;"

SEC. 102. INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES.

Section 203 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9102) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.—There shall be a National Museum and Library Services Board within the Institute, as provided under section 207."

SEC. 103. DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE.

(a) COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.—Section 204(e) of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9103(e)) is amended by adding

at the end the following: "Where appropriate, the Director shall ensure that activities under subtitle B are coordinated with activities under section 1251 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6383)."

(b) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Section 204 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 9103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Director may promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to implement the provisions of this title.

"(g) APPLICATION PROCEDURES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible to receive financial assistance under this title, a person or agency shall submit an application in accordance with procedures established by the Director by regulation.

"(2) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Director shall establish procedures for reviewing and evaluating such applications. Such procedures shall not be subject to any review outside of the Institute. In establishing such procedures, the Director shall ensure that the criteria by which applications are evaluated are consistent with the purposes of this title, taking into consideration general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and values of the American public.

"(3) TREATMENT OF PROJECTS DETERMINED TO BE OBSCENE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The procedures described in paragraph (2) shall include provisions that clearly specify that obscenity is without literary, artistic, political, or scientific merit, and is not protected speech.

"(B) PROHIBITION.—No financial assistance may be provided under this title with respect to any project that is determined to be obscene.

"(C) TREATMENT OF APPLICATION DISAPPROVAL.—The disapproval of an application by the Director shall not be construed to mean, and shall not be considered as evidence that, the project for which the applicant requested financial assistance is or is not obscene."

SEC. 104. NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.

The Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 207 as section 208; and

(2) by inserting after section 206 the following:

"SEC. 207. NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.

"(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Institute a board to be known as the 'National Museum and Library Services Board'.

"(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

"(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall be composed of the following:

"(A) The Director.

"(B) The Deputy Director for the Office of Library Services.

"(C) The Deputy Director for the Office of Museum Services.

"(D) 10 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are citizens of the United States and who are specially qualified in the area of library services by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

"(E) 10 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are citizens of the United States and who are specially qualified in the area of museum services by virtue of their education, training, or experience.

"(2) SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS.—

"(A) LIBRARY MEMBERS.—Of the members of the Museum and Library Services Board appointed under paragraph (1)(D)—

"(i) 5 shall be professional librarians or information specialists, of whom—

"(I) at least 1 shall be knowledgeable about electronic information and technical aspects of library and information services and sciences; and

"(II) and at least 1 other shall be knowledgeable about the library and information service needs of underserved communities; and

"(ii) the remainder shall have special competence in, or knowledge of, the needs for library and information services in the United States.

"(B) MUSEUM MEMBERS.—Of the members of the Museum and Library Services Board appointed under paragraph (1)(E)—

"(i) 5 shall be museum professionals who are or have been affiliated with—

"(I) resources that, collectively, are broadly representative of the curatorial, conservation, educational, and cultural resources of the United States; or

"(II) museums that, collectively, are broadly representative of various types of museums, including museums relating to science, history, technology, art, zoos, botanical gardens, and museums designed for children; and

"(ii) the remainder shall be individuals recognized for their broad knowledge, expertise, or experience in museums or commitment to museums.

"(3) GEOGRAPHIC AND OTHER REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Museum and Library Services Board shall be appointed to reflect persons from various geographic regions of the United States. The Museum and Library Services Board may not include, at any time, more than 3 appointive members from a single State. In making such appointments, the President shall give due regard to equitable representation of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities who are involved with museums and libraries.

"(4) VOTING.—The Director, the Deputy Director of the Office of Library Services, and the Deputy Director of the Office of Museum Services shall be nonvoting members of the Museum and Library Services Board.

"(c) TERMS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, each member of the Museum and Library Services Board appointed under subparagraph (D) or (E) of subsection (b)(1) shall serve for a term of 5 years.

"(2) INITIAL BOARD APPOINTMENTS.—

"(A) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS SERVING ON EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), each individual who is a member of the National Museum Services Board on the date of the enactment of the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003, may, at the individual's election, complete the balance of the individual's term as a member of the Museum and Library Services Board.

"(B) FIRST APPOINTMENTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), any appointive vacancy in the initial membership of the Museum and Library Services Board existing after the application of subparagraph (A), and any vacancy in such membership subsequently created by reason of the expiration of the term of an individual described in subparagraph (A), shall be filled by the appointment of a member described in subsection (b)(1)(D). When the Museum and Library Services Board consists of an equal number of individuals who are specially qualified in the area of library services and individuals who are specially qualified in the area of museum services, this subparagraph shall cease to be effective and the board shall be appointed in accordance with subsection (b).

“(C) AUTHORITY TO ADJUST TERMS.—The terms of the first members appointed to the Museum and Library Service Board shall be adjusted by the President as necessary to ensure that the terms of not more than 4 members expire in the same year. Such adjustments shall be carried out through designation of the adjusted term at the time of appointment.

“(3) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of the member was appointed.

“(4) REAPPOINTMENT.—No appointive member of the Museum and Library Services Board who has been a member for more than 7 consecutive years shall be eligible for reappointment.

“(5) SERVICE UNTIL SUCCESSOR TAKES OFFICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, an appointive member of the Museum and Library Services Board shall serve after the expiration of the term of the member until the successor to the member takes office.

“(d) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall advise the Director on general policies with respect to the duties, powers, and authority of the Institute relating to museum and library services, including financial assistance awarded under this title.

“(2) NATIONAL AWARDS.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall assist the Director in making awards under section 209.

“(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Director shall serve as Chairperson of the Museum and Library Services Board.

“(f) MEETINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall meet not less than 2 times each year and at the call of the Director.

“(2) VOTE.—All decisions by the Museum and Library Services Board with respect to the exercise of its duties and powers shall be made by a majority vote of the members of the Board who are present and authorized to vote.

“(g) QUORUM.—A majority of the voting members of the Museum and Library Services Board shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business at official meetings, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

“(h) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

“(1) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Museum and Library Services Board who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of pay authorized for a position above grade GS-15 of the General Schedule under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Museum and Library Services Board. Members of the Museum and Libraries Services Board who are full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Board.

“(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Museum and Library Services Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

“(i) COORDINATION.—The Director, with the advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, shall take steps to ensure that the policies and activities of the Institute are coordinated with other activities of the Federal Government.”.

SEC. 105. AWARDS; ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF SERVICES.

The Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 208 (as redesignated by section 104 of this Act) the following:

“SEC. 209. AWARDS.

“The Director, with the advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, may annually award National Awards for Library Service and National Awards for Museum Service to outstanding libraries and outstanding museums, respectively, that have made significant contributions in service to their communities.

“SEC. 210. ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES.

“From amounts described in sections 214(c) and 275(b), the Director shall carry out and publish analyses of the impact of museum and library services. Such analyses—

“(1) shall be conducted in ongoing consultation with—

“(A) State library administrative agencies;

“(B) State, regional, and national library and museum organizations; and

“(C) other relevant agencies and organizations;

“(2) shall identify national needs for, and trends of, museum and library services provided with funds made available under subtitles B and C;

“(3) shall report on the impact and effectiveness of programs conducted with funds made available by the Institute in addressing such needs; and

“(4) shall identify, and disseminate information on, the best practices of such programs to the agencies and entities described in paragraph (1).”.

TITLE II—LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

Section 212 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9121) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting the following:

“(2) to promote improvement in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States;

“(3) to facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; and

“(4) to encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public.”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

Section 213 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively.

SEC. 203. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 214 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9123) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle \$210,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2005 through 2009.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “3 percent” and inserting “3.5 percent”.

SEC. 204. RESERVATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS.

Section 221(b)(3) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9131(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the minimum allotment for each State shall be \$340,000, except that the minimum allotment shall be \$40,000 in the case

of the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

“(B) RATABLE REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year is insufficient to fully satisfy the requirement of subparagraph (A), each of the minimum allotments under such subparagraph shall be reduced ratably.

“(C) EXCEPTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year exceeds the aggregate of the allotments for all States under this subsection for fiscal year 2003—

“(I) the minimum allotment for each State otherwise receiving a minimum allotment of \$340,000 under subparagraph (A) shall be increased to \$680,000; and

“(II) the minimum allotment for each State otherwise receiving a minimum allotment of \$40,000 under subparagraph (A) shall be increased to \$60,000.

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS TO AWARD ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM.—If the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year exceeds the aggregate of the allotments for all States under this subsection for fiscal year 2003 yet is insufficient to fully satisfy the requirement of clause (i), such excess amount shall first be allotted among the States described in clause (i)(I) so as to increase equally the minimum allotment for each such State above \$340,000. After the requirement of clause (i)(I) is fully satisfied for any fiscal year, any remainder of such excess amount shall be allotted among the States described in clause (i)(II) so as to increase equally the minimum allotment for each such State above \$40,000.

“(D) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection and using funds allotted for the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau under this subsection, the Director shall award grants to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau to carry out activities described in this subtitle in accordance with the provisions of this subtitle that the Director determines are not inconsistent with this subparagraph.

“(ii) AWARD BASIS.—The Director shall award grants pursuant to clause (i) on a competitive basis and pursuant to recommendations from the Pacific Region Educational Laboratory in Honolulu, Hawaii.

“(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Director may provide not more than 5 percent of the funds made available for grants under this subparagraph to pay the administrative costs of the Pacific Region Educational Laboratory regarding activities assisted under this subparagraph.”.

SEC. 205. STATE PLANS.

Section 224 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9134) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “not later than April 1, 1997,” and inserting “once every 5 years, as determined by the Director.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking “this Act” each place such term appears and inserting “this subtitle”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “1934,” and all that follows through “Act, may” and inserting “1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)(6)) may”;

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “section:” and inserting “subsection:”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking “given” and inserting “applicable to”.

SEC. 206. GRANTS TO STATES.

Section 231 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages;

“(2) developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international electronic networks;

“(3) providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries;

“(4) developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;

“(5) targeting library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills; and

“(6) targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “between the two purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection,” and inserting “among such purposes.”.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP GRANTS, CONTRACTS, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 262(a)(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9162(a)(1)) is amended by striking “education and training” and inserting “education, recruitment, and training”.

TITLE III—MUSEUM SERVICES

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.

Section 271 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 271. PURPOSE.

“It is the purpose of this subtitle—

“(1) to encourage and support museums in carrying out their public service role of connecting the whole of society to the cultural, artistic, historical, natural, and scientific understandings that constitute our heritage;

“(2) to encourage and support museums in carrying out their educational role, as core providers of learning and in conjunction with schools, families, and communities;

“(3) to encourage leadership, innovation, and applications of the most current technologies and practices to enhance museum services;

“(4) to assist, encourage, and support museums in carrying out their stewardship responsibilities to achieve the highest standards in conservation and care of the cultural, historic, natural, and scientific heritage of the United States to benefit future generations;

“(5) to assist, encourage, and support museums in achieving the highest standards of management and service to the public, and to ease the financial burden borne by museums as a result of their increasing use by the public; and

“(6) to support resource sharing and partnerships among museums, libraries, schools, and other community organizations.”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 272(1) of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9172(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “Such term includes aquariums, arboretums, botanical gardens, art museums, children’s museums, general museums, historic houses and sites, history museums, nature centers, natural history and anthropology museums, planetariums, science and technology centers, specialized museums, and zoological parks.”.

SEC. 303. MUSEUM SERVICES ACTIVITIES.

Section 273 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9173) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 273. MUSEUM SERVICES ACTIVITIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, subject to the policy advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, may enter into arrangements, including grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other forms of assistance to museums and other entities as the Director considers appropriate, to pay for the Federal share of the cost—

“(1) to support museums in providing learning and access to collections, information, and educational resources in a variety of formats (including exhibitions, programs, publications, and websites) for individuals of all ages;

“(2) to support museums in building learning partnerships with the Nation’s schools and developing museum resources and programs in support of State and local school curricula;

“(3) to support museums in assessing, conserving, researching, maintaining, and exhibiting their collections, and in providing educational programs to the public through the use of their collections;

“(4) to stimulate greater collaboration among museums, libraries, schools, and other community organizations in order to share resources and strengthen communities;

“(5) to encourage the use of new technologies and broadcast media to enhance access to museum collections, programs, and services;

“(6) to support museums in providing services to people of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds and to individuals with disabilities;

“(7) to support museums in developing and carrying out specialized programs for specific segments of the public, such as programs for urban neighborhoods, rural areas, Indian reservations, and State institutions;

“(8) to support professional development and technical assistance programs to enhance museum operations at all levels, in order to ensure the highest standards in all aspects of museum operations;

“(9) to support museums in research, program evaluation, and the collection and dissemination of information to museum professionals and the public; and

“(10) to encourage, support, and disseminate model programs of museum and library collaboration.

“(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(1) 50 PERCENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share described in subsection (a) shall be not more than 50 percent.

“(2) GREATER THAN 50 PERCENT.—The Director may use not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this subtitle for a fiscal year to enter into arrangements under subsection (a) for which the Federal share may be greater than 50 percent.

“(3) OPERATIONAL EXPENSES.—No funds for operational expenses may be provided under this section to any entity that is not a museum.

“(c) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish procedures for reviewing and evaluating arrangements described in subsection (a) entered into under this subtitle.

“(2) APPLICATIONS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may use up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subtitle for technical assistance awards.

“(B) INDIVIDUAL MUSEUMS.—Individual museums may receive not more than 3 technical assistance awards under subparagraph (A), but subsequent awards for technical assistance shall be subject to review outside the Institute.

“(d) SERVICES FOR NATIVE AMERICANS.—From amounts appropriated under section 275, the Director shall reserve 1.75 percent to award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, Indian tribes and organizations that primarily serve and represent Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 7207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7517)), to enable such tribes and organizations to carry out the activities described in subsection (a).”.

SEC. 304. REPEALS.

Sections 274 and 275 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9174 and 9175) are repealed.

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 276 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9176)—

(1) is redesignated as section 275 of such Act; and

(2) is amended, in subsection (a), by striking “\$28,700,000 for the fiscal year 1997, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002.” and inserting “\$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2005 through 2009.”.

SEC. 306. SHORT TITLE.

Subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 271 through 273 as sections 272 through 274, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after the subtitle heading the following:

“SEC. 271. SHORT TITLE.

“This subtitle may be cited as the ‘Museum Services Act.’.”.

TITLE IV—TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS; REPEALS; EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 401. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE HEADING.—The title heading for the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“TITLE II—MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES”.

(b) SUBTITLE A HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle A of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle A—General Provisions”.

(c) SUBTITLE B HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle B of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9121 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle B—Library Services and Technology”.

(d) SUBTITLE C HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

“Subtitle C—Museum Services”.

(e) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 208 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9106) (as redesignated by section 104 of this

Act) is amended by striking "property of services" and inserting "property or services".

(f) STATE PLAN CONTENTS.—Section 224(b)(5) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9134(b)(5)) is amended by striking "and" at the end.

(g) NATIONAL LEADERSHIP GRANTS, CONTRACTS, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 262(b)(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9162(b)(1)) is amended by striking "cooperative agreements, with," and inserting "cooperative agreements with,".

SEC. 402. REPEALS.

(a) NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT.—Section 5 of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act (20 U.S.C. 1504) is amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) and redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

(b) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 1996.—Sections 704 through 707 of the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996 (20 U.S.C. 9102 note, 9103 note, and 9105 note) are repealed.

SEC. 403. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, except that the amendments made by sections 203, 204, and 305 shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, March 4, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 13.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003, which authorizes Federal assistance to museums and libraries through fiscal year 2009.

H.R. 13 maintains the modest, but essential, Federal support for museums and libraries across the country. It authorizes funds for the one Federal agency, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, devoted exclusively to museums and libraries, and encourages model cooperation between museums and libraries.

Last Congress, the Committee on Education and the Workforce reported a bipartisan authorization bill that had 94 cosponsors. It was supported by the administration and was endorsed by the American Library Association, the chief officers of State library agencies, and the American Association of Museums.

To complete our work from last Congress, I introduced H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003. H.R. 13 has 126 cosponsors, makes several

modifications to current law to streamline and strengthen museum and library services, and will help build on the bipartisan progress made by the committee during the 107th Congress.

Generally, this legislation authorizes the Federal Library and Museum program under the Institute of Museum and Library Services. More specifically, H.R. 13 requires the director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services to establish procedural standards for making grants available to museums and libraries which will prohibit projects that are determined to be obscene from receiving funding, ensures that library activities are coordinated with activities under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, consolidates Museum and Library Advisory Board activities under a single statute, authorizes the director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services to present national awards for library service and national awards for museum service, and ensures that administrative funds are also used to conduct annual analyses of the impact of museum and library services in order to evaluate and identify needs and trends of services provided under IMLS-funded programs.

I believe there is broad support for this reauthorization legislation, because museums and libraries are a vital part of our society. Attendance at America's museums is now at more than 865 million visits per year, and today's 21st century library is not merely a provider of books. Instead, the typical library coordinates a complete and comprehensive approach to community development and services.

The Library Services and Technology subtitle is the only Federal program solely devoted to supporting libraries. This legislation assists libraries in providing crucial services to the communities they serve. Throughout our Nation, libraries are at the forefront of reading and family literacy programs; and importantly, libraries serve as essential links to the business community, assisting with job creation and training programs, and assisting with business development initiatives as well. They are also critical for many people with disabilities, providing them with specialized materials and resources that are obtainable in a single location.

For older Americans, libraries provide a place to interact with others, use the Internet, and receive services. For those persons of limited resources or who live in remote areas, libraries provide access to books and reference materials, computers and the Internet, and community-based social services that are often available nowhere else.

The Museum and Library Services Act also supports museums in their educational role and assists museums in modernizing their methods and facilities so they are better able to conserve the cultural, historical, and scientific heritage of the United States.

Museums play an important role in its education of people of all ages. Spe-

cifically, most American museums provide K through 12 educational programming, with most using local and State curriculum standards to shape their programs. Additionally, museums increasingly partner with libraries to offer joint educational opportunities for adults, as well as children.

The Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 makes commonsense reforms to authorize museum and library activities, includes provisions important to Members on both sides of the aisle, and reauthorizes a program that should be supported by this Congress.

I would like to thank all those who participated in this process, including the ranking Democrat on the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the American Library Association, the chief officers of State library agencies and the American Association of Museums. They deserve a great deal of the credit for this bipartisan bill before us today.

I look forward to moving this legislation through the House and working with the Senate to complete an authorization bill that President Bush will support, so that we can ensure that our Nation's museums and libraries are getting the best assistance we are able to provide from the Federal level.

I would also like to thank the staff that has worked on this bill.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) on other legislation that will come through the subcommittee. We really did not work on this, we took a lot of what we did in the last Congress on this bill, but I really appreciate starting off in such a positive way on this bill, and also on the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act that the House will consider sometime in the next couple of weeks.

I think it is a great start for this subcommittee. I look forward to working with my colleague on other legislation that will come before the subcommittee and am sure we will have the same kind of bipartisan effort on that legislation, especially the Corporation for National Community Service which our subcommittee will consider this year. I think this is a great start.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation that means so much to our Nation; and I, too, want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman BOEHNER); our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER); and my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the subcommittee, for their work in bringing this bill to the floor today.

We have experienced an economic downturn over the past 2 years; and as

a result, the continuing vitality of our museums is in question. Many have had to close their doors to the public, staff has been laid off, budgets for curriculum materials has been reduced, and the general public wonders about our national priorities.

With our present economy, we have fewer contributions from corporations in support of vital library and museum functions. I support the reauthorization of the Museum and Library Services Act because all of us realize the vital importance of these institutions for our national fabric.

The bill provides modest, but essential, support for museums of all sizes to help them continue their operations, ensure equity of access, and foster culture and education for all our people.

In addition to operating expenses, the act elevates the role of these institutes of lifelong learning. Libraries are essential to parents and community organizations as they look for innovative ways to educate our children, our youth, and adults. The business community also has a big interest in excellent libraries, since the knowledge base for job creation, training programs and business development is a significant portion of library holdings.

In the past 5 years, libraries and museums have received hundreds of millions of dollars under this act to address a wide range of needs, including assessment of museum operations, conservation projects, staff training, technology upgrades, electronic linkages, resource sharing, and outreach programs.

I know that my own State of Texas has benefited from this act, and there is a project in Weslaco in my congressional district which is doing very good work with the resources provided by the Federal Government.

As the need for lifelong learning becomes even greater in the coming decades, this act will become increasingly vital. We have before us a good example of Federal, State, and local partnerships that deserves our continuing support.

I applaud the leadership for bringing this bill to the floor and urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 13.

I also want to say that I look forward to working with our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), because there are many things on the Committee on Education and the Workforce that we need to address. I hope we can work together in calling hearings so that we can get the input from the community nationwide as our States are facing big deficits in their respective governments and legislatures. I know that access to higher education at the community colleges and universities is going to be a serious problem because of the cuts that they have to make.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to looking at that, and many other issues that are going to be very important to us here in our Nation's capital.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS), a new member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003.

Museums and libraries are a fundamental part of our society. They remain an integral component of our education system. As has been noted, attendance at American museums continues to grow, and today's library offers critical community services for all of our citizens.

Charlotte Rogers, the director of the Jefferson County Library System in the Twelfth Congressional District of Georgia, has contacted me in support of this bill because the people of Jefferson County, the people of the State of Georgia and the people of the twelfth district benefit from the services provided by these excellent institutions.

With over a dozen higher-educational institutions in the twelfth district, this bill will ensure continued support for a key component of a balanced education.

H.R. 13 provides the essential Federal support for museums and libraries across this country. As a new member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I was pleased to support this bill during its consideration. I look forward to voting for the passage of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in that effort.

□ 1030

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the outstanding gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank and congratulate my colleagues who worked on this legislation. I also thank my colleagues in general for appreciating the role of libraries and museums.

I also would like to issue a new, repeated challenge to the Members of Congress to take a hard look at libraries and see that we have certainly shortchanged them or overlooked their importance as an institution that gives us the greatest bang for the buck. Our cost-benefits ratio with libraries is probably greater than any institution that we fund anywhere.

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

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, excuse me for interrupting, but before the gentleman continues with his remarks, I think it would be appropriate that the House recognizes that the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is well-versed in this area, I believe being the only librarian, professional librarian, as a Member of the House of Representatives.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman and make that reference before the gentleman continues his remarks. I

thank the gentleman for being down here.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. Now that my objectivity has been established, I would like to say that we have been slow to recognize it, but I hope that this bill will help to concretize in our minds the value of libraries and museums to work together.

I happen to live across the street from one of the greatest museums in America, the Brooklyn Museum of Art. I also live one block away from one of the greatest public libraries, the Central Library of the Brooklyn Public Library, where I worked for 8 years as a librarian. I got a master's degree from the Atlanta University School of Library Science, and was a librarian for 8 years before I went into another line of work that led to politics.

But in the history of Federal funding of libraries, everything we have done for libraries, of all the years there has been some kind of Federal assistance it would not equal the price of one aircraft carrier. I think that is unfortunate, because we do get a great deal of cost-benefits ratio, a good cost-benefit ratio from libraries.

I am particularly interested in the library service as the technology section of this bill. That section recognizes that libraries are moving with the mainstream in terms of digitalized and computerized learning, and that it is probably in the forefront. Long before other institutions were utilizing computers, we had a cataloging system that came out of Ohio where we could catalog any book in the Nation and put it through a computer system, and that one cataloging process could serve all the libraries throughout the Nation.

Cooperation among libraries of various kinds has gone on for a long, long time. One of the reasons libraries were able to deliver so much with so little is that they have always had those networks where they cooperate among libraries in a given system, among libraries across State borders, among local libraries and the Library of Congress. They are models of cooperation and collaboration.

We should also realize that in times of recession when we have difficult economic times, the libraries are used more than ever. This is a pattern that started certainly in the Great Depression. It has not changed.

I understand from my colleagues now in library service positions, especially public libraries, the use of libraries has gone up as the recession has set in. People go for very practical purposes: They are looking for books that will deal with changes in their occupations, or for various reasons; it is not recreational reading they go for when times are hard. So we should bear that in mind also, that it is an instrument by which people are able to change their own lives.

We also have had demonstrated over and over again, despite the fact that people who make budget decisions at

the local level often cut libraries first, that surveys in several cities and localities have established the fact that if the public is given the choice, would you pay more taxes for a particular service, libraries are right at the top in terms of individuals are willing to pay more taxes in order to keep their libraries open and keep their libraries operating at a quality level. That has been proven again and again. So in our reluctance to fund libraries, we are running counter to the perception of the public in terms of an institution where we get our money's worth.

Museums, of course, now serve so many different kinds of purposes. When we say "museum," we are not necessarily talking about an art museum. There are museums of all kinds. I have three grandchildren, and my oldest grandson is 5 years old. He has dinosaur books, but when he went to a library and saw an exhibit, he came back and wanted to be a paleontologist. That big word certainly had meaning for him.

I hope that in the future we would be more generous and would be willing to authorize higher sums for these institutions that have proven their worth over and over again.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 13.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentlewoman will suspend.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(b) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in emergency recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1105

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.

MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. When the recess was declared, the House was considering H.R. 13 and 43½ minutes of debate remained.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) has 22½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) has 21 minutes remaining.

Prior to the recess, the gentleman from Michigan had yielded two minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), and the gentlewoman from New York had 2 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 13, the sole Federal agency devoted exclusively to museums and libraries which partners with schools to educate America's young.

Museums and libraries have traditionally served us as lifelong centers of learning creating centralized locations for the dissemination of information that provides equal access for Americans of all ages.

As the availability of information increases through the use of computer technologies, it is only logical that museums and libraries expand their services in order to fully maximize their mission as reference centers, as well as to fill the public's need to acquire the necessary skills to utilize such technology and reap the benefits of this expansion of cultural and historical knowledge.

The money in this bill will be used to bring projects and resources that would not otherwise be available in our communities to our local libraries and to this Nation's fine museums.

In my district, libraries provide paid mentors that help kids and families with homework in the library, especially they try to include parents whose first language is not English. In addition to the establishment of the centers, the grant has provided for the addition of several important learning resources to participating libraries' collections.

The authorization of the MLSA is an important step to helping students and other museums and library patrons find the resources and materials that they need to successfully come together and share information about history and culture.

Passing this legislation will ensure that libraries and museums across the country continue to provide accessible, safe, dynamic places of learning for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his leadership on something that is so important to America, and that is, the Museum and Library Services Act.

As my colleague has pointed out, this bill authorizes \$245 million in Federal assistance for museums and libraries in the coming fiscal year and additional funds all the way through the end of this decade.

A civilized society, Mr. Speaker, must include cultural enrichment, and it is one of the responsibilities of our government to support that aspect of our civilization. We get what we pay for. Thanks to our museums and libraries, our citizens become well-rounded individuals, and our children are encouraged to become the best that they can be.

Let me highlight for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, a few of the success sto-

ries that come out from the Library Services and Technology Act, which is a part of the Museum and Library Services Act, in my home State of California.

The Infopeople project provides training and computers for local libraries, assuring public access to the Internet in 530 of our State's 765 public libraries.

The University of California in San Diego is assisting over 100 libraries and cultural institutions to recover from natural and man-made disasters.

The County of Los Angeles Public Library is training college students to assist with the library's Summer Reading Program for Children, providing work experience for students while helping open the door to reading for over 30,000 of our children.

The Family Literacy Program provides programs and books for infants and children.

The Oceanside Public Library in San Diego County provides health information from a mobile vehicle funded through this Act.

From my own congressional district, in the city of National City, one of the poorest cities in California, but blessed with a great city librarian, Anne Campbell, this city has funded a large community computer center in the National City Public Library. Over 50,000 residents each year have access to electronic information, software programs, Internet and training. Residents are working on job resumes, e-mailing a loved one aboard a Navy ship, running a business, preparing reports for school and 1,000 other uses that we know that the Internet can provide.

Currently, a grant from this Act provides Web page design training for high school students, with real life experiences designing Web sites for local businesses and nonprofit organizations. From the first class, already two students have been hired permanently to continue to update these Web sites. So the digital divide of which we hear a lot has been narrowed in National City because of the LSTA.

We can go on for a long time about the stories. These are just a few, but they would not be possible without our investment in our Nation's libraries.

I urge support of this legislation, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and my friend from Michigan for granting me the time to rise and speak in strong support of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003.

Mr. Speaker, America has a moral obligation to support its museums and libraries, and throughout our Nation, libraries are at the forefront of our reading, education and family literacy programs. Museums are the centerpiece of our history and civilization, and together, our museums and libraries form the core of democracy in America.

This year, Mr. Speaker, more than 865 million people will visit a museum in America. Millions of students will take out their first book and millions of families will gather for community literacy and learning programs.

All of us remember our very first library card. All of us remember our very first library experience, that first book and that first story which always means so much in our lives, and the role of libraries in American society is and will continue to be critical to our future.

I remember my hometown library, and I especially remember with great fondness and respect and admiration for her impact on my life my own hometown librarian, Martha Gould, who now serves on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Not only has Martha Gould provided technical and institutional knowledge held by libraries in strengthening America's homeland defense, she stands as a stalwart supporter of our library system and works diligently to ensure that our libraries keep up with the 21st century technology and maintain their core function of providing all Americans with the means and capabilities of preserving and protecting democracy.

I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 13 for our Nation, and for the future generations of America.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I thank my colleague for helping us move this bill and encourage all of our colleagues to vote in support of this reauthorization.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to offer my support of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 authorizing our federal library and museum programs under the Institute of Museum and Library Services. As a former educator and life-long supporter of the arts, I fervently believe we must reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act, and do much more to promote libraries and literacy, and to help art in all of its forms to continue to flourish.

We must do all we can to encourage the growth of such institutions, which help to enlighten us regarding our rich and diverse cultural heritage.

We have a strong tradition of providing our citizens with world-class library services and museums. Under H.R. 13, library services nationwide will be enhanced in order to better meet the needs of all Americans by: extending access to information for citizens in all types of libraries and thus increase citizens' knowledge, and assisting libraries in more effectively sharing resources to promote the streamlined delivery of services.

In my District, the County of Los Angeles Public Library offers CHIPS, a consumer health information program located in the City of Carson. This invaluable service offers my constituents information and referrals, responds to reference questions and circulates health materials to the community. Through CHIPS, constituents in my District can become

better informed about the quality of their health by gaining up-to-date medical information. The State of California also offers through our libraries:

Working with Kids@Your Library, an internship program for undergraduate students tutoring children in the Summer Reading Program;

Live Homework Help, a program offering students grades 5–12 online access to tutors, or 20 minutes of one-on-one tutoring now available through the Long Beach Public Library; and

Grapes of Wrath Program in the Long Beach Public Library to promoting reading and discussion of John Steinbeck's Pulitzer-prize winning book.

Under H.R. 13, the Library Services and Technology section of the Act will provide almost \$250 million in special funding to libraries and museums nationwide. In the past, my District received approximately \$410,000 to fund vitally needed programs for libraries and museums, and continued funding is required in order for ongoing community needs to be met.

By providing additional grants to states, we can offer citizens:

Greater access to utilizing information electronically;

Facilitate electronic and other linkages between all kinds of libraries;

Create public and private partnerships with external community-based groups and other agencies;

Direct library services to people of distinct cultural, geographic and socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as to persons with disabilities, and those with limited literacy skills; and

Tailor library and information services to people experiencing difficulty using libraries, including children from low-income families, and individuals living in underserved urban and rural areas.

Under H.R. 13, our museums will be better able to continue their tradition of public service by integrating all of society to the natural, cultural, historic, artistic and scientific aspects of our heritage. In my District, I am a proud advocate of the Museum of Latin American Art in the City of Long Beach, which is distinguished as the only museum in the western United States to only feature contemporary Latin American art.

By passing H.R. 13, we will help our museums by: promoting the educational roles played by museums; and extending the exchange of resources and promoting partnerships among schools, libraries, museums, and other community groups.

Because we live in an era when life-long and distance learning are essential to increasing citizens' access to education and vocational opportunities, it is critical that we provide our libraries with the maximum support necessary for them to carry out their missions. At the same time, we must assist our museums so that they may keep raising our awareness and enrich our communities through art.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of the resolution, this Member wishes to add his strong support for the Museums and Library Services Act (H.R. 13), as museums and libraries certainly are a vital part of our society.

This Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Chairman of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce, and

the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the ranking member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce for bringing this important resolution to the House floor today. This Member would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, for sponsoring H.R. 13.

Attendance at American museums is now at more than 865 million visits per year. Today's 21st Century library is not just a provider of books, as the typical American library coordinates a complete and comprehensive approach to community development and services.

The Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 authorizes Federal assistance to museums and libraries through fiscal year 2009. The legislation maintains the modest but essential Federal support for museums and libraries across the country; authorizes funds for the one Federal agency—the Institute of Museum and Library Services—devoted exclusively to museums and libraries, which are natural partners with our nation's schools; and encourages model cooperation between museums and libraries.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 13.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, this year more than 865 million people will visit a museum in America and millions will use their local library for books and other community services. Libraries and museums play a vital role in educating our children and promoting communities.

Throughout our Nation, libraries are at the forefront of reading and family literacy programs. Libraries are critical to many people with disabilities, providing them with specialized materials and resources that are obtainable in a single accessible location. For those persons of limited financial resources or who live in remote areas, libraries provide access to books and reference materials, computer services, and other community-based services.

Museums across the country work with local schools to provide K–12 educational programming. They are an important source of cultural and historical knowledge for people, as they learn about the history and traditions of our country and other places around the world. In addition, museums serve as places where people of different backgrounds come together to share information about history, culture, and civilization.

Under the leadership of Chairman HOEKSTRA in the last Congress, the Education and the Workforce Committee worked in a bipartisan manner to report the Museum and Library Services Act of 2002. That bill had 94 cosponsors, was supported by the Bush Administration, and had been endorsed by the American Library Association, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, and the American Association of Museums. The Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 is very similar to last year's bill, and with 126 cosponsors, it builds on the bipartisan bill reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce last year.

The legislation before the House today funds the Institute of Museum and Library Services, a federal agency devoted exclusively to museums and libraries, which partner with our Nation's schools. It consolidates museum

and library board activities to reduce unnecessary paperwork and duplication. In addition, the reauthorization of the Museum and Library Services Act is an important next step in ensuring that the President's education reforms signed into law last year are properly implemented. H.R. 13 requires that all library activities are coordinated with activities under the No Child Left Behind Act, President Bush's landmark education reform legislation.

First Lady Laura Bush, a former librarian, supports reauthorization of the Museum and Library Services Act. Mr. MILLER, the ranking Democrat on our Committee is a cosponsor of this legislation—I would like to thank him for his support. Mr. HOEKSTRA has put together a good, bipartisan bill and I encourage my colleagues to support the legislation and our Nation's museums and libraries.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as an educator and avid reader, it's always a special pleasure to visit a library or a museum. Libraries safeguard our freedom and keep democracy healthy. Museums and libraries preserve the past and offer brighter futures to all of us. They are true community assets. That is why I was pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act.

Libraries are often referred to as the "People's University." It is a fitting name.

Libraries provide all of us with free access to a fabulous wealth of information. In this increasingly technology-driven society, they speak directly to what we call the Digital Divide. A recent survey by the Department of Commerce found that our libraries are the No. 1 point of access for those who do not have Internet access at home or at work. Today, 90 percent of public libraries have some kind of Internet connection.

Research also shows us that Americans visit libraries 3.5 billion times each year; 1.6 billion items are borrowed annually from public libraries; and research librarians answer 7 million questions every week.

Clearly libraries are responding not only to the daunting challenges of the Information Age and to the changing needs of our communities, but they are continuing to serve all of their traditional roles as well.

Libraries are also true community centers. They create environments where students can do their homework, townspeople can gather, families can interact, seniors can learn new skills, and job seekers can find advice. They are forums building partnerships, linking with everyone from garden clubs to Head Start programs to extend their reach throughout our communities.

Throughout our country, libraries serve as, the catalyst for economic revitalization, bringing together our communities civic and social leaders. They provide reading material for people of all ages by sending books into maternity wards, setting up reading stations in pediatrician's offices, developing teen centers, and establishing mobile book carts in nursing homes and senior centers.

I am currently observing the improvements at my own Princeton public library that are traceable to this authorization bill. The library is in the process of constructing a state of the art library security, inventory, and circulation system that will allow library users to automatically check in and check out books.

Let me cite some other examples of how our local libraries are helping people all across

the 12th District of New Jersey. The South Brunswick Public Library has been fortunate to receive funding from the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) grants. Their Computer Training Center, established in part by these funds serves hundreds of people each week. The center not only provides free Internet access, but it provides the training many people need to use the Internet on their own.

Robert Weidlich of Kendall Park, NJ, turned to the library when he began suffering chronic back pain brought about by hunching over a microscope all day, conducting medical research in a nearby company. He wanted to find the internal source of his pain, which his doctors had not been able to do. At the library, staff helped Weidlich use the library's collections and electronic sources to tap into the medical sources and the latest research from all over the world. He became a regular at the computer center, spending many hours logged on the Internet to learn about disorders of the spinal cord and back. As a result of his research, he located the unusual source of his pain—a damaged ligament in the lumbar region of his back. With his new understanding of the problem, he was able to invent ways to mechanically support his back so that he could go on with his life.

Peter Gao of Monmouth Junction, gleefully reported that he was able to find a new job at the post office because of the assistance the library provided in his job search when he recently lost his programming position at Dow Jones.

Greta Ji passed the Yale law school tests with a top score, thanks to the materials and computer access that she obtained through the library.

Dan Guerra, a family lawyer, regularly uses the library in his research, and especially finds the databases helpful.

Finally, the Investments Club utilizes all our resources to keep abreast of the latest market developments. None of the Club members have computers at home, nor could they individually afford the financial databases they like to check at their weekly meetings. Senior citizens like Leona Bouthwell, can now regularly check her investments and look up consumer information.

These are examples of how important libraries are to me and millions of other Americans. Mr. Speaker, Carl Rowan, a noted journalist, once said, "The library is the temple of learning, and learning has liberated more people than all the wars in history."

I look forward to the passage of H.R. 13 the Museum and Library Services Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, March 4, 2003, the bill is considered read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

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

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

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

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of H.R. 13 may be followed by a 5-minute vote, if ordered, on approving the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 2, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie	Cooper	Gutknecht
Ackerman	Costello	Hall
Aderholt	Cox	Harman
Akin	Cramer	Harris
Alexander	Crane	Hart
Allen	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)
Andrews	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Baca	Cummings	Hayes
Bachus	Cunningham	Hayworth
Baird	Davis (AL)	Hefley
Baker	Davis (CA)	Hensarling
Baldwin	Davis (FL)	Herger
Ballance	Davis (IL)	Hill
Ballenger	Davis (TN)	Hinchee
Barrett (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Barton (TX)	Deal (GA)	Hoefel
Bass	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Beauprez	DeGette	Holden
Becerra	Delahunt	Holt
Bell	DeLauro	Honda
Bereuter	DeLay	Hooley (OR)
Berkley	DeMint	Hostettler
Berman	Deutsch	Houghton
Berry	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoyer
Biggett	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hulshof
Bilirakis	Dicks	Hyde
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	Doggett	Isakson
Bishop (UT)	Dooley (CA)	Israel
Blackburn	Doolittle	Issa
Blumenauer	Doyle	Istook
Blunt	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boehler	Duncan	Jackson-Lee
Boehner	Dunn	(TX)
Bonilla	Edwards	Janklow
Bonner	Ehlers	Jefferson
Bono	Emanuel	Jenkins
Boozman	Emerson	John
Boswell	Engel	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	English	Johnson (IL)
Boyd	Eshoo	Johnson, E. B.
Bradley (NH)	Evans	Johnson, Sam
Brady (PA)	Everett	Jones (NC)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Jones (OH)
Brown (OH)	Fattah	Kanjorski
Brown (SC)	Feeney	Kaptur
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Keller
Brown-Waite,	Filner	Kelly
Ginny	Fletcher	Kennedy (MN)
Burgess	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Burns	Forbes	Kildee
Burr	Ford	Kilpatrick
Burton (IN)	Fossella	Kind
Buyer	Frank (MA)	King (IA)
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	King (NY)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Cannon	Frost	Kirk
Cantor	Gallely	Klecza
Capito	Garrett (NJ)	Kline
Capps	Gerlach	Knollenberg
Capuano	Gibbons	Kolbe
Cardin	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Cardoza	Gillmor	LaHood
Carson (IN)	Gingrey	Lampson
Carson (OK)	Gonzalez	Langevin
Carter	Goode	Lantos
Case	Goodlatte	Larsen (WA)
Castle	Gordon	Larson (CT)
Chabot	Goss	Latham
Chocola	Granger	LaTourette
Clay	Graves	Leach
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Lee
Coble	Green (WI)	Levin
Cole	Greenwood	Lewis (CA)
Collins	Grijalva	Lewis (GA)
Combest	Gutierrez	Lewis (KY)

Linder	Pastor	Shuster
Lipinski	Payne	Simmons
LoBiondo	Pearce	Simon
Lofgren	Pelosi	Skelton
Lowey	Pence	Slaughter
Lucas (KY)	Peterson (MN)	Smith (MI)
Lynch	Peterson (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Majette	Petri	Smith (TX)
Maloney	Pickering	Smith (WA)
Manzullo	Pitts	Solis
Markey	Platts	Souder
Marshall	Pombo	Spratt
Matheson	Pomeroy	Stark
Matsui	Porter	Stearns
McCarthy (MO)	Portman	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Price (NC)	Strickland
McCollum	Pryce (OH)	Sullivan
McCotter	Putnam	Sweeney
McCrery	Quinn	Tancredo
McDermott	Radanovich	Tanner
McGovern	Rahall	Tauscher
McHugh	Ramstad	Tauzin
McInnis	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
McIntyre	Regula	Taylor (NC)
McKeon	Rehberg	Terry
McNulty	Renzi	Thomas
Meehan	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Meek (FL)	Reynolds	Thompson (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez	Thornberry
Menendez	Rogers (AL)	Tiahrt
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Tiberi
Michaud	Rogers (MI)	Tierney
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher	Toomey
Miller (MI)	Ross	Towns
Miller, Gary	Rothman	Turner (OH)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Turner (TX)
Mollohan	Royce	Udall (CO)
Moore	Ruppersberger	Udall (NM)
Moran (KS)	Rush	Upton
Moran (VA)	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Murphy	Ryan (WI)	Visclosky
Murtha	Ryuan (KS)	Vitter
Musgrave	Sabo	Walden (OR)
Myrick	Sanchez, Linda	Walsh
Nadler	T.	Wamp
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Waters
Neal (MA)	Sanders	Watson
Nethercutt	Sandlin	Watt
Ney	Saxton	Waxman
Northup	Schakowsky	Weiner
Norwood	Schiff	Weldon (FL)
Nunes	Schrock	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Scott (GA)	Weller
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Whitfield
Obey	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Olver	Serrano	Wilson (NM)
Osborne	Sessions	Wilson (SC)
Ose	Shadegg	Wolf
Otter	Shaw	Woolsey
Owens	Shays	Wu
Oxley	Sherman	Wynn
Pallone	Sherwood	Young (FL)
Pascarella	Shimkus	

NAYS—2

Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—16

Conyers	Lucas (OK)	Snyder
Cubin	Millender	Stupak
Culberson	McDonald	Van Hollen
Etheridge	Miller (NC)	Wexler
Gephardt	Ortiz	Young (AK)
Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1135

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 47, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 47, I was detained by a group of women constituents speaking on a panel on

Violence Against Women." Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 47 on March 6, 2003, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COOPER moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I am an unlikely radical. I called for a motion to adjourn today, that disrupted normal House business, in order to highlight one of the smelliest pieces of legislation in recent memory. Sunshine is the best disinfectant, and this bill, although it is labeled as helpful to our military men and women, needs lots of sunshine and lots of disinfectant so that a new, improved bill can be truly helpful to our military.

I felt compelled to rise in reluctant opposition to H. Res. 126 and H.R. 878, the rule for debate and the "Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act." I am one of the strongest supporters of our National Guard and Reserve, but this bill is not good enough for them. It only grants a tiny fraction of the tax relief that our Guard and Reserve deserve, and it is a bill loaded with special interest provisions that have nothing to do with the Guard and Reserve.

Fortunately, the Republicans have now pulled the bill from the floor because I think they were beginning to notice the stink that their legislation was causing. I hope that we will vote on an improved bill very soon because our service men and women deserve a clean, strong bill to give them tax relief now.

Newspapers across the nation have denounced H.R. 878 with headlines such as, "Help Soldiers, Not Gamblers," but many members still feel compelled to vote for it on final passage because it does still contain some relief for our men and women in uniform. That is a devil's bargain. We should not be blackmailed into accepting special interest tax provisions just because they are packaged with all too meager tax breaks for our Guard and Reserve. Especially in a time of war, the U.S. House of Representatives should honor and reward our Guard and Reserve, and not limit their benefits as this bill does. Above all we should not load it with lobbyists' dream lists of special interest tax provisions, such as a tax relief for foreign gamblers.

The Republicans majority are using our Guard and Reserve as human shields for their special interests selfishness. They should have allowed a substitute to be offered so that Congress could vote for either their bill, with \$189 million in tax benefits for our Guard and Reserve over 10 years, or the Democrats and Senate Finance Committee bills with \$851 in tax relief for our troopers. A fair vote on these two bills was denied the House, under the rule, H. Res. 126, and that's why I am opposing not only the bill but also the rule.

Who would have thought that the Republican majority would add tax breaks for foreigners who bet on U.S. horse races to the bill, or tax relief for bow and arrow manufacturers, or tax breaks for mixing diesel fuel with water. These provisions should be considered

separately, not in legislation whose title is the "Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 358, answered "present" 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

AYES—63

Allen	Hoyer	Olver
Andrews	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Ballance	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Berry	(TX)	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Price (NC)
Cardoza	Kucinich	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Lantos	Rush
Clay	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
Cooper	Lee	Sabo
Crowley	Levin	Schakowsky
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Doggett	Lynch	Stark
Evans	Markey	Tanner
Farr	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Filner	McGovern	Thompson (MS)
Ford	McNulty	Tierney
Frank (MA)	Miller (NC)	Towns
Grijalva	Miller, George	Velazquez
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Oberstar
Hinchey	Oberstar	Obey
Honda	Obey	

NOES—358

Abercrombie	Calvert	Ehlers
Ackerman	Camp	Emanuel
Aderholt	Cannon	Emerson
Akin	Cantor	Engel
Alexander	Capito	English
Baca	Capps	Eshoo
Bachus	Cardin	Everett
Baird	Carson (OK)	Fattah
Baker	Carter	Feeney
Baldwin	Case	Ferguson
Ballenger	Castle	Flake
Barrett (SC)	Chabot	Fletcher
Bartlett (MD)	Chocola	Foley
Barton (TX)	Clyburn	Forbes
Bass	Coble	Fossella
Beauprez	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Becerra	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Bell	Combust	Frost
Bereuter	Costello	Gallegly
Berkley	Cox	Garrett (NJ)
Berman	Cramer	Gerlach
Biggart	Crane	Gibbons
Bilirakis	Crenshaw	Gilchrest
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Gillmor
Bishop (NY)	Cunningham	Gingrey
Bishop (UT)	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Goode
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Blunt	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boehlert	Davis (TN)	Goss
Boehner	Davis, Jo Ann	Granger
Bonilla	Davis, Tom	Graves
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Green (TX)
Bono	DeFazio	Green (WI)
Boozman	DeGette	Greenwood
Boswell	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Boucher	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Boyd	DeLay	Hall
Bradley (NH)	DeMint	Harman
Brady (PA)	Deutsch	Harris
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hart
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hastings (WA)
Brown, Corrine	Dicks	Hayes
Brown-Waite,	Dooley (CA)	Hayworth
Ginny	Doolittle	Hefley
Burgess	Doyle	Hensarling
Burns	Dreier	Hergert
Burr	Duncan	Hill
Burton (IN)	Dunn	Hinojosa
Buyer	Edwards	Hobson

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 49. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 47, 48, and 49, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on these rollcalls.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 684

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 684, the District of Columbia Student Opportunity Scholarship Act of 2003. I was signed on by mistake.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at noon), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader for purposes of inquiring about the calendar.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Whip yielding to me, and I would note, Mr. Speaker, that the House has completed its business for the week.

While we expected to consider the Armed Services Tax Fairness Act today, some problems with the bill have arisen, and we intend to work through those problems over the next several days and hope to consider the bill in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. The House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to the Members' offices early next week. There will be no votes in the House before 6:30 on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we expect to consider several health-related measures: the

Automatic Defibrillation in Adam's Memory Act, the Organ Donation Improvement Act, the Mosquito Abatement for Safety and Health Act, the Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities Prevention Act. We will also consider a bill addressing medical errors. We expect several of those measures to be considered under suspension of the rules.

On Thursday, we expect to consider H.R. 5, the HEALTH Act, to improve patients' access to health care and reduce health care costs by reforming our medical liability system, and that is the schedule for next week.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and happy to answer any questions.

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

I want to tell the gentleman I am of two minds on the fact that we have removed from floor consideration the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act. Of two minds because I think all of us agree that the underlying bill was a bill that we should have passed today, indeed yesterday or the day before yesterday. It is an Act that tells our service people that we are sending into harm's way that we want to make sure that we can limit the financial consequences of that service to country, as much as we possibly can.

So I lament the fact that we have had that removed from the schedule. However, I say I am of two minds because I am pleased that it was removed because we added to that bill extraneous pieces of legislation, which in and of themselves individually may have been subject to worthy debate. There was some in there that I thought were not, but having said that, I would hope that when this bill is reported back that it can be presented in a form that all 435 of us can vote for, because 435 of us, in my opinion, are for it.

So, as I say, I am of two minds. I am sorry that it is delayed, but I am sure that it will come back, hopefully soon, and that we can pass it in the form that all of us support it, and I would ask the gentleman, in that vein, does the gentleman know if this bill will be coming back next week?

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, first, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns. I might also add, the gentleman should never have to apologize for a delay, but as the gentleman knows, the Committee on Ways and Means worked on this bill and marked it up last week in open process and within the rules of their committee and the House and many of the provisions that were added to the Military Tax Fairness bill were added, in many cases, by voice vote and unanimous votes. Some were controversial, but the committee acted in good faith and marked up the bill and there was full participation by every Member on that committee.

Unfortunately, as the bill headed towards the floor, as the gentleman

knows, there were concerns raised by our Members and as well as the gentleman's Members, and we felt compelled that we needed to address those concerns before we actually bring it to the floor, and that is what we are going to try to do in the next several days, and hopefully, we will get a bill that everybody can vote for.

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

To press the point, I understand that my colleagues need to work on that and try to work out whatever problems existed, but in light of that, it is the gentleman's expectation he will be able to work out those problems next week so we can pass this bill in a form that will allow us to pass it with the overwhelming support that I think it has on this floor if it is the base bill? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I want this bill as much as anybody. It is very, very important, as the gentleman has already stated. It is important to give our military families the tax relief that they deserve, and we want to do this.

I remind the gentleman that this bill, the Military Armed Services Tax Fairness Act, has passed this House almost unanimously twice, and we hope that we can get it up here just as soon as possible. As soon as we get everything ironed out and the bill ripens a little bit, we will bring it to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, and in an effort again to be helpful, I think that the majority leader is correct. Everybody wants this bill to pass, and the shame of it not passing today is, I am sure the gentleman shares, is that we somehow sent a message to our Armed Forces personnel arrayed across this globe, and particularly in the Middle East, at risk and they look to this capital and know full well that this bill is passed with over 400 votes and must be concluding to themselves that it was politics and political division that undermined the passage this day.

So I know my colleague is working towards this objective. This is not a criticism of the gentleman, and it was an open session in the Committee on Ways and Means, and as my colleague recalls, I am sure, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a Republican, raised the issue that this was a real problem, in open session, in committee.

So it was obviously on both sides of the aisle that we are concerned about the fact that we politicized an otherwise bipartisan, nonpartisan objective that we wanted to achieve, and I look forward to that coming back hopefully in the posture that it was in when we, 400 of us plus, came together to pass that legislation. So I would hope that can happen.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was absolutely right. It was an open process in the committee, and I may stand corrected, but I believe there were Democrat amendments approved by the committee as well as Republican amendments approved by the committee in developing what at least the committee thought was a bipartisan bill. So, unfortunately, these things happen in the legislative process, and fortunately, we can correct those problems hopefully.

Mr. HOYER. I suppose whether it was a bipartisan bill or not is in the eye of the definer, I suppose, and notwithstanding that, I would hope, again, it would come back in a form that all of us could vote for it and it would not be extraneous matters.

Those extraneous matters may well have merit, but why argue them on their merit or demerit, and we ought not to hold hostage our men and women in the Armed Forces, in harm's way, families disrupted by being called to service. We ought not to say to them anything but that we are prepared to act together, we are prepared to act quickly and we are prepared to make sure that, to the extent we can, we will diminish the financial burden that their service to our country requires.

On the medical malpractice bill that the gentleman indicates will be on the floor next week, on today's major piece of legislation which we have been discussing, the Committee on Rules denied two of our ranking members' ability to offer key amendments, and we are very concerned about that. Can the leader inform me if he knows what kind of rule there will be for the medical malpractice bill, what he anticipates will be in order?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has been any discussion as to what kind of rule we would bring to the floor in order to bring the medical justice bill to the floor.

In the past, we have always, on this kind of legislation, allowed the minority to have a substitute. The chairman of the Committee on Rules obviously, along with the Committee on Rules, will consider amendments that other Members may offer, and as the gentleman well knows, the rule will be written sometime next week, so that we can bring the bill to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leader for his comments. I am aware of the fact that the Committee on Rules has been extraordinarily advantaged by the addition of a new chief staffer on that committee who will, I think, add greatly to the consideration of that committee of alternatives.

Mr. Pitts is a man that I have found to be fair and knowledgeable with respect to this House. He is as well an individual who was involved when the Republicans were in the minority of lamenting the fact that we did not give

fair and full opportunity of loyal opposition to offer alternative proposals, and I would hope that we would reverse, frankly, the practice that has gone from 1995 to date where increasingly we have reduced the opportunity of the minority party to offer alternatives, either in the nature of substitutes or in amendments to the base bill.

I say that very seriously because I think that my colleagues were frankly correct when they were in the minority, making the proposition that that would improve legislation, and we ought to vote it up or down. If it was good when the gentleman was in the minority, presumably that same principle is good when they are in the majority.

We are tested somewhat when the shoe shifts from foot to foot to see where we want to put that foot I suppose, but I would hope that on this bill, which is a controversial bill, a bill, that is, we believe has great consequence for patients, for doctors, for hospitals, we want to make sure that our people have the best medical service available to them and that our doctors and that our hospitals and that our patients have the ability to work with one another to effect that. We have some ideas on that. We have some ideas how that can be effected, and we are hopeful, respectfully, and we would urge that the Committee on Rules give us a full and fair opportunity to present our alternative ideas if we have them. If we do not have them when we support your proposals, then fine, but if we have alternative ideas, we would urge on legislation of such great consequence to the American public that we fully debate options and ways and means of solving the problems that we are addressing.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, and the gentleman said earlier it is all in the eyes of the beholder. In the eyes of this beholder, we think we have been more than generous with the minority, and in showing that, to entice Mr. Pitts to come work for the Committee on Rules shows our generosity to the minority because he is a very fair man, a very creative man in dealing with rules and really understands how this House works, and we hoped that by Mr. Pitts coming to work for the Committee on Rules it was a signal to everyone in the House that everyone in the House would be treated fairly.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I do not want to prolong this too much.

I want to say with all sincerity, I share the gentleman's view of Mr. Pitts. I have worked with him over a long period of time. I have extraordinary respect and affection and regard for Bob Michel, for whom he worked effectively and for a long time.

□ 1315

I want to tell the gentleman, as sincerely as I can say on this floor, caring about this institution, frankly, if Billy Pitts is making the determination of what he thinks is fair or not fair, from his perspective from a long time in the minority, as to what the minority's rights ought to be in terms of offering alternatives on this floor, of having time to debate on this floor, of having individual amendments considered, I will tell the gentleman that I am confident that it will be done fairly.

But I will also tell the gentleman with equal sincerity that I have had my staff do an analysis from 1995 to date; and there has been, from 1995 to 2002, an almost straight-line reduction in the alternatives in bills allowed to the minority as we consider major pieces of legislation. I do not think that is good for our country, I do not think it is good for this institution, and it is not good for the comity between our two parties.

The gentleman from Texas and I have had an opportunity to work closely together on many items of great concern to this institution. We have worked well together. The gentleman and I have very serious disagreements on issues, but we do not have disagreements on the fact that this institution ought to operate as effectively as possible on behalf of our country. We share that in common, and I know we will continue to share that in common. But I really sincerely urge the gentleman, as the leader of his party on this floor and working with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and Mr. PITTS, to say to the American public and to this institution that we are prepared to debate these matters, we are prepared to debate these matters fully and fairly and give options to the minority party.

I will say to my friend there was some discussion in our party. We had one motion, as the gentleman knows, to adjourn, and there was some discussion that we ought to make many more motions and have disruption. We did not do that. But I will tell my friend that there is great concern on this side of the aisle that if we do not have a fair and open system to consider legislation that we will not be as cooperative as we otherwise would like to be, and so that the American public can be best served.

On the budget, Mr. Leader, if I can, when do we expect the budget to be on the floor?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. The distinguished whip understands that the Committee on the Budget is working as we speak, and continues to work to develop a product that they can mark up in the very near future. We fully expect to move a budget resolution through the House under a time frame that gives us ample opportunity to have a conference with

the Senate and complete the budget resolution by April 15, as required by law.

It is a very ambitious schedule, I know; and it is putting a lot of pressure on a lot of Members to make a lot of decisions in a very short period of time. But we feel very strongly that we need to get this budget done as quickly as possible.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. One additional question, which this is sort of a follow-up on what I have just discussed. In the past, as the gentleman knows, we have had a number of substitutes which have been offered. Our Congressional Black Caucus has offered substitutes, our Blue Dog Caucus has offered substitutes, and I know the gentleman will be happy to hear that it is fully my expectation that the minority on the Committee on the Budget will have a Democratic alternative. I noted that the gentleman urges us to do that; and he and I share that view, and we are going to do that. But will we be allowed, Mr. Leader, to offer those substitutes as we have in the past as well as offer amendments that are requested?

I realize the gentleman cannot answer to all the amendments, because I do not know what amendments will be asked for; but will there be consideration of valid amendments that have broad-based support?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will further yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We want to follow precedent as to how we want to approach the debate on the budget, and certainly I do not want to make decisions for the Committee on Rules. They are more than capable of making their own decisions about how to bring the budget to the floor and what kind of debate we will have. But as the gentleman has already noted, we have always been open to alternatives to the majority's budget as laid out by the Committee on the Budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus has always had a substitute and others have had substitutes. I think this is because it is such an important issue, the budget of this Nation and its government; and we are hoping to have as open a debate as possible.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman very much for those comments.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,
MARCH 10, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 10, 2003.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY,
MARCH 11, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 10, that it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 11, 2003, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS
ACT

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, what began as the "Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act" for those bravely serving around the world, a bill to ensure that their families would not be taxed on the small, \$6,000 death benefit payable to those families when someone is killed in conflict, that bill has now been totally perverted. The Republican leadership has desecrated the noble purpose of this bipartisan legislation.

In addition to the tax-free winnings for foreigners on horse races that was already in the bill, last night, in a truly shameful act, the House Republican leadership insisted on including in this military tax fairness bill an amnesty provision for corporate tax dodgers for the "ex-patriots" who have renounced America and planted their mailbox in the sands of Bermuda, even following the horrible attacks of September 11, in order to avoid paying their fair share of our military and other needs, the Republicans want to grant them amnesty.

While Americans are concerned with protecting their families, they need to know that the leadership of this House has launched a sneak attack to protect the corporate expatriates who have renounced America, and they do so in a misnamed bill, the "Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act."

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS
ACT

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

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we were to take up a bill today, which was H.R.

878, and the bill would have basically provided tax relief for our young men and women who are in the armed services, particularly those in the Persian Gulf at this time, 240,000 of them. It would have eliminated capital gains tax if and when they would sell their private residence. And if in the event that one or two of them would pass away or die, it would provide nontaxability of any survivor benefits that they would receive. This bill needs to be passed very quickly, because the President plans to go to war within the next 2 weeks or so. We are almost certain of that.

One of the problems is that last week, as the bill was in the House Committee on Ways and Means, my Republican colleagues added to the legislation a number of special interest tax breaks. Unfortunately, now it will slow the bill down. They took it off the floor of the House today because they could not even get enough votes on their side of the aisle to pass it. And, secondly, if it should pass, it will get bogged down in a House-Senate conference.

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS
ACT

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI).

Mr. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, these tax breaks would provide for foreigners who place bets outside the United States on horse races a tax break. It would provide special tax breaks for the blend of diesel fuel and water. It will provide a special tax break for manufacturers of fishing tackle boxes. In all, \$300 million worth of tax breaks like these would have been provided. A wide variety of these tax breaks would be given to these different companies, many of whom have contributed to the colleagues who in fact have offered them.

I think this is tragic. We have a situation where our young men and women are put in harm's way. We want to give them some relief so that at least they can have some peace of mind when it comes to selling their house. And many will have to sell their homes. That is one of the reasons we gave this tax break, mainly because their income is going to go down, and many have families back home.

As a result of that, we are slowing this process down now. So I would just hope they would bring the bill back, stripping off these special tax provisions.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding to me.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for his leadership and all his good work.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET DOES LITTLE TO CLOSE ACHIEVEMENT GAP IN EDUCATION

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

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Bush recently announced his opposition to the affirmative action plan used by the University of Michigan in admissions. It is troubling that the academic achievements of white students and African American students at Michigan are markedly different, but it is troubling for a reason that President Bush apparently did not consider. It is troubling that almost a half century after the Supreme Court's decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* there remain such disparities in the academic achievements of white students and African American students.

Mr. Speaker, the public schools are where we deliver on the promise of equality of opportunity. The public schools must deliver on that promise to white children; to black children; to children whose parents do not speak English in their homes; to the children of parents who care passionately about their children, who read to them every night, who join the PTA and volunteer at their children's schools; to the children of parents who are themselves children and are as little prepared to be parents as their parents were before them.

Just days after President Bush announced his opposition to the University of Michigan's affirmative action plan, he announced his proposed budget. We see from that budget what he would do to close the achievement gap so that universities can achieve a diversity in population without affirmative action plans like Michigan's. Mr. Speaker, he would do very little.

The very programs that are most effective in closing the achievement gap and delivering on the promise of equality of opportunity for every child are hardest hit. The proposed budget cuts No Child Left Behind by \$9 billion. The act gives a nod to the promise of equality of opportunity, but the budget breaks that promise.

The budget cuts after-school programs by more than 40 percent, teacher training by almost \$200 million. It cuts

individualized instruction in math and reading for disadvantaged children. President Bush's budget guts Head Start, our effort to reach disadvantaged children who now arrive for kindergarten so far behind they can never catch up.

□ 1330

I sat in a first grade class in my State and had one child after another read out loud to me. Some children read effortlessly in a sing-song voice because the material lacked such challenge. Other children read laboriously, sounding out every word, getting every third or fourth word wrong.

When those children apply for college 13 years later, I fear there will be the same differences in their academic achievement, and we will still need affirmative action plans like Michigan to achieve diverse populations in our colleges.

Mr. Speaker, it is not acceptable to me that our children's chances in life depend so greatly on the circumstances into which they were born. President Bush's budget shows that he is not bothered by that.

SECURING AMERICAN BORDERS

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought forward to the House a picture and a little story about an individual who died on the border last August. His name was Chris Eggle. Mr. Eggle was an employee of the United States Government acting in the capacity of a park ranger down in the Oregon Pipes National Park in Arizona. He was killed in the line of duty by people who had come across the board after being involved in some sort of drug altercation where three others were killed in Mexico.

The point of my presentation yesterday was to explain to the Members of this body that we have, in fact, a war zone on our southern border, and to a certain extent, on the northern border.

Today, unfortunately, I have the sad occasion to bring to Members' attention another young man named Jorge Salomon Martinez. Mr. Martinez was brutally murdered in Mexico just a short time ago. He was a Border Patrol agent working for the United States. Mr. Francisco Javier Rosas Molina, who is 18 years old, is in custody, and the Mexican authorities continue to search for others that they say have probably fled across the border into the United States.

Mr. Martinez had apparently met Mr. Rosas Molina earlier in the week near the border town of Naco. They began to party together and converse, and Salomon had originally identified himself to the group as a member of the Border Patrol, as employed by the Border Patrol. Then they met some other

people and Rosas Molina evidently told the other members of the group that Mr. Martinez was indeed a Border Patrol agent, and what happened next is described as the following.

He said that is when Rosas Molina identified him to the others as a Border Patrol agent, and that appears to be the reason that they killed him. Martinez was beaten and his head bashed in with rocks. His Ford pickup was stolen along with other belongings, including a gold chain and a medallion. A passerby discovered the body early Wednesday and notified Mexican police. Later police received a tip about the slaying and robbery of a U.S. Border Patrol agent. The caller led agents to Rosas Molina, who had the agent's truck and medallion. Rosas Molina has admitted involvement in the slaying.

The purpose of the slaying, as it appears from the evidence gathered, is because Mr. Martinez was a Border Patrol agent. He is not the first Border Patrol agent to be killed in the line of duty on the border, he is not the first Border Patrol agent to be accosted. It happens all too frequently. It is because our borders are war zones. We were are in the process of debating whether or not, and the President is in the process of determining whether or not to send Americans off to fight a war in the Middle East. Without discussing the merits of that particular decision, I will tell Members there is a war going on on our borders. People are being killed on our borders. Troops are needed on our borders.

Our homeland needs to be defended. These people need to be defended. They need to be trained, and they need to be protected. We have to make a decision as a Nation as to whether or not we want borders or not. If we choose not to enforce our borders, we should move away from them and let people come into this country at their will. We should stop this process of sending a few people down to our border, put them into harm's way, and then refuse to actually secure the border.

Mr. Martinez, before him Mr. Eggle, and others, are examples of this kind of policy, this policy that puts people at risk without really having a desire on the part of this Nation to defend those borders or to protect our people on those borders.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to the family of Mr. Martinez. Our prayers go out to that family. I hope that we will not forget his face or his story.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

WINNING WITHOUT WAR

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offered President Bush, as did so many others here, immediate bipartisan support for the war on terror, but regime change in Baghdad, rather than disarming Iraq, represents a diversion from that bipartisan effort.

Not only do we have continuing concerns about Osama bin Laden, but also we have grave concerns about the looming nuclear threat from North Korea, which does have long-range missiles. This threat was deliberately hidden from this House until after our vote on Iraq.

The Korean peninsula crisis worsens by the day with Administration mismanagement and neglect heightening the far greater danger from this xenophobic, despotic regime. The Administration has a "Don't Talk, Don't Tell" policy that is steadily narrowing our options and increasing the risk of what could easily become a devastating conflict.

Just yesterday, former Defense Secretary William Perry and former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright warned that North Korea could be headed toward "serial production" of nuclear weapons.

I believe that the Administration's fixation with regime change in Baghdad is diverting precious intelligence and other resources that we need to protect American families from what is a very genuine threat. Despite its clever marketing campaign, and it has been clever indeed, attempting to link 9/11 with Saddam Hussein, as of this very moment, the Administration has not offered one shred of evidence to make that connection stick, nor has it demonstrated why Iraq represents any greater danger of attacking our families today than it did on September 10, or since the time we were supplying them aid.

Today, we have crisscrossed Iraq with weapons inspectors. It does not even pose such a threat that its next-door neighbor, Turkey, is willing to challenge it.

The Central Intelligence Agency, in reports that we forced out of the Administration, has indicated that the real threat to our families would come with an invasion to Iraq and the danger that any weapons of mass destruction might spread and affect us.

Overthrowing a single tyrant, in what many will perceive to be a crusade against Islam, will ultimately jeopardize families across America as we create a generation of terrorists. Further attacks will only reinforce those here in America, who are determined to ensure our safety by trampling our civil liberties.

Attacking Iraq is apparently the first step in implementing a dangerous new security policy that dramatically alters a half century's bipartisan reliance on containment that has served to protect us from villains as bad as Saddam Hussein. America will now attack first with preemptive strikes in what could spiral into wars without end be-

cause other countries are likely to copy our model.

Fighting wars as a first choice, not a last choice, is a formula for international anarchy, not domestic security. A quick draw may take out the occasional tyrant, but it comes at the cost of destabilizing the world, disrupting the hope for international law and order, and, ultimately, it makes all of us unsafe.

True security certainly requires a strong military and a willingness to use it. We are strong enough to conquer Iraq and others, but we must be wise enough to rely on our many other strengths to rid the world of dangers. Ultimately, imposing our will by force unites our enemies and divides our allies. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld may dismiss our major partners as "Old Europe," but many yearn for "Old America" that collectively and successfully worked to prevent and remove threats to peace and ensure the safety of our families.

This is not a choice between "war" and "appeasement." Rather, the better alternative is to isolate Saddam Hussein and unite both his neighbors and our allies behind an aggressive inspection and weapons destruction program.

We know that the real cost of war is paid in blood. But Americans are already paying for this war at the gas pump. And with so few allies, hundreds of billions of our tax dollars that could be spent on the needs of Americans will be spent abroad.

A robust debate in an elected Congress on whether war should be waged with Iraq is the sign of a strong democracy. Unfortunately, this year, that debate took place in Turkey, not here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns regarding domestic violence that plagues our Nation. Franklin D. Roosevelt once said there are four essential human freedoms, the last being freedom from fear.

Today there still are too many women and children who have never experienced a life free from fear. These women and children are the 1 to 4 million women who experience serious assaults by an intimate partner each year. They are the 3.3 million children who witness their mothers being abused every year. They are the 3.2 million victims of child abuse each year.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Lifetime Television and its partners for drawing attention to this most important and most persistent problem. To those women and children who are out there who are victims, please know that there are people and there are programs out there to help you become free from fear.

PLEA FOR PEACE

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to plead for peace. Every day our great Nation moves ever closer to war with Iraq. I know many Americans believe war is unavoidable. I hope and pray that they are wrong.

It is not an easy thing to disagree with the administration at a time when hundreds of thousands of our brave men and women are poised in the Persian Gulf. I want to make it clear that I will support our troops regardless of what happens, but I cannot, in good conscience, betray the nonviolent principles on which I have worked my whole life. I cannot sit silent when I believe there is still time to use diplomacy and let the inspectors do their job.

□ 1345

While I believe that the hour is late, it is not too late to stop the rush to war. It is not too late to embrace peace. War with Iraq will not bring peace to the Middle East. It will not make the world a safer or better or more loving place. It will not end the strife and hatred that breed terror.

War does not end strife. It sows it. War does not end hatred. It feeds it. War is bloody. It is vicious, it is evil, and it is messy. War destroys the dreams, the hopes, and aspirations of people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that war is obsolete.

As a great Nation and a blessed people, we must heed the words of the spiritual: "I am going to lay my burden down, down by the riverside. I ain't gonna study war no more." For those who argue that war is a necessary evil, I say you are half right. War is evil. But it is not necessary. War cannot be a necessary evil, because nonviolence is a necessary good. The two cannot co-exist. As Americans, as human beings, as citizens of the world, as moral actors, we must embrace the good and reject the evil. To quote Ghandi: "The choice is nonviolence or nonexistence."

America's strength is not in its military might, but in our ideas. American ingenuity, freedom, and democracy have conquered the world. It is a battle we did not win with guns or tanks or missiles but with ideas, principles, and justice. We must choose our resources, Mr. Speaker, not to make bombs and guns but to solve the problems that affect all humankind. We must feed the stomach, clothe the naked bodies, educate and stimulate the mind. We must use our resources to build and not to tear down, to reconcile and not to divide, to love and not to hate, to heal and not to kill. Let us, in Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s words, "take offensive action in behalf of justice to remove the conditions which breed resentment, terror and violence against our great Nation." That is a direction in which a great Nation and a proud people should move.

War is easy; but peace, peace is hard. When we hurt, when we fear, when we feel vulnerable or hopeless, it is easy to listen to what is most base within us. It is easy to divide the world into us and them, to fear them, to hate them, to fight them, to kill them. War is easy.

But peace is hard. Peace is right, it is just, and it is true. But it is not easy to love thy enemy. No, peace is hard. As my friend and mentor, Dr. King, said when he spoke about the Vietnam War: "War is not the answer. Let us not join those who shout war. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness." He was right then and the wisdom of those words holds true today. War was not the answer then, and it is not the answer today. War is never the answer. It is not too late to stop our rush to war. Let us give peace a chance.

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

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

IRAQ

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

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Saddam Hussein has been and continues to be a threat to Iraq's neighbors, his own people, and to all peace-loving nations of the world. The United States and the United Nations have recognized the dangers posed by his pursuit of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The world has wisely taken action to proactively address this threat.

The issue is not whether Saddam Hussein is a terrible dictator or whether or not he is dangerous. He clearly is. The issue is whether a preemptive war is justified now. I believe the answer is no. Iraq is neither an immediate or an imminent threat to the security of the American people. Aggressive inspections and disarmament by the United Nations with the full support of member states can be successful. We have time to work together with the international community to collectively address the threat of Iraq without resorting to war and without endorsing a policy of preemptive attack.

Following the devastation of World War II, the United States showed tremendous leadership in the world as we created international institutions and a framework of international law to prevent war and to sustain and maintain peace. We were the leaders in promoting a world where conflicts could be resolved peacefully and cooperatively. While never perfect, this system

of international institutions has been remarkably effective. I and many others around the world are shocked and dismayed by the unilateral, confrontational approach that this administration has taken in the world arena. We must recognize the consequences in the world community of our rejection of Kyoto, of the International Criminal Court, of the treaty to ban land mines, and our own withdrawal from the ABM treaty. We must be mindful about how our criticisms of the U.N. and NATO are heard throughout the world community.

We have to recognize that after 9-11, the world came together in solidarity with our loss, working with us to find the perpetrators, to break up al Qaeda and arrest its leaders, to interrupt the flow of money. It should have been crystal clear that fighting terrorism and protecting American security would require our friends and our allies; cooperation, not confrontation. Yet the administration instead engaged in a single-minded drive to achieve its Iraqi objectives at any cost instead of developing a policy to deal with Iraq by working with our allies, by working with the world community. Even if the administration gets what it wants this time, what is the long-term damage to our international relationships? How will it impact our efforts to stop terrorism and protect the security of the American people?

I am worried. The people that I represent are very anxious. It seems more and more likely that war is around the corner. What will that war be? Are the American people prepared? The American people are expecting, I think, a smaller conflict than we are walking into, perhaps a Grenada, a Panama or the first Gulf War; quick, hopefully few casualties, troops in and out within weeks or months. I think that this war would be different. After a large ground war to capture the entire country, we will likely occupy Iraq. The Army Chief of Staff, General Shinseki, estimated that we would need 100,000 troops or more for the occupation. We have no idea how long they would have to stay. Mr. President, we need to hear about your exit strategy, and we need to hear that now.

The congressional debate that we had last fall to authorize the use of force against Iraq did not prepare the American people for the ramifications of this war and what this administration truly envisions. I call on this administration to answer the myriad questions that have been posed by numerous Members of Congress on behalf of our constituencies before ground troops are committed. All of Congress and all of America stand by our troops, but we think it is absolutely incumbent upon this administration to answer our questions.

U.S.-FRENCH RELATIONS IN LIGHT OF IRAQI CONFLICT

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

tleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, in the current international debate on Iraq, I have the very clear impression that the United States and France are talking past each other and not listening to each other. More particularly, that the United States is not listening to the very nuanced views expressed by the French. My assessment of the dialogue is that President Chirac and President Bush are in accord on the objective of disarming Iraq of weapons of mass destruction and the capability to deliver such weapons. The Bush administration, however, has concluded that the only way to achieve this objective is through military action. In contrast, the French and many other U.S. allies and friendly observers favor continued diplomacy in the firm belief that a vigorous, intensive weapons inspection program will attain the disarmament objective.

It would be useful for the Bush administration to think more constructively about France's contributions to international dialogue and its distinguished record of multilateral peacekeeping as well as military intervention when justified.

A few highlights would be instructive: France was a valuable partner for the United States during the Gulf War in 1991, deploying 10,000 troops and 100 aircraft in Operation Desert Storm. From 1991 through 1995, France was an active ally to secure the peace in Bosnia. During this important peacekeeping mission, 70 French soldiers were killed and more than 600 wounded. In 1999, France deployed the greatest number of aircraft and flew the largest number of sorties of any combatant in Operation Allied Force in Kosovo. France today is contributing the largest contingent of peacekeepers in the Balkans, more than any other nation, including our own.

After September 11, French troops participated in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan where France continues to place its troops in harm's way to provide security in that critical region. French President Chirac was the first foreign leader to pay his respects to the United States in person following the September 11 attacks. This is a very significant record of valuable contributions that France has made where and when needed to combat terror and secure peace.

Our foreign policy would be better served by respecting the historical reality of the U.S.-French relationship. We need to listen to the wise counsel of this longstanding friend of America which has learned how to deal with the Islamic terrorist threat from its own painful experience in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco and the large Arabic-Islamic population among its own citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a New York Times op-ed piece on this very subject.

A WARNING ON IRAQ, FROM A FRIEND
(By Jean-David Levitte)

WASHINGTON.—Reading the papers from both sides of the Atlantic, I sometimes wonder whether the impending war is not between France and the United States. I would like to strongly reaffirm what, in the heart of the French people, is a longstanding reality: the friendship between France and America began in the early days of your fight for independence and has endured throughout the centuries.

America rescued my country twice in the last century—something we will never forget. Today we stand side by side in many parts of the world, including Afghanistan. France is the largest contributor of troops to NATO operations. Our friendship is a treasure, and it must be maintained, protected, enhanced.

However, the polls are clear: 78 percent of French people oppose a military intervention in Iraq. Polls are similar in most other countries, including in Eastern Europe. European governments may be divided over the use of force in Iraq, but public opinion is united.

There are, in my view, three reasons the mood is so cautious. The first relates to our assessment of what is far and away the biggest threat to world peace and stability: Al Qaeda.

French intelligence is clear that not since the Algerian war 40 years ago has my country been under such an immediate threat. Last May, 11 French citizens were killed in a suicide bombing in Karachi, Pakistan. In the fall a French tanker was attacked by Al Qaeda off Yemen. And in December, near Paris, we arrested several suspects who were suspected of close links to Al Qaeda and of planning terrorist attacks in France.

Terrorist suspects have also been arrested elsewhere in Europe—in Britain, Spain and Italy—belonging to groups connected with networks active in Afghanistan, Chechnya, Algeria and Bosnia. Yet we haven't seen any evidence of a direct link between the Iraqi regime and Al Qaeda.

A second reason for the reluctance of the French people is that Iraq is not viewed as an immediate threat. Thanks to the determination of President Bush and the international community—and to the inspections that destroyed more armaments between 1991 and 1998 than did the Persian Gulf war itself, and which have now been reinforced with stronger means and bigger teams—Saddam Hussein is in a box. And the box has been closed with the inspectors in it.

Europeans consider North Korea a greater threat. Imagine what a sense of security we all would feel if, as in Iraq, 100 inspectors were proceeding with unimpeded inspections throughout North Korea, including the president's palaces.

A third reason for the cautious mood relates to the consequences of a war in Iraq. We see Iraq as a very complex country, with many different ethnic groups, a tradition of violence and no experience of democracy. You can't create democracy with bombs—in Iraq; it would require time, a strong presence and a strong commitment.

We also worry about the region—considering that no peace process is at work for the moment in the Middle East, that none of the great powers seem able to foster one, and that a war in Iraq could result in more frustration and bitterness in the Arab and Muslim worlds.

People in France and more broadly in Europe fear that a military intervention could fuel extremism and encourage Qaeda recruitment. A war could weaken the indispensable international coalition against terrorism and worsen the threat of Islamic terrorism.

The inspections should be pursued and strengthened, and Saddam Hussein must be made to cooperate actively. War must remain the very last option.

ASBESTOS LITIGATION INUNDATES THE COURT SYSTEM

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Steven Kazan, the prominent asbestos victims lawyer, informed the Congress: "Asbestos litigation has become a nightmare because the courts have been inundated by the claims of people who may have been exposed to asbestos but who are not sick, who have no lung function deficit. This flood is conjured up through systematic, for-profit screening programs designed to find potential plaintiffs with some x-ray evidence 'consistent with' asbestosis. Ironically, and tragically, in many States that x-ray evidence triggers the statute of limitations, literally forcing the filing of premature claims. These claims are choking the asbestos litigation system and keeping the courts from doing their real job, providing compensation for people who are genuinely injured by asbestos diseases."

Mr. Speaker, the current state of asbestos litigation is a public health tragedy in which the claims of truly ill, terminally ill cancer patients and others who struggle to breathe are mixed together with those plaintiffs who suffer no impairments. In 2001, almost 90,000 individuals joined in asbestos-related personal injury suits against 6,000 entities, but only 10 percent of those claimants have any symptoms of asbestos-related illnesses. These legal tactics force defendants into settlements because they cannot take the risk of "betting the company" on pronouncements of a judge and jury. This first happened in 1982 when 16,000 asbestos personal injury suits forced Johns Manville Corporation into bankruptcy. Since then, the uncertainty of asbestos litigation has driven nearly 70 major American companies into bankruptcy.

During the past 20 years, 2,100 asbestos cases have been tried or settled at a total cost of \$54 billion, with over half of the money used to pay lawyers. As the Wall Street Journal points out, that is more money than the cost of 9-11, Enron and WorldCom put together.

□ 1400

It certainly is a lot of money, but sick plaintiffs are not getting their fair share. The Manville Asbestos Claim Trust created by the bankruptcy court started paying claims in 1988 and was depleted in just 2 years. Today Manville pays just 5 cents on the dollar to claimants, and more money flows out to individuals with no impairments than to people who are truly sick. The truest victims of this tragedy are those who deserve quick and fair compensation for the illnesses they suffer.

However, this problem has more victims. The long-term economic cost paid by all Americans is staggering. According to the RAND Corporation, another \$150 billion to \$200 billion will be spent on asbestos litigation if nothing is done. To date, \$54 billion has been expended. Without reform 423,000 American jobs will be lost. Local governments will spend millions on unemployment benefits, job retraining, and medical coverage for displaced workers and their families. Workers in bankrupt firms will not only lose their jobs, but their retirement security will slip away as they watch the value of their 401(K) accounts drop by 25 percent.

The ever-burgeoning caseload has spawned criticism even from Supreme Court justices who warn that the asbestos litigation crisis is slowing the administration of justice nationwide, and therefore, Congress must act. These complaints span the ideological spectrum of the Supreme Court, including court liberals like Ruth Bader Ginsberg and moderates like David Souter. In 1999, Souter wrote: "The elephantine mass of asbestos cases . . . defies customary judicial administration and calls for national legislation." Opining on the same case, Rehnquist, Scalia, and Kennedy also begged Congress to act. Others are joining the chorus.

Both the Washington Times and the Washington Post called on Congress to move asbestos litigation reform. Just 2 weeks ago, even the American Bar Association voted to support medical standards that would bring the cases of truly sick asbestos plaintiffs to the front of the docket.

Asbestos victims, business leaders, lawyers, and opinion leaders all agree. The need for reform is clear. Therefore, today I am introducing the Asbestos Compensation Act of 2003. This bill establishes medical criteria to expedite the claims of the truly ill and gives these victims access to quick and fair compensation. Any worker who feared he was exposed to asbestos could be tested by a qualified doctor in his area identified by the Justice Department. Those found to be injured would have the value of their impairments determined in accordance with a fair formula, and the worried well would retain the right to return at a later date if they developed symptoms of asbestos-related illness.

The Justice Department would contact corporations named by the workers as responsible for injuries, apportioning liability in accordance with the facts and a set liability formula. Many contacted corporations would accept these settlement offers since they would avoid the expensive legal battles of staying in court.

Mr. Speaker, this is a cloud on our entire economy, affecting 900 stocks in the stock market and the 401(K) and other retirement savings of all of our constituents. I ask for rapid support of

this legislation. This is the most important legislation after the President's tax package that this Congress will consider this year.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 936

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 936.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Ms. CARSON of Indiana addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because it is critical that the RECORD be clear about what happened earlier today on the floor of the House, and that we learn the right lessons.

The bill relating to Armed Forces Tax Fairness was supposed to be before us. The bill originally related exactly to that, tax fairness for those who are in the armed services. But it was decided before we met in committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, apparently by the leadership of that committee, that Members would be allowed to offer provisions totally unrelated to that important bill. A number of those in the majority decided to take that opportunity.

No Democrat participated in presenting any special interest or particular interest legislation. So what we saw was a flood of special interest or particular interest proposals totally unrelated to the critical issue of armed services tax fairness. Provisions relating to makers of bows and arrows, those who make fishing tackle boxes, a provision relating to the taxation of people, foreigners who bet on American horse races.

What happened? The majority leader earlier said on the floor that the result in the Committee on Ways and Means was a bipartisan one, as I heard his words. That is simply incorrect. We

voted, Democrats, against a number of these particular provisions. We had roll calls. Republicans voted aye; Democrats by and large almost unanimously voted no. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member, presented a substitute that would have stripped the bill of all of these particular interest provisions and, as I remember it, have adopted the Senate provision. That was voted down.

So let the RECORD be clear as to what happened in the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill came out on a voice vote because Democrats did not want to vote against a bill relating truly to tax fairness for those in our armed services. However, we had made clear where we stood on those specific provisions.

What is the lesson? At best, this bill, as it came out of the Committee on Ways and Means, reflected misguided priorities and the arrogance of power. Misguided priorities because they inserted several hundred millions in provisions totally unrelated to armed services tax fairness. Bows and arrows, money there when we are short-changing education for our kids, fish tackle boxes when there is not enough money going for homeland security. And then horse races to help those who bet on horse races when there is not enough money for people who are short on prescription drugs.

An arrogance of power that led some in the majority to decide to put on a bill relating to tax fairness for those who were abroad as well as at home, provisions that helped those who were here at home.

So I come here because it is critical the RECORD be clear, it be critical we learn from this experience. I hope next week early on a bill will be presented here preferably the Senate bill that treats even more fairly than the House bill, without these provisions, those in the armed services.

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT
BERMAN GANOE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a constituent of mine who fought and died in the Vietnam War and is being honored tomorrow in my district, the fifth congressional district of Florida. In 1968, 19-year-old Berman Ganoë enlisted in the U.S. Army and was sent shortly thereafter to Vietnam. On March 24, 1970, Staff Sergeant Ganoë's helicopter was shot down while on a rescue mission in Cambodia. The helicopter that Sergeant Ganoë was aboard was acting as a rescue aircraft for a gunship team engaged in combat on the ground. A fellow army pilot who witnessed the crash of Sergeant Ganoë's aircraft called the rescue mission and the actions of the entire crew "the most heroic act he had ever seen."

Shortly after the crash, Sergeant Ganoë was classified as "missing in action" and became Marion County, Florida's only Vietnam War "missing in action" person. In 1974, the Army changed his status to "assumed dead." In 1998, after an excavation of the crash site, Sergeant Ganoë's remains were returned to the United States but were never positively identified until mid-2001.

He is one of 22 Florida soldiers whose remains were recovered and returned to the United States following the end of the war. When the technology to positively identify years-old remains was developed and perfected, the remains were identified and the families of the fallen soldiers were contacted.

Tomorrow in my district, friends and family of Sergeant Ganoë are memorializing him and honoring his contribution to our country. A bronze memorial of Sergeant Ganoë will be unveiled at a ceremony in Ocala which will follow a private memorial service for his surviving three brothers, four sisters, and numerous friends and extended family members.

Sergeant Ganoë served his country and made the ultimate sacrifice to protect our freedom. Further, he died in a rescue mission to save the lives of fellow soldiers. Posthumously, Sergeant Ganoë was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Bronze Star, 16 Air Medals, the Purple Heart, and numerous other medals of valor.

I commend Sergeant Ganoë for his actions and stand here today to honor his life and his sacrifice. I think it is particularly important that we consider the sacrifices of Sergeant Ganoë and of the people who currently are serving in our military today.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OF THE CONGRESS

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Attending Physician of the Congress of the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Superior Court for the District of Columbia.

After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

Dr. JOHN EISOLD,
Attending Physician.

MAKING THE CASE AGAINST IRAQ

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to cover two points. One will cover recent rulings in the FCC regarding the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and the other is we are going to talk about our foreign policy with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, in 1996 the Telecommunications Act was heralded as a grand attempt to move the telecom markets toward competition. I was a conferee on that bill. It was a great compromise between the House and the Senate. That bill was greatly heralded by many people, but 7 years later the Act's intent has been overrun by the FCC's recent decision that has effectively blocked competition and created disincentives for investment by maintaining the UNE-P status quo.

□ 1415

It is not only the intent of the act that is being circumvented. More tangibly, the already-fragile telecom industry has suffered another financial setback. In response to the FCC's decision, many of Wall Street's analysts have made their voices heard on the negative effects that the decision will have on the economy, including Morgan Stanley, Goldman Sachs, Lehman Brothers and others.

An analogy of the FCC's decision would be to allow McDonald's, or Burger King, a competitor, to come into their restaurants and use their entire facilities. You bring your meat, you fry it up, you bring your own drinks, you use it all, you use their advertising, you use their building, you use their drive-up window, you use their cash registers, and you are in competition with the McDonald's or Burger King franchise?

No one in America would ever allow a competitor to do such a thing. But

that is what is happening in the telecommunications industry. What incentive is there at all to allow investment, if that in fact is what is going to occur?

As a matter of public policy, the FCC's decision simply makes no sense. On one hand, the commission deregulates broadband, and on the other hand it complicates and multiplies regulation on UNE-P.

Last year, this body passed the Tauzin-Dingell broadband legislation, 273 to 157. I think we could argue that the will of the Congress had an impact on how the FCC views broadband. Do we now pass another bill to show the FCC that further regulation on UNE-P offers no help to the Nation's economy? Mr. Speaker, if that is what it takes, then I say, let us do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has joined us here for this Special Order on behalf of the Republican leadership.

There were some what I call the voices of dissent that came to the floor, the voice of dissent with regard to war. I call it the sounds of freedom. One was asking, please give peace a chance. The other one was saying I am concerned about the long-term damage to our alliances if we do not follow what Germany, Russia, China, and France are asking for. The other says we just need to continue our diplomacy and we should follow the lead of the French. That was the voice of dissent that came here to the floor today.

I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), to those voices out there that say give peace a chance, it is easy to say that when you sit in freedom, and peace is truly the consequence of freedom. America represents freedom, and we export hope and opportunity; and Iraq and some of the sub-national terrorist organizations that represent tyranny, they export fear and terror.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, I agree with the gentleman that the folks who express their dissent and have been expressing their dissent in government, basically giving the other side of the debate, are providing a public service by doing that. But I think there are a few observations that are important here.

There have been people demonstrating worldwide in large numbers, hundreds of thousands of people, against the prospect of war with Iraq. I do not think any of those people demonstrated when the Kurdish babies were laid low by the gas attacks with poison gas that Saddam Hussein spread over their villages.

I do not think any of those folks demonstrated when he gassed Iranians by the tens of thousands, or when he executed his own people, cut off their ears and did the myriad of reprehensible acts that have now been ascribed to him, both in closed-door sessions by

our intelligence officers and in open sessions by various human rights agencies.

So I think it is always important to set the record straight, or to come into these debates with a full understanding of where they come from. And I think one of the most honest talk shows that was ever devised for television was "Crossfire," where the conservative would say "from the right," and the liberal would say "from the left."

But it is obvious that the people who are demonstrating by the hundreds of thousands, some of them well-meaning people, also include lots of people who are not necessarily demonstrating because they have a great love of mankind, or that they are special peace people or have a special care about humanity, because, if they did, they would have been demonstrating when Saddam Hussein gassed those Kurdish babies by the hundreds. They were not demonstrating there, so that did not bother them.

It did not bother them because it was not destabilizing. I think a lot of folks do not like the idea that war in itself is something unsure, it is destabilizing, that it potentially affects the cost of gasoline in your automobile, it potentially affects your community, it may affect relatives who may have to go off to war. So it is something that brings about a feeling of unsettlement.

But let us answer that question the gentleman brought up, why are we entering into this confrontation, it appears? I think one question that could be well thrown back is this: in 1991, when we had not only lots of folks in this country and around the world against us taking action against Iraq when they invaded Kuwait, we not only had lots of folks on the streets around the world, but we also had a majority of the Democrat leadership. I do not fault that Democrat leadership for having taken their position, which they have a political right to do, and taking that side of the debate. But we found afterwards, to answer those people who said give peace some time, give it a chance, give us another 10 months, 18 months, whatever, we found out that according to United Nations estimates, Saddam Hussein at the time that we defeated him in battle was 6 months away from having a nuclear weapon.

So certainly those well-meaning folks who thought that time was on our side discovered afterward, and to the surprise of everyone, conservatives, liberals, Democrats, Republicans, none of us knew how close he was to having that system. So time is not always on our side.

It is my estimate, after having conducted some closed hearings and some open hearings, eight hearings in total, it is my judgment that this country is going to have a nuclear device in about 3 years, and, along with that capability, possessing that capability, because we have allies who have nuclear devices, Britain has nuclear devices and we are not worried about them,

that country has with its present leadership, I think, the intent to use that capability against Americans, either in theater or in the American homeland.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up capability plus intent, you have a national interest; and our national interest now is to take that away from him before he has the full capability. So I think that reasonable people can differ on this subject. But the lesson of Desert Storm I was that time is not always on our side.

Mr. BUYER. Reclaiming my time, beginning with the threat, I think is probably the right place for us to start this discussion here today.

A report released on September 9, 2002, from the International Institute for Strategic Studies, an independent research organization, concludes that Saddam Hussein at that time, actually Saddam Hussein could build a nuclear bomb within months if he were able to obtain the fissile material. Iraq has stepped up its quest for nuclear weapons and has embarked on a worldwide hunt for materials to make an atomic bomb. We all know about the aluminum tubes, the dual-use material and technologies that he has been trying to obtain.

So the gentleman's comments with regard to time, it is true; and I do not know why some people are unwilling to acknowledge this individual's ambitions. Saddam Hussein has repeatedly met with his nuclear scientists over the past few years, signaling his continued interest in developing a nuclear weapons program.

With regard to chemical munitions, Iraq admits but UNSCOM cannot confirm the destruction of 6,500 chemical-weapon bombs filled with 1,000 tons of agent, over 3,000 tons of chemical warfare agents, 614 tons of precursor chemicals used to make the most toxic nerve agent, VX, 550 artillery munitions, 155 millimeter, filled with mustard and chemical warfare agent, and 31,658 empty and filled chemical weapons munitions.

Iraq continues to rebuild and expand the dual-use infrastructure that could quickly divert from chemical weapons production such as chlorine and phenol plants.

Iraq is seeking also to purchase chemical weapons, agents, precursors, and applicable production equipment and is making an effort, obviously, to hide those facilities while inspections even continue.

With regard to biological weapons, Iraq admits, but the U.N. cannot confirm, the destruction of 8,500 liters of anthrax, 2,160 kilograms of bacterial-growth media, enough to produce 26,000 liters of anthrax, 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin and 5,500 liters of aflatoxin.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield on that point, the facts that the gentleman is putting out are especially important because those are not guesses on our part. In fact, they are not even guesses on the part of the

United Nations or on the part of the arms inspectors. Those come from documents from the Iraqis themselves, from their own declarations and their own documents. So the 6,500 liters of anthrax, for example, which is enough anthrax to kill around 1 million folks, is something that came from their documentation, not ours. That is something that they have not turned over.

The thousands of chemical munitions that the gentleman has gone through, that comes from their documentation, not ours. So this is like the storekeeper who says here is my inventory list, and then later on he wants you to expect that somehow, without any outward manifestation or anything that could be picked up or anything that was shown to the rest of the world, all of those weapons have disappeared.

Let me just say, and this might be the time to comment on this, the easiest bet in show business is that this tiny little handful of so-called inspectors, and there are less inspectors than there are policemen in the average small town in America, the idea they are somehow going to be able to go through this massive state and discover weapons of mass destruction in these vast empty buildings that the inspectors are being shown by the Iraqi bureaucrats, the idea that that is in some way going to happen is an absolute fantasy.

So I predicted early on, before this thing ever started, on the record, that they were not going to find anything of import. These folks have had a long time to bury it. And the Iraqi bureaucrat who actually leads arms inspectors into these places, and 90 percent of them are places where they have been before, time and again, big empty buildings, and lo and behold, there is a weapon of mass destruction that somehow the maid forgot to clean up from the night before, that bureaucrat is going to be considered two things: one, the dumbest bureaucrat in Iraqi history, and, secondly, shortly thereafter, the dearest bureaucrat in Iraqi history.

So this is a state that has had an entire agency devoted to hiding things very effectively, and the idea that this little bitty corporal's guard of so-called inspectors is somehow going to find them, is like saying that this massive police force in Washington, DC., and the police force in D.C. is 10 times as big as the inspectors for all of Iraq, it is like saying that the drug lords of Washington, DC. are expected to pile all of their cocaine at an intersection on Pennsylvania Avenue at a given time. When they do not pile it up, and the Washington Post thereby concludes that there is not any cocaine in Washington, DC., you will have the equivalency to what some of the media is doing today with these reports of negative findings with respect to Iraq.

Of course, they are not going to turn over this stuff that they have spent millions of dollars hiding to this little bitty force which does not have the ability to go in and which is having ab-

solutely no success in terms of finding it.

Remember this great idea where we were going to isolate or bring out for interrogation these people in the Iraqi technical establishment, the scientists, the engineers who build this stuff? Somehow we were going to get them and the families alone outside of the country, and then they were going to tell us things, just like the ones that have come out have told us.

Now, that has not happened; and not surprisingly, while these people are under the control of Saddam Hussein, while the Iraqi guard stands there and looks them in the eye, they say, I would rather not talk unless I am accompanied by one of Mr. Hussein's officials.

□ 1430

Well, of course they say that. The safety of their lives and the lives of their children depend on them saying that.

This country has to act in the security interests of the United States. I recall, with respect to these other countries that have not come on board, that when Menachem Begin hit the Iraqi nuclear reactor site in Osirak in the 1980s, lots of countries in the world publicly deplored the act, and said this was a terrible intrusion on the Iraqi airspace. They then walked quietly into the security of their own offices and they breathed sighs of relief because that capability had been taken away.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, is this the same nuclear reactor that was built by the French?

Mr. HUNTER. Yes. I think one French engineer was killed that way. There was one engineer working on a Saturday or Sunday at the Iraqi site. As I recall, there was one engineer killed.

My point is, the world has two faces; one face in which they, too, are deathly afraid of an emerging nuclear capability on the part of Saddam Hussein, and terrified with the present-day chemical and biological weapons capability. They do not want him to hurt them, they want us to protect them. On the other hand, those people, especially the people that Don Rumsfeld describes as those who live in the neighborhood, who have to deal with them, are going to be very reluctant to publicly say that the bully should be taken on, because the bully is going to remember what they said.

Mr. BUYER. I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), since we talked about the present threat, let us spend a little time on what Saddam Hussein has done from 1991 to present.

With regard to his repression of the Iraqi people themselves, there is his refusal to admit human rights monitors; continued torture; the executions and repression of political opposition; disappearances of people in the night;

withholding of food and medicine in the food for peace program; the mass murder of Iraqi Kurds and Iraq Shi'a Muslims. He continues to support international terrorist organizations, which has been well known.

He also has refused to account for Gulf War prisoners. In his failure to account, Saddam Hussein has been unwilling to come forward on 609 cases of missing Gulf War prisoners of war and missing in action representing 14 nationalities, including one American pilot. We also have Saddam Hussein failing to return and account for a large number of Kuwaiti citizens and citizens of other countries who were detained during the Iraqi occupation.

Also, Saddam Hussein has refused to return stolen property from Kuwait, and Saddam Hussein has continued his efforts to circumvent the economic sanctions.

So for those who are saying give peace a chance, let us let the economic sanctions work, are they working, I ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. HUNTER. I think the gentleman has given an excellent representation of what this dictator does, Mr. Speaker, and what he stands for. I think that builds an excellent context in which we can try to evaluate whether or not peace would work, given a chance.

First, he is deceptive. Secondly, I think he believes his future depends on manufacturing weapons of mass destruction. Third, he is willing to take his own people through enormous discomfort and inconvenience and danger in order to achieve his own political ends.

But I would say to the gentleman that there are pieces of Saddam Hussein's activities, although maybe not the composite, but it can be fairly said, and it has been said by lots of people, are there not other dictators in the world who do the same thing, and we are not attacking them?

I would say that that is true. I would say the reason that I think we should move forward, and I think is the major justification for this massive operation, is American security. This guy is the leader who has used ballistic missiles against American troops and killed them with it. He has used poison gas against his own people in recent times. He has exhibited a willingness to kill Americans.

As a result of the background that I have seen and the facts that I have seen, it is my conclusion that if he can achieve the production of a nuclear device, that at some point he will use it on our troops in theater or on Americans. I think it is a wise decision to keep him from being able to do that.

That takes us to, I think, what I think is a very important point for policy debate. It has been a point for policy debate. We now have what I call the Pearl Harbor school emerging from the other side of this debate. Those are the people who say, by golly, we are America. We wait for our Pearl Harbors before we respond. When the enemy in-

flicts a heavy blow on us, that is when we rally; that is when we talk about the day of infamy; and that is when we go out and strike back and overwhelm the enemy, and justice prevails.

The problem with the Pearl Harbor school is that these weapons are so severe today and so dangerous and so destructive that we cannot afford to wait to have a Pearl Harbor occur before we eliminate the source. To some degree, we are carrying that out right now. September 11 killed a lot of Americans; but, arguably, the new tightening of our borders, the new security efforts we have undertaken in the American homeland should prevent some of those things from being able to happen again.

Therefore, it could be argued that there is no reason for us to be in Afghanistan going after people and disrupting terrorist groups; in fact, in some cases taking on people who personally were not involved in the event of 1995.

But what we have discovered is that we do have to do some preemption. I think this question is going to be facing us again and again in this century: Are we going to stand by and watch somebody who has demonstrated an intent to kill Americans develop high technology with which he can kill lots of Americans, and stand by and wait for him to gain that weapon and use it on us before we respond; or are we going to try to eliminate that danger before the Pearl Harbor occurs?

That is a tough thing, because Americans do not like to be the first ones to strike out. When we watch the speech of FDR after Pearl Harbor, there was no dissent in the House Chamber. That was an easy vote, that vote for war. We were all together, we had that common ground, and had that feeling that we were in the right. As Joe Lewis said, we felt that God was on our side.

Now we are faced with these terrible weapons, and we cannot afford to take the blow that will come from those systems. In a way, we are a little bit like little tiny postage stamp Israel that stood there and watched this nuclear reactor being built in Iraq. They had seen the speeches by Saddam Hussein where he made thinly veiled threats to the effect that the final recipient of the output of those nuclear reactor plants would be weapons detonating in Israel. Israel realized they were too small, too flimsy, too frail to take that massive blow, so they went out and destroyed that plant.

Unfortunately, one person was killed. He was an engineer from France who was working there over the weekend. But because of that, they saved thousands of people from being killed.

So whether we embark on this policy of preemption or not is a valid subject for a major policy debate, but I think, in many cases, the answer must be yes; and certainly in this case this person is a person who has already killed Americans with ballistic missiles as well as with conventional capability, and has tried to acquire these other capabilities.

Because of that, I think we see the intent, and when the intent is married up with the ability to do it, we are going to rue the day that we, for convenience' sake and for stability's sake and for safety's sake, we gave up an opportunity to disarm him when we had the opportunity.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, to support the gentleman's position on a preemptive strike, I think it has been clear that Saddam Hussein's efforts to circumvent the economic sanctions has proven itself very successful. Saddam has illegally imported hundreds of billions of dollars in goods, in violation of economic sanctions, and even outside of the U.N.'s oil for food program.

For example, Iraq has imported a fiberoptic communications system that supports the Iraqi military. It has diverted dual use end items obtained under the oil-for-food program for military purposes. For example, Iraq diverted U.N.-approved trucks for humanitarian relief purposes for military purposes, and has used construction equipment to rebuild weapons of mass destruction-affiliated facilities. They came to Iraq under the dual use program.

Saddam Hussein also has about \$3 billion in illegal proceeds that he is able to use with these items. He is contracting with over 75 nations around the world, and he is giving priority contracts to France, Germany, and Russia in return for their support in this very difficult time.

Does the gentleman have any comments he would like to add?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, and I hope my colleague will excuse me, because I have to go try to do something we have both been working on, and that is talk to some folks from our Committee on the Budget and convince them we need more for defense.

But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the gentleman has laid out a very well-documented case for taking action. I notice also that the gentleman is a veteran of the Gulf War. He told me about the apprehension that he and other Americans had when they heard those missiles coming in.

This is a very dangerous situation we are in. I think we have to acknowledge it every time we debate this issue. Is this dangerous? Yes, it is dangerous. The policies of doing nothing are also extremely dangerous. This is not going to be the easy century following the disassembly of the Soviet empire that we once thought it was going to be.

I think we need to have a broad military capability, the ability to make a surgical strike, to fight guerilla warfare, to take on conventional attack and armored attack, and also the ability to stop a missile attack. We live in an age of missiles, and we have to be able to stop that.

In this case, we have to have the ability to preempt and disarm an adversary whose intended goal is to destroy Americans. I know it is a difficult,

tough thing to do, and I would just ask the gentleman to comment on this a little in his remarks after I leave.

I have been impressed with this President, because if he had wavered slightly through this last process of the last 6 months or so, we would be faltering right now. But he understands his role, which is as President of the United States, and his duty to the security of the United States.

That is not a role which is to be subverted by a vote by Cameroon, for example, or some other country whose name Americans have difficulty remembering. It is an American obligation to defend Americans. He is our Commander in Chief. He staged the forces very effectively for this operation. He is willing to account for the success or failure of any military operation. He is a good commander in chief. I think he has done the right things.

I think some of the allies falling by the wayside was entirely predictable, because when good old Americans can carry the load, other countries are often willing to let us do that. That is why, when we bring 90 percent of the funding to a military operation that they ask us to do, like Bosnia, we sometimes choke a little bit but we usually do it; and usually they are willing to stand back and let us bear the brunt of those operations, because it is practical for them for their politics and economy.

But this President has kept his eye on the ball, which is to disarm Saddam Hussein. I think he is moving this mission forward in a very effective manner.

I want to thank the gentleman. I would like him to talk a little bit about Desert Storm. I have to take off, but I would like the gentleman to share with folks about Desert Storm, that the gentleman is a veteran of, and the quality and capability of the folks we have in the Armed Forces.

Mr. BUYER. I thank the gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker.

There have been over 17 resolutions before the United Nations in which Saddam Hussein continues his open defiance.

The first resolution was November 29 of 1990, that said Iraq must comply fully with Resolution 660 regarding the illegal invasion of the country of Kuwait.

The next resolution was number 686, on March 2 of 1991. It says Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War. Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War. Iraq must accept the liability from international law for damages during its illegal invasion of Kuwait. He has not done anything about that.

The next resolution, number 687 on April 3 of 1991, Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removing and rendering harmless under international supervision of chemical and biological weapons, all stocks of agents, and all related subsystems and components of all research develop-

ment, support, and manufacturing facilities. This was in 1991.

Iraq must unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons-usable material, or any research, development, or manufacturing facilities. It continues, recalcitrant.

Iraq must unconditionally accept the destruction, removal and rendering harmless under international supervision all ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers. Now he is destroying missiles; this was back on April 3 of 1991. The list goes on and on under that resolution.

The next resolution out of the U.N. Security Council was number 688 on April 5 of 1991. It condemns the repression of the Iraqi civilian population, the consequences of which threaten international peace and security.

Iraq must immediately end repression of the civilian population, and Iraq must allow immediate access of international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance. It never happened. Those were the words of the U.N. April 5 of 1991.

The next resolution came from the U.N. Security Council, number 707, on August 15 of 1991.

□ 1445

It condemned Iraq's serious violation of resolution 687. It condemned Iraq's noncompliance with the International Atomic Energy Agency and its obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance. August 15 of 1991. Never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council, No. 715, October 11 of 1991, said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors. Never happened.

The next resolution from the U.N. Security Council, No. 949, October 15 of 1994, condemns Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait. Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or U.N. operations in Iraq. Iraq must fully cooperate with U.N. weapons inspectors and Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq. Never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was No. 1051 on March 27, 1996. They said Iraq must report shipments of dual-use end items related to weapons of mass destruction to the U.N. and to the International Atomic Energy Agency. Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and these agency inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution, 1060, on June 12, 1996. It deplores Iraq's refusal to allow access to U.N. inspectors and Iraq's clear violations of previous U.N. resolutions. Iraq must cooperate fully with U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional and unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council was No. 1115 on June 21 of 1997. It condemns repeated refusal of Iraq authorities to allow access to U.N. inspectors which constitutes a clear and flagrant violation of U.N. resolutions 687, 707, 715 and 1061. Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access. Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom the U.N. inspectors want to interview. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was 1134 on October 23, 1997. It condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to all access to the U.N. inspectors which constitutes a flagrant violation, again, of resolutions 687, 707, 715, and 1061. It says Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access.

Boy, this sounds like a broken record.

Iraq must give immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom U.N. inspectors want to interview. It never happened.

The next resolution came from the U.N. Security Council on November 12, 1997. It condemned the continued violations by Iraq of previous U.N. resolutions including the implicit threat of safety of aircraft operated by U.N. inspectors and the tampering of U.N. inspectors' monitoring equipment. It reaffirmed Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of U.N. inspectors, and Iraq must fully comply with U.N. inspections and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access. It never happened.

The next U.N. Security Council resolution was 1154 on March 2, 1998. They said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access and notes that any violation would have the severest of consequences for Iraq. That was in 1998. Do you think Iraq was scared? These words are beginning to get very, very empty if you say them over and over again.

The next resolution was 1194, September 9 of 1998. It condemned the decision by Iraq on the 5th of August 1998 to suspend cooperation with the U.N. and the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors, which constitutes a "totally unacceptable contravention of its obligations under the U.N. resolutions 687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154." And they said Iraq must fully cooperate with the U.N. and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate unconditional, unrestricted access.

The next resolution came on the 5th of November of 1998. It was resolution 1205 of the U.N. Security Council. It condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation with

the U.N. inspectors as a flagrant violation of resolution 687 and other resolutions. And they said Iraq must immediately and completely and unconditionally cooperate with the U.N. and IAEA inspectors. It never happened.

The next resolution by the U.N. Security Council was No. 1284, December 17, 1999. It created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission to replace previous weapons inspection teams. And they said Iraq must allow this new inspection team the immediate unconditional, unrestricted access to Iraqi officials and its facilities. Iraq must fulfill its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners, this is 1999, and calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination. It never happened.

The next resolution then was the one which is presently being discussed, 1441. This resolution was meant to be different from all of these that I just mentioned. Because this resolution was by its very nature words that were negotiated painstakingly to give a final opportunity for Iraq to comply with its disarmament obligations under all these relevant resolutions by the council.

During that same time, Congress decided it would also exercise a voice. In 1998 there was H.R. 4655, a sense of the Congress that U.S. policy is regime change and democracy for Iraq. That was during the Clinton administration, October 5 of 1998.

On December 20 of 2001, House Joint Resolution 75, Congress spoke and said Iraq is in material breach of U.N. resolutions. It passed this House by a vote of 390 to 12.

The next resolution that came from this House was on October 10, 2002, which authorized military force in Iraq and passed this House by a vote of 296 to 132. So we have had a continued decade of deception and defiance that has been noted.

The decade of deception and defiance continues. I went through this long litany. Sure, it may have taken 15 minutes, but it was 10 years of work and labor by the U.N.

The time for the U.N. in its relevancy and materiality of this present is before us. Are the words going to have meaning? The President has come forward and made that point very clear to the United Nations.

My hope is that the U.N. stands firm and gives definition to their meaning. Saddam Hussein has had a long history of complying with inspectors on a very small and technical scale, and then he continues to cheat inspectors on a very large scale. His tactical concessions are designed to buy time and ease pressure on his regime and to split the international community and to hopefully end resolve.

Since 1991 Saddam has presented no fewer than six, six full and final and complete declarations of his illegal bio-

logical weapons programs alone. Each of these has been an outward lie and has failed to account for large stockpiles of prohibited materials.

The United Nations has worked with three countries to give very good examples of cooperative disarmament. Those countries would be South Africa, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. And there are three very basic elements of cooperation. One is a decision must be made at the highest level to disarm. Next would be you have to state your national intentions. And third is you cooperate with international efforts to verify the disarmament behavior and that it is open and it is transparent, not secretive.

Iraq with regard to its highest level, their efforts are concealment. Iraq also tasked its key institutions toward thwarting the inspectors, and instead of transparency, Iraq chooses to conceal and lie. That is very, very different from what we have seen. So the cosmetic compliance that is presently going on is nothing new.

With regards to Dr. Blix, I want to extend my thanks. He has a very difficult job to do. He is trying to make Saddam Hussein comply. Knowing that this track record that we have laid out, knowing the little games he plays, and the cheat and retreat strategy that he has, Dr. Blix has a tremendous job. But Dr. Blix was never meant there to be a detective. He was meant there to work with a country cooperatively in a transparent effort to disarm the country that was meant to comply with all of these resolutions.

So almost what has happened is that the world has placed an unrealistic expectation upon Dr. Blix. We cannot do that and should not do that to him. That is why resolution 1441, it demands nothing less than the full and immediate disarmament by Iraq. So this report that is going to be presented tomorrow is extremely important. I believe that no one can say that Iraq's cooperation has been full and immediate because the regime has submitted a false declaration, it has blocked private interviews. Only 5 of the 30 requested UNMOVIC have even taken place. They have threatened witnesses and their families with death, and they have hidden documents and concealed materials from inspectors.

The "why now" question for me is obvious. For others who perhaps do not know about all these resolutions and what has gone on, it is a good question to ask. The President has come forward with a preemptive doctrine. Some maybe do not understand what a preemptive doctrine is.

What is extremely important is after September 11 is that we have a right of self-defense. We also should be taking our defenses in doubt. What that means is you do not just say we are only going to focus on homeland security. We are going to cower in our defenses and seek the security because we feel insecure. No. You take it to where the threat is. So whether it is in Afghanistan or

whether it is in the Horn of Africa or wherever al Qaeda is trying to hide, you work cooperatively with nations; you take it to the terrorist organizations.

Likewise, with Saddam Hussein, who poses a threat to destabilize the region of the Middle East, the United States as a superpower, some people are uncomfortable with that word, but it is true. The United States is the sole remaining superpower. We have a responsibility to regional stability in the world.

Saddam Hussein has been recalcitrant to the world, and his threats will continue along with his cooperation with these terrorist organizations.

Now, I am a father, like many. My son is 17. I love Ryan. But if I said, Ryan, you know, you have got a curfew and he violated his curfew 17 times and I did nothing, and I see he is getting ready to go out tomorrow night and I said, Ryan, remember your curfew, what do you think he is going to do? He is going to come home whenever he pleases. Why? Because my words are hollow. They mean nothing. I say them, but he will not follow them because they have no meaning or definition, therefore, no consequence for the recalcitrant act. That is Saddam Hussein.

So all these resolutions that I talked about, great words. They are firm. But if the U.N. is not going to give meaning and definition to the words, who will?

□ 1500

Who will stand up and exercise the might to make right? Once again, the United States, we have seen this before. We have been there before. We are going to do it again.

I think about my comrades who find themselves on the desert floor. I remember very much what it was like. One thing I can share and to the mothers and fathers who have their loved ones who are about to be in harm's way is that not only has this Congress taken the appropriate resources to help train and equip these men and women over the last decade, this force is better than the force that I fought with in the Gulf War. I am so proud of them. When I see them, they give me chills. They represent the very best of America.

I will never forget the scene in the Indianapolis airport of a young sailor who was getting ready to be shipped off, and he has his sisters with him, his very young brother, his parents are standing there and his grandparents are also standing there, and he is standing there in a sailor's uniform. His youngest brother is holding the sailor's cap as if it were a crown, and it is a scene unlike many scenes all across the country.

Now this Congress has done its duty. It has been vigilant to make sure that this force is prepared. It will be highly lethal, it will be highly mobile, and it has very precise munitions.

With regard to the enemy for which they are about to face, I remember the

Iraqi people themselves, to include the conscripts. I interrogated many of them during the Gulf War. They do not like Saddam Hussein. Iraq is a very wealthy country, and Saddam only takes the wealth of that country to the benefit of a very few as he suppresses other tribes within Iraq. They do not like Saddam Hussein.

One of the individuals I was interrogating had, under his blouse, I saw this red and blue sort of semicircle. I could not understand exactly what it was. I asked him to undo his blouse and it was a Chicago Cubs T-shirt. He had relatives that lived in Michigan, and they were fans of the Cubs, and so he tried to track the Chicago Cubs.

One other story. In order to help bring calm and peace at the Western antiwar camp, we gave the Iraqi prisoners, over 46,000 of them, what they wanted to hear. They wanted to listen to Madonna. So we piped in Madonna music. They are more Western than one can imagine, and they do like America, and they do not like Saddam Hussein.

With regard to the leadership, I came out of the interrogation tent. My interpreter at the time was former King Fahd's grandson, Bandar, and as I come out of this tent, there is an Iraqi general officer sitting on the desert floor. He is sitting there with his legs crossed. His elbows are on his knees. His hands are in his face, and he is weeping like a child so hard that his shoulders are actually shaking. I stood there and I looked at this and behind are his army. I walked up to the gentleman, and I kicked the sole of his boot. I then ordered him to stand at attention.

Through the interpreter he tells the general man to stand up. I got really close to him, looked at him, asked if he was a general officer. He asked him and acknowledged and shook his head and said yes, and I told him then act like one. Now think about this scene. I am a United States Army captain, telling an Iraqi general officer how to act. Why? Why would a United States Army captain have to do such a thing? Because he was not a general officer because of his strategic mind and his tactics. He was a general officer because of his loyalties and relationships to Saddam Hussein.

So, with regard to "the enemy" in which we are about to face, they are not led by great military minds. So it would be no wonder why the conscripts and others will fold quickly. I also believe that he was weeping, not for his men which stood behind him, he was weeping for himself because he knew that upon repatriation, Saddam Hussein would probably execute him. That is the repression of Saddam Hussein.

The Kurds and the Shi-ites have been waiting a long time for this day. I know that in my own sense and feeling of having gone through what no differently that my ancestors have gone through for freedom and liberty in this country, I know about the con-

sequences of war. I know about the long dark shadows of horror. I know about things that are unimaginable and things one does not speak of and things that we see we just cannot believe. War is inhumane toward mankind and I cannot believe in this day and age, for all of our sophistication and technological advances, that man still yet has not found a way to resolve our differences.

The bottom line is this is not up to us. This is now up to Saddam Hussein. I still hold out the hope that there is a country out there that is willing to take him in and that we can actually move in peacefully and change the regime. That is my desire, that is my hope. It is my prayer and I know that the soldiers that are standing there feel the same way. They pray for peace, even though they are prepared for war because they are the ones that gave an oath to give their life to defend the Constitution and our very liberties and freedom.

So let me end where we started, with the voice of dissent. I acknowledge the voice of dissent as constructive to the discussion. I find what is not constructive are those in an antiwar message that would also be "un-American." Do not go out and burn the flag. Do not say and be obnoxious and do something stupid. If a person has got something that is constructive that can bring peace and tranquillity to this world, step forward and say it, but they can do so in a manner without being un-American or being disrespectful of individuals of whom have lost loved ones, or even have someone who finds themselves in harm's way in the very next few days.

I think what we should do is go find something and send it to a soldier that is in the desert. Pick it out, support the troops that are over there. Believe me, it is a very lonely place, the Saudi Arabia and Iraqi and Kuwaiti desert. Just to glance upon the American flag is something that will give a chill because it is the only thing out there that that can strike a memory of home and of loved ones.

I know that the decision that President Bush has in front of him is one that he understands the burden of the decision because he also understands the opportunity that the peace will bring, not only to the regional stability, but the opportunities and new alliances and greater heights for freedom.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ (during the Special Order of Mr. BUYER). Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 130) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 130

Resolved, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT: Mrs. Jones of Ohio, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Doyle.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR WITH IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in the conduct of foreign affairs, every President deserves the benefit of the doubt.

I am standing here today in an empty Chamber because these special orders are simply the time in the House's schedule when after legislative business is concluded Members can gather or take the time to get something off their chest, and so I am here today to get something off my chest about the coming war with Iraq.

As I said, in the conduct of foreign affairs, I think every President deserves the benefit of the doubt, and on a number of occasions, I have worked with Presidents, regardless of party, on foreign policy issues. Sometimes I have honestly differed.

Iraq, in my view, is a close call. There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein is a pathological thug. We have lived with and contained other sociopaths before. Example, Joseph Stalin, whose 50-year anniversary of his death we just celebrated yesterday. It is hard to believe he has been gone 50 years, but we did not attack the Soviet Union, even though Stalin was probably one of the two greatest sociopaths of all time, the other being Hitler.

We have also seen groups like the Khmer Rouge systematically butcher their own people, and certainly, the administration has not, in any way, demonstrated or tried to demonstrate that Saddam had anything to do with the attack of September 11.

But it may very well be that we need to remove him at some point, and that point may be soon. My purpose today is not to talk about that. My purpose is to talk about what condition America will be in both at home and abroad if we take on that task, because if we do it, we have an obligation to go after Saddam in a way that does not weaken our ability to lead the world in dealing with future challenges that will certainly confront us.

My concern is that this administration has demonstrated such shortsighted arrogance that they have made it more difficult for the United States to retain its leadership ability and to see that the U.S. has the support it needs in this coming endeavor.

Now, it is obvious that President Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. Wolfowitz and a number of others in the administration have intended to attack Saddam since the moment they took office, but if that is so, you would think that the administration would have done anything that they could do in order to build allies for the coming effort, both at home and abroad. Instead, the administration has dealt with Congress and with the international community in a my way or else approach.

At home, after September 11, the Congress in total bipartisanship fashioned an initial \$40 billion package to deal with the immediate response needs of the administration, but then when Members of the House and Senate attempted to talk to the administration about the need to do more to build up our homeland security efforts in our ports, on our borders, in our local communities. We were told, in essence, if you allocate or if you appropriate one dime more than I have asked for, I will veto it.

Again, in June, when Congress tried again to beef up our ability to protect communities and ports and other vulnerable areas from terrorist attack, the President vetoed more than a billion-and-a-half dollars in homeland security money that this House and the other body voted to provide by 90 percent margins of both political parties in both Chambers.

Now, that action by the White House, in vetoing those funds, raised doubts in Congress. Were we really willing to do everything necessary to baton down the hatches at home, to guard against retaliatory action if we are going to take on Saddam? The answer from the White House, given by its action on the veto of home security funds, was only partly.

Internationally, the signals were just as confusing. Now, I know the French do not need many excuses to go their own way in foreign affairs. They have demonstrated that from the time of Charles de Gaulle.

But look at the administration's conduct the last 2 years on four fronts. First, in the past 2 years, the administration has unilaterally announced its intention to, or its desire to blow up three international treaties: the nuclear test ban treaty, the antiballistic missile treaty, and the global warming treaty. Then after those actions, the administration professes surprise when the French and the Germans feel free to engage in a little unilateralism of their own. By example, it seems to me that, by example, the administration made it easy for France and Germany and others to go their own way because that is what we announced our free

right and intention to do on those other treaties.

□ 1515

Second, the administration added to the unraveling of NATO and the weakening of the Security Council resolve by announcing twin doctrines of American unilateralism and preemption. Now, obviously, the United States and any other sovereign nation has the right to undertake a unilateral or preemptive act to defend its own people. Obviously. But to announce it and to trumpet it to the world as a new intellectual doctrine scared the bejabbers out of many countries and gave other countries an excuse to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to Teddy Roosevelt's advice, "Speak softly and carry a big stick"? And it did not help that the administration's chest-beating on preemption came at the same time that our own officials were worried pea green about a preemptive military action that might be taken by either India or Pakistan during their escalated confrontation.

Third. The administration even let it be known that nuclear weapons were a possibility in Iraq under certain circumstances. That also added to the world's jitters. The net result of the administration's overblown rhetoric resulted in pro-American responses in public opinion polls in Europe declining by almost 20 percent. And all of that made it easier for the French and the German governments to question the Bush administration and its policy on Iraq. I think it would have been much harder for them to do so if the administration had not spent the last 2 years telling the rest of the world we were going to do everything our way or suffer the consequences.

And even if we, in the end, obtain the acquiescence of countries like Germany and France to proceed on Iraq, our past rhetoric will make it more difficult for the U.S. to have their support in the years ahead when we will be neck deep in a post-war Iraqi-American regency of dubious wisdom. So, in my view, in short, the administration, by its rhetoric, has written a textbook on how not to rally support on a controversial question.

Fourth. As a result of the unilateralist rhetoric, the administration has also raised the cost of this endeavor to U.S. taxpayers. President Bush's father was able to work the world by telephone, sort of in a dialing-for-dollars operation, in which he was able to convince other countries to pay their share for the cost of attacking Iraq in 1991. This President has brought a new wrinkle to diplomacy. He has offered to pay other countries for their share of the cost associated with this war. That really is an interesting wrinkle. Meanwhile, the administration has steadily hidden the potential range of costs and the duration of our occupation of Iraq from the American people.

Now, I have no doubt that we are going to war; and when we do, I, like every other Member of this body, will rally around the troops in the field, because they are doing their duty under the Commander in Chief and we have no choice and no desire to do anything but to support them. I know my daughter-in-law's brother is one of those patchy helicopter pilots who will be stuck with heavy duty over there. But, please, Mr. Speaker, spare us the rhetoric about how this operation is going to transform Iraq into a beacon of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard such overblown rhetoric about how this action will unleash the forces of sweetness and democracy in Iraq, but I fully expect that the next thing we are going to hear is that we ought to replace New Hampshire with Iraq on the Presidential primary cycle.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the die is cast, and I am not going to continue to chew the same old argument. This House has already voted. But before this operation moves ahead, I want to express my dismay at the shortsighted and thoughtless manner in which the administration, through its careless and arrogant unilateralist rhetoric, has mishandled relations with the same NATO allies that we will need in the Security Council. And I would ask some of the same questions I asked on this floor before we went to war against Iraq in 1991. And I would say parenthetically that I was privileged to chair that debate for a considerable period of the time in which it occurred back then. But I want to ask some of the same questions I asked then.

Now, the administration clearly expects this war to go swiftly, and they expect it to go well. And they are probably right. I think they are, and I hope that they are. But my concern is what about afterwards. Do we really believe that we will not create thousands of new recruits for al Qaeda and other terrorist organizations in the Arab world? Do we really intend to continue the policy of benign neglect and drift that has characterized our policy toward the moribund peace process between the Israelis and the Palestinians? How long will U.S. military presence be in the Middle East after the war is over, and how do we intend to handle that presence that we do not become a hated occupying power in a radicalized region of the world?

And I would ask this: While we are focusing on Iraq, is the administration, by default, going to acquiesce in North Korea's becoming a permanent member of the nuclear club? It appears from what we see in the papers that that is very likely on the part of the administration.

And then I would ask, bringing the issue closer to home, what are we going to do to protect our own economy from the cost of both this war and its 10-year aftermath? So far the administration's answer is we are going to go to war and so we need to cut your taxes.

Can you imagine President Teddy Roosevelt or President Woodrow Wilson or FDR or Harry Truman saying we are going to go to war and your country needs you to accept a tax cut? Should we really be saying, we are going to go to war and so you should have a tax cut and your kids should pay the bill, not just for the war but for the 10 years afterwards? We are already being asked to borrow money to pay for this war, and the scuttlebutt is that the minute the war begins we are going to get a bill from the administration, a request for about \$100 billion. And Lord knows what it is going to cost in the next 10 years.

And my simple and last question would be: Should we, at the same time that we are borrowing money to pay for this war, should we also be borrowing money to take millionaires off the tax role, as the White House tax and budget request in fact is asking us to do? I would hope that the political leadership of this country would be more mature than that and more fair than that. I cannot believe that we are going to put this war on the cuff; that we are then going to proceed with tax action that will take another more than \$1 trillion out of the Federal Treasury in the next few years and then go to the American people with a straight face and say we have strengthened the economy for the long term.

I think Americans expect to do their duty in a time of crisis, and I think Americans do not expect that while we are having several hundred thousand troops abroad prepare to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of what the President has concluded is in our national interest, I do not believe that at a time when those soldiers are doing that, that the best we can do back home is to say to everyone on the home front, folks, you are going to have to sacrifice by taking a tax cut, even though it is going to load billions and billions of dollars of debt on future taxpayers, including the kids that we say this war is being fought to help protect.

So, Mr. Speaker, this country is going to war. It is obvious. But I would hope that the next time that we do so we have not ahead of time, as the administration has done, that we have not ahead of time looked for ways to antagonize the very allies that we are going to need in this case, like we need support in the Security Council today if we are to have unity in the world when we take on Saddam. I hope we learn from this experience that if you intend to ask the support of the world in a military endeavor of this nature that you do not spend the first 2 years saying, by the way, everything we are going to do in the world, we are going to do it our way or no way. I do not think that is an intelligent or a thoughtful way to run foreign policy. And I certainly do not think that adding over \$1 trillion to our budget deficit and our national debt over the next few years is a way to run the economy

at a time when we are contemplating going to war.

□ 1530

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the wake of so many thoughtful remarks made in this Chamber as perhaps this Congress is about to adjourn a weekend before America may again be called upon to lead the civilized world and the arsenal of democracy into battle.

We have heard from my colleagues this afternoon, many of the strategic and military and diplomatic justifications for that. They are legion. The violations of U.N. Resolution 1441 are painfully and patently obvious. The rejection by the regime of Saddam Hussein over the last 2 decades through five Presidential administrations and 17 U.N. resolutions, of one international convention after another, argue for the civilized world, for the forces of order, to rise up against the forces of disorder, as the columnist Thomas Friedman, from the New York Times, is want to say.

I rise today after having received a very thoughtful e-mail from a constituent named David in Richmond, Indiana. David is opposed to the war strongly, and he wrote to me after urging my staff to make sure that I saw the letter, not knowing that I see all my mail, but he urged me to look at a Web site, and so I did. It was not just a Web site opposed to the war, but it was mostly a Web site, takebackthemedias.com, or some such thing, that showed very moving photographs of families in Baghdad.

Mr. Speaker, I brought a few of those photographs with me today, like this photograph of a beautiful baby boy curled up on a rug with his official travel papers of his family before him to prove his location. He looks an often lot like one of my three small children. David had me look at these pictures of families, like this beautiful young family with a boy about the age of my 11-year-old son, families on the streets of Baghdad. The argument was if as a Member of Congress, I were to look into the faces of those who may by virtue of living in Baghdad fall into harm's way, I might change my mind about the use of force.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell Members, as I told David in a phone call, when I look into these bright shining faces of families who live in Baghdad, in the region of what used to be Mesopotamia, this picture taken January 5, 2003, I am not moved away from taking action to remove this regime, I am moved closer toward it. As I said to David in a phone call late yesterday, when I look into these faces, I see an argument for re-

moving Saddam Hussein because I cannot imagine, particularly for the four young women depicted in this photograph, what it is like to live in Iraq during these last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise today. It is in the hope of talking about the human rights record of this regime that I come to the floor today. We recall a great deal of focus in the 1990s on the human rights record of Slobodan Milosevic, and the world community coming together, including France and Germany, calling on the United States of America to challenge and to remove Slobodan Milosevic for one reason: Because of his record of abuse of human rights, his wanton killing of Muslims strictly out of a policy horrifically known as ethnic cleansing. President Clinton did nobly lead America into the breach with France and Germany under the color and authority of NATO and remove that barbarous dictator.

There were no U.N. resolution. There was no previous example of them attacking their neighbors or discussion of weapons of mass destruction, there was just a dictator who abused and tortured and killed his own countrymen for ethnic reasons.

So I am a bit confused when the human rights record of Saddam Hussein seems to be irrelevant to many who oppose the war. It is a record against which the record of Slobodan Milosevic pales in comparison. The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has actually said that Saddam Hussein's record on human rights is second only to that of Adolph Hitler in the 20th century, and I want to speak on some facts, things that we know about Saddam Hussein and his regime. It is about these beautiful young girls that I hope Members' hearts will attach, to think of a regime in which these young girls are forced to live is my purpose today.

First, from the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, a 1997 report, the Commission on Human Rights, reaffirming that all member states have an obligation to promote and protect human rights elaborates the following actions by Iraq that it strongly condemns:

One, the massive and extremely grave violations of human rights and international humanitarian law by the Government of Iraq, resulting in an all-pervasive, repression and oppression sustained by broad-based discrimination, and this is the U.N.'s terms, against his own people, widespread terror.

Two, suppression of freedom of thought, expression, religion, information, association, assembly and movement through fear of arrest, imprisonment and other sanctions.

Summary and arbitrary executions were also condemned by the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in 1997, including political killings, enforced or involuntary disappearances by the thousands. Without regard to due process, political opponents of Saddam Hussein, according to the U.N. Human

Rights Commission, have disappeared into the mist. Arbitrary arrest, detention consisting of a routine failure to respect due process of law, and again thinking of these families, Mr. Speaker, I quote, "widespread systemic torture in its most cruel forms. The enactment and implementation of decrees prescribing cruel and inhuman punishment, namely mutilation for punishment of offenses and diversion of medical care services for such mutilations."

Mr. Speaker, this is a barbarous regime, and I begin by quoting from the United Nations because we hear so much about how we ought to rely on the United Nations and I begin there, but the facts simply continue to flow. Think about that for a moment, Mr. Speaker. Widespread terror against his own people, the suppression of human rights, suppression of freedom of thought, expression, religion, information, association, assembly and movement through fear of arrest, imprisonment and other sanctions, summary and arbitrary executions and political killings, widespread and systematic torture in its most cruel forms. That is from the Commission on Human Rights United Nations High Commissioner, April 16, 1997.

Mr. Speaker, citing from the report published by Great Britain, let us talk about what we know from organizations like Amnesty International and others, let us talk about the torture that is sanctioned by the government of Saddam Hussein and in which he has been personally involved on many occasions.

From the British report, we find that the victims of torture and their families have reported the following methods of torture to international human rights like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, eye gouging.

Amnesty International reported the case of a Kurdish businessman in Baghdad who was executed in 1997. When his family retrieved his body, the eyes had been gouged out and the empty eye sockets stuffed with paper.

Piercing of hands with an electric drill. A common method of torture for political detainees, Amnesty International reported one victim who then had acid poured into his open wounds during interrogation in Iraq.

Suspension from the ceiling. Victims are blindfolded, stripped and suspended for hours by their wrists, often with their hands tied behind their backs. This causes dislocation of shoulders, tearing of muscles and ligaments. Iraq is also known to use electric shock. A common torture method, shocks are applied to various parts of the body including ears, tongue, fingers and genitalia.

Sexual abuse. Victims, particularly women, have been raped and sexually abused as a means of interrogation on a routine basis by this regime.

Mock executions. Victims are told to be executed by firing squad. A mock execution is staged. Victims are hood-

ed, brought before a firing squad, and then blanks are fired as a form of torture.

David Scheffer, U.S. Ambassador at Large for War Crimes, reported that photographic evidence showed that Iraq had used acid baths during the invasion of Kuwait. Victims were hung by their wrists and gradually lowered into acid.

These are unspeakable acts of barbarism, Mr. Speaker. I am a bit loathe in this, what is a public forum by definition, to speak these words after school is out, but I think it is important as we think through the strategic issues, as we think through the diplomatic issues, international convention, disarmament, international terrorism, that we also think of this. These are the facts that I must assume that the sincere activists, perhaps at this very hour, are engaged in some demonstration here in America, or perhaps even on the streets of Baghdad, these are the facts that these people must not know. How could any decent human being, knowing the official barbarism of the regime of Saddam Hussein, ever deign to defend it.

Let us talk for a moment about the cost to fellow Muslims. There are many who want to divide the world along religious lines between the West and the Islamic world, suggesting that we in the West are not challenging an outlaw regime in Baghdad that has attacked 3 of its 5 adjacent neighbors during its regime and used chemical weapons on its own people, but rather that we are somehow engaged in a war against an "ism," against a religion.

Here is the truth, again citing the recent British report published this fall. The truth of it is that Muslims have had no greater enemy in contemporary history than Saddam Hussein. I believe it is accurate to say that Saddam Hussein has killed more Muslims than any government leader in the past 50 years, including Slobodan Milosevic who sought, through a policy of ethnic cleansing, to destroy the Muslim population in the form of Yugoslavia.

□ 1545

The Iran-Iraq war, which ranged from 1980 to 1988, resulted in 1 million Muslim casualties dead and wounded. Iranian casualties in that war, Mr. Speaker, were estimated at between 450,000 and 730,000. Iraqi casualties were between 150,000 and 340,000. Really not since our Civil War have we ever as a nation experienced casualties the likes of which occurred in a barbaric and ruthless war between these two nations for 8 years.

During the 1988 Anfal campaign in Iraqi Kurdistan, Iraqi troops were responsible for the death or disappearance of up to 100,000 Muslim Kurds. Also according to Great Britain on March 16, 1988, Iraqi troops killed up to 5,000 and injured some 10,000 Muslim Kurds in a single day in a chemical weapon attack on the town of Halabja in northern Iraq.

The 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait led to the death of 1,000 Kuwaiti Muslim nationals. 605 prisoners of war remain completely unaccounted for since 1991, including nationals of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, India, Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Egypt, Bahrain and Oman. Between 3 million and 4 million Muslim Iraqis have abandoned their homes and sought refuge outside of Iraq. Many hundreds of thousands of Iraq's Muslims have been displaced internally. Estimates of 900,000 according to the United Kingdom's report may be conservative.

In the north, towns and villages were systematically destroyed by the regime during the war with Iran. Further south, non-Arabs in the region of Kirkuk have been relocated to other parts of Iraq and Arabs induced to occupy their homes and lands. And in the south, between 300,000 and 500,000 Muslim citizens have been forced from their traditional homes in Iraq's marshlands. Thousands of Muslims have been arbitrarily arrested, ill treated, tortured, and executed in Iraq in recent years.

This is according to the International Alliance for Justice News Service, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch Country Report, and the U.S. Committee for Refugees Report, and I will cite each of the following. The regime of Saddam Hussein has reaped an extraordinary and barbarous toll on Muslims in the region over its 20-some-odd-year history. This is also a regime that has used chemical weapons according to the Human Rights Watch's "Genocide in Iraq" report.

Mr. Speaker, I will say for a moment that while I have great respect for Amnesty International and great respect for Human Rights Watch and as a member of the Committee on International Relations I greatly cherish any organization that makes its business to attend to the human rights of people around the world, I must concede standing on this particular side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, not to have a great deal culturally in common with most of the people that are drawn to the work of these organizations. I have a passion for human rights. I am on the Subcommittee on the Middle East for precisely that reason. I am interested in advancing the human rights of people all across the world in whatever brief time that I have in this institution. But I know that most people who think about these things and donate to these organizations have a little bit of a different political view from mine and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, a different political view of the war from mine.

And so I am hoping that somehow through this process, we can reach some of those who object to this war, who express fealty and appreciation for Human Rights Watch and for Amnesty International and for all the plethora of groups out there that largely draw their support from the left, who have

nonetheless chronicled as a great service to mankind the barbarism of this regime.

According to the Human Rights Watch "Genocide in Iraq" report, which carried extensive research into chemical weapons attacks in northern Iraq, based on field interviews, they have determined that at least 60 villages as well as the town of Halabja were attacked with mustard gas, nerve gas or a combination of the two during the Anfal campaign against the Kurds between 1987 and 1988.

Human Rights Watch says that the Iraqi regime has used chemical weapons for at least four complementary purposes: number one, to attack base camps and main-force concentrations of Kurdish guerillas; two, to harass and kill retreating guerillas; three, to inflict, I make emphasis here, Mr. Speaker, that we are not simply talking about Iraq deploying chemical weapons in a military environment, which according to international convention and expectation is barbarism but also, according to Human Rights Watch, they have deployed chemical weapons to inflict exemplary collective punishment on civilians for simply supporting the Kurdish guerillas. The most dramatic case is the chemical bombing of Halabja after the seizure of the town by guerillas and Iranian revolutionary guards. And lastly, they have used it simply to spread terror among civilian populations as a whole, flushing villagers out of their homes to facilitate their capture, relocation, and killing.

The list of chemical attacks by Iraq against its own citizens, and not just in a military context, is astonishing and horrifying. And the list goes on, Mr. Speaker, of evidence upon evidence of a regime that has lost any connection to the civilized world.

But I want to go back to these pictures, if I can; and I have not yet shown all of them. These are some great-looking kids. This photograph that I got off the aforementioned Web site was apparently taken on December 19, 2002, in Baghdad, and those are some beautiful little girls. I have got two little girls of my own. They are 9 and 8 years old, Mr. Speaker. I think that I would do anything to deliver my little girls from living in the kind of society and under the kind of regime that I am here to describe and that organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have identified and associated with the regime under the leadership of Saddam Hussein.

Let me share with you some testimony which was presented before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on the human rights situation in northern Iraq, the Kurdish minority. This is the testimony of Bayanne Surdashi, a Kurdish humanitarian aid worker now in asylum in the United States of America. After pleasantries, Bayanne told the following story. This is a Kurdish Iraqi and her personal story:

"I was 12 years old when I experienced firsthand the suffering of my

people. One evening in the spring of 1987, one of my aunts and her whole family showed up on our doorstep in Sulaymaniyah unexpectedly. We learned that their village, Askar, was one of several that were attacked by Iraqi helicopters using chemical gas and then turned into rubble by bulldozers. My aunt's family had managed to avoid the military and find their way to our home. They spent 11 months hiding with us.

"Later the Iraqi regime relocated them to newly built government settlements where they could be closely watched by the military. They were not allowed to return to their farms and were turned from hard-working independent people into people dependent on the government for their very simplest needs. Over time my family discovered that at least 40 of our relatives living in the villages had been killed during this genocidal campaign known as the government's Anfal policy. Only those relatives who managed to escape or hide survived the horror of Anfal which killed more than 150,000 Kurds.

"Three years later after our failed uprising against Saddam Hussein in 1991, the Iraqi army used every possible form of brutality as they moved into northern Iraq, destroying everyone and everything before them. In the middle of a cold, rainy winter, we were awakened by the sound of bombs. It was clear that Saddam's army was very close. My parents feared that Saddam would again use chemical gas like he did during the genocidal campaign, so, like hundreds of thousands of other frightened Kurds, we fled. We said good-bye to our home, and we joined a flood of other refugees crowding the streets on our way out of the city and out of Iraq in search of sanctuary. We walked on foot for 10 days through the mountains before we reached Iran and safety, poorly clothed from harsh weather and without enough food or water. We were surrounded by the sound of misery and distress and witnessed families burying their dead along the road and weeping mothers unable to let go of their dead infants. Due to shock, one of my brothers suffered terrible seizures a few times a day.

"When we finally returned home," Bayanne would conclude before this congressional committee, "we learned that some of our relatives did not survive the exodus. My mother's aunt had been in the hospital when we left but died along with hundreds of other patients abandoned by the staff who were forced to flee the city as well. My uncle was found frozen to death in the mountains. On the radio we heard more than a thousand Kurds died every day during the exodus."

That was the testimony of a 12-year-old little girl who because of the courage of her family made it out. This could be a picture of her, Bayanne Surdashi. She is now a Kurdish humanitarian aid worker. She escaped. Hun-

dreds of thousands did not. But when I think of my children that same age and I think of that horror through which she passed, my blood runs cold. And I am amazed that others' does not. I am amazed, Mr. Speaker. I really am. And I just must assume that those who oppose the use of force in Iraq do not know this. Because I believed when I voted to authorize the use of force, Mr. Speaker, I believed it was right under international conventions going from the U.N. resolution 687 that was the cease-fire in 1991 and that it was appropriate for us to make clear to Iraq that they must disarm, they must disclose, they must destroy their weapons and cease any liaisons with terrorist organizations. I supported giving the President that authority. I have supported the administration unflaggingly in its attempt to develop international support for this war and believe those arguments are enough.

But there is this, which when taken in its totality, 20 years of barbarism, we see that the case against Iraq does not end with diplomatic resolutions, Mr. Speaker. The case against Iraq does not end with liaisons with terrorist organizations. The case against Iraq ends here. It ends with what will end when that regime ends.

I want to speak specifically to the issue of torture, which as I have said before is systematic in Iraq. I think again of David who asked me to look at a Web site, Mr. Speaker, where there were pictures, and I think of innocent Iraqis like this. This photograph was taken January 5, 2003, on the streets of Baghdad. These are adorable kids who maybe look an awful lot like the kids that we now know are tortured to extract information from their parents by this regime.

Mr. Speaker, I am very moved by that thought, and the sheer horror of it, but I want to reflect for a moment on what the word "systematic" means.

□ 1600

We are not talking, Mr. Speaker, about the torture that happens on the margins in the basement of the prison because of the brutality of prison guards who are operating outside the rule of law. When the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch use the phrase that torture is systematic in Iraq, that means it is part of the system of Iraq. It is part of the ordinary undue process that the people of Iraq must endure.

And I hope I make this point, Mr. Speaker, that we are not talking about a regime that has left the rails. We are not talking about a regime that some of its operators have lost their way. We are talking about a regime that sanctions the torture and killing of its own people. The most senior figures in this regime, according to international sources, have been personally involved in torture.

Saddam Hussein runs Iraq with close members of his own family, the "filthy

40" that we heard about in the media this week, most of them either married into the family or in some way related by blood. Most of these come from his hometown of Tikrit. These are the only people he feels he can trust. He directly controls the security services and, through them and a huge party network, his influence reaches deep into Iraqi society. Saddam presides over the all-powerful Revolutionary Command Council, which enacts laws and institutions and it has been through this council, according to Amnesty International in a report published in August of 2001, "torture is used systematically against political detainees. The scale and severity of torture in Iraq can only result from the acceptance of its use at the highest level."

Over the years, Amnesty International and other human rights organizations have received thousands of reports of torture and interviewed dozens of torture victims who survived and escaped. Some of the propagandists, Tariq Aziz comes to mind, may step before the cameras some day in the near future and hold out something from a statute book in Iraq that says that torture is illegal in Iraq. But according to the report recently published by the British Government, our intelligence sources are not aware of a single case of an Iraqi official suspected of carrying out torture being brought to justice or prosecuted, not one.

I quote again, Amnesty International in a report from 2001: "Torture is used systematically against political detainees," and stay with me now. "The scale and severity of torture in Iraq can only result from the acceptance of its use at the highest level," according to Amnesty International.

Let me tell the story about a family, and I think we have a picture of a wonderful family in Baghdad. This photograph taken on the streets of Baghdad on January 7, 2003. A father, maybe a grandfather, with his arm around what looks to be about an 11- or 12-year-old boy and a daughter in a shawl, and it is a warm family photograph. Let me read the story of a family arrested in late 2000, not long ago. They were taken to two separate interrogation centers in Iraq within Republican Guard facilities located along the road to Abu Ghraib, according to a report published by the United Kingdom.

The husband was held in one center whilst the wife and children were held in a women's facility. The husband and wife were interrogated under torture about the husband's sale of vehicle that the interrogator said had been captured by Iraqi security forces during a raid on Iraqi oppositionists. The interrogators said separately to both husband and wife that they would cease the torture if they signed confessions admitting to be collaborating with oppositionists. They refused. The wife was stripped naked and cigarettes stubbed out on all parts of her body when she refused to implicate her husband.

This was August of 2000. I am not talking about ancient history, Mr. Speaker. According to testimony, she was beaten and thrown around the interrogation room. Her children were forced to watch the torture. She was eventually released, having been told her husband would continue being tortured until she returned to confess. She was arrested again 2 weeks late and the same pattern of torture was repeated, leaving her a psychological wreck.

During his testimony, the husband's arms were tied behind his back. He was then suspended in the air using a hook hung from the ceiling. According to testimony, this caused intense pain as his muscle and shoulder ligaments were torn. After a period, the interrogators entered the room and the husband was unhooked, placed in a chair. From close range, he was then shot at with a pistol whenever he refused to agree to sign the confession. Sometimes shots were fired which missed his body. At other times, a pistol muzzle was placed against his fingers, toes, and arms and fired so as to mutilate those areas. Over the following 2 weeks, further interrogations occurred at intervals following periods of food and water deprivation. Eventually the husband and wife's wider family paid a bribe to an Iraqi intelligence officer and they were released, and subsequently survived to escape from Iraq and testify.

Mr. Speaker, I recite these things because I think many people just do not know them. I recite these things because there are many who want to morally equivocate in this case and even to suggest that there are other countries that have weapons of mass destruction, Iraq is no different. Iraq is different, Mr. Speaker.

Let me give you more examples. Among these pictures that I was presented when I went to a Web site called to my attention by a constituent who opposed the war who asked me to look into the eyes of some recent photographs of people who live in Baghdad and think about the cost of this war. Among those photographs here is a January 5 picture of four beautiful girls and one little boy, and it is a good starting point for us to talk about women in Iraq, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to quote some propagandist organization on the right or some pro-war organization. I am going to quote from the Human Rights Alliance in France and Amnesty International's report in 2001 about the treatment of women by the regime in Baghdad.

According to Amnesty International, a 25-year-old woman known as Um Haydar was beheaded in the street without charge or trial at the end of December, 2000, after her husband, suspected by the authorities, of involvement in Islamic armed activities, fled the country. Beheaded in the street without a trial. And some think this is just another country, Mr. Speaker.

Men belonging to Saddam Fidayeen took Haydar from her house in the al-

Karrada district in front of her children and mother-in-law. Two men held her arms and a third pulled her head from behind and beheaded her in front of her family, according to witnesses with firsthand knowledge presented to Amnesty International. Human Rights Alliance in France, their report in 2002, young woman was arrested because her husband had refused to join the war against Iran. Pregnant at the time, she gave birth in prison on 3 December, 1999. She said, "I breast-fed my son, but they took him away when he was 17 days old so that he would not become like me. I'm still looking for him. I never had further news of him."

This woman, who was also horribly tortured in prison, still said she suffers endless torture, the torture of not knowing where her son is. This according to Human Rights Alliance in France.

Najat Mohammed Haydar, an obstetrician in Baghdad, was beheaded in October, 2000, apparently on suspicion of prostitution, according to Amnesty International. Even by Iraqi standards, her execution was an outrage, Mr. Speaker. There was no evidence to support the charge of prostitution. She was reportedly arrested before the introduction of the policy to behead prostitutes. The real reason for her death was believed to be, according to Amnesty International, her criticism of corruption in the Iraqi health service. A female obstetrician in Baghdad was beheaded in October of 2000.

I cannot say enough, and as I prepared for these remarks today, these are things that shocked my conscious and mind. I know where I was in October of 2000, Mr. Speaker, and to think that there is still a place in the world where a professional woman, an OBGYN, a medical doctor could criticize her government's health policy and be beheaded publicly is a frightening thought. But that is Baghdad and that is Iraq.

A few more personal stories, Mr. Speaker, and then I will yield this Chamber to another colleague. It is the individual stories that touch me the deepest. When I got that e-mail from David in my district, I had to thank him. He challenged me, Mr. Speaker. He said that if you support this war, I challenge you to go to a Web site where there are photographs of families that live in Baghdad, recent photographs of the people who may fall under the wake of U.S. military involvement. He challenged me, and I rose to the challenge, and I went to the Web site, but instead of finding myself backing away from engagement, I found myself drawn to it. I looked into the face of this little boy and he looks like mine. And it is the personal stories that draw me into this and reaffirm my belief that the rule of law and the laws that govern civilized men and women on planet earth are not the province of the west. They are not the province of English-speaking people or Europeans, but the freedom from terror, the obligations of due process, the freedom of

speech and association, these are things that attach to the human heart that this little boy, sitting on a carpet in Baghdad, smiling for all the world to the camera, not knowing what may well be coming to his city, touches me deeply.

A few more personal stories and I will close. These are from an Amnesty International report issued in November of 1999. They are personal stories regarding Iraq's obvious human rights violation, and I say this it as often as I can, Mr. Speaker, that I might per chance by some be heard that what I am reading now is not from some pro-war, pro-Bush Web site or document. This is from Amnesty International. Abd al-Wahid al-Rifa'i, married with nine children, according to Amnesty International, was arrested without a warrant on 8 March, 1999, at 2 a.m.

Taken from his house in Baghdad by plainclothes security men, initially he was held in the headquarters of the General Security Directorate. According to Amnesty International and testimony thereafter, he was then taken to a hospital because of ill health, returned to the Baghdad security headquarters where he is currently held without charge or trial. Since his arrest, his family has not been allowed to visit him. He is believed to have been arrested because authorities suspected he was in contact with the opposition through his brother, an active anti-government opponent who lives in Europe.

□ 1615

His brother, a businessman, fled with his wife and children to Jordan in 1995. The previous month, he had been detained in Iraq accused of having contacts with opposition abroad, and was tortured. This included beatings, suspension by his feet, electric shock to his lips and genitals. He escaped by bribing a prison official in August of 1995, and a criminal court sentenced him to death in absentia. His brother remains incarcerated without charges in his absence.

Ibrahim Amin al-'Azzawi, a 70-year-old lawyer, according to Amnesty International, was arrested on the morning of 23 March 1999. Four plainclothes security men took him away from his house in Baghdad. He was reportedly not involved in any opposition activities.

The previous evening his daughter, Bushra, married with two children, came with her children to her parents' house in a state of shock. She told her family, who are Sunni Muslims, that her husband had been arrested at his house and taken away by security men.

The whole family could not sleep that night. When the four security men came to the house around 6 a.m., they knocked at the door, and it was Ibrahim Amin al-'Azzawi who opened the door. They searched the house, confiscated documents, and arrested Ibrahim without giving him any reason for the arrest.

The family then feared that the security men would return and arrest them. Bushra and her two children and her two unmarried sisters and their 61-year-old mother collected some of their valuables and ran from the house. A few weeks later, they managed to flee the country. They believe that the reason behind their father's arrest was that his son-in-law, a Shi'a Muslim, was suspected of involvement in some antigovernment activities.

Ibrahim Amin al-'Azzawi was executed. His body was buried by the authorities. No information of a charge, trial, or sentencing was available. No information was made available to Amnesty International as to the fate of his son-in-law. This was a 70-year-old lawyer in Baghdad, who upon hearing that his son-in-law had been arrested in the dead of night, went to his house to comfort his daughter and was himself dragged off and executed. This is Iraq, Mr. Speaker. This is Iraq today, 1999, according to Amnesty International.

Let me tell you a story about a 67-year-old man, married with four grown children. Ayatollah al-Shaikh Murtaadha al-Burujerdi is his name, I say with respect, age 67. He was shot dead by armed men on the night of 22 April 1998 as he walked home from the shrine of Imam Ali in al-Najaf one of the Shiite Muslims' holiest cities, where he had led the congregation in dawn prayers. His two companions were also shot and sustained injuries.

He had reportedly been harassed in the past by Iraqi security services, and there had been at least one attempt on his life in 1991, and following the Shiite uprising in the South, he was arrested with scores of other Shiite scholars, was detained, and then released.

A few weeks before his murder, he had been visited by a delegation from the Ministry of Religious Endowments and Religions Affairs, urging him to stop leading the prayers. He was reported to have stated to the delegation he would only agree if he received in writing an order from the Iraqi government. Following the assassination, an official statement released by the government blamed the intelligence service of a foreign country. Amnesty International.

These names are hard for me to pronounce, but these facts are not hard for me to understand: a 67-year-old grandfather coming back from a prayer service, shot and killed. Two men were coming back from one of the holiest places for Shiite Muslims were also shot and wounded. His offense was praying.

The list, Mr. Speaker, goes on and on and on. There is persecution of the Kurds that has been documented again and again. There has been much human rights and religious persecution within Iraq. It is a record of mindless barbarism that is contemporary, not ancient history.

Some may believe that these were things of a frontier period in the regime before law and order took hold.

These things may happen, they say; but I am talking from the benefit of the great work of Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International.

Mr. Speaker, I speak of things that have happened within months of this day. A woman who was a medical doctor was beheaded because she criticized the government; a grandfather walking back from a prayer service, shot and killed simply because he did not adhere to the government's demand that he stop leading prayers with the Shiite Muslims; and the systematic use of torture as part of government policy.

So I rise today to simply add something to the discussion. I do so with great humility, Mr. Speaker, knowing that each one of us among the 435 who are privileged to serve in this place are simply part of a national conversation. We are the way America talks to itself.

I had a burden on my heart, Mr. Speaker, that America ought to be talking about this. We get caught up in resolutions and weapons of mass destruction, and were they or were they not involved with al Qaeda, were they or were they not involved in September 11. Each one of us, by our own lights and by the facts, will decide what we believe, and decide what we believe should be the proper course of action.

However, what I see the debate bereft of is an honest discussion of the barbaric and virtually unprecedented record on human rights that is contemporary Iraq under Saddam Hussein.

These families, these kids. December 19, 2002, this paragraph was taken of two beautiful little girls, about the age of my girls, in Baghdad. When I think of the man who was beheaded in front of his wife and children, when I think of the parents who were incarcerated and tortured in front of their children, when I think of the woman who escaped from Iraq, but they took her boy of 17 days away because they did not want him to be polluted by her ideology and thinking, she grieves to this day, not for the torture that she suffered and no doubt the physical scars she bore, but she feels the emotional scars of not knowing where her baby boy is.

It is about these families, Mr. Speaker, that I believe in the justness of our cause. I think of those words from Ecclesiastes, Chapter 4: "Again I looked and saw all the oppression that was taking place under the sun. I saw the tears of the oppressed, and they have no comforter. Power was on the side of their oppressors, and they have no comforter. I declared that the dead who had already died are happier than the living who are still alive; but better than both is he who has not yet been, who has not seen the evil that is done under the sun."

When I look into these eyes, Mr. Speaker, I see the tears of the oppressed. When I look into these eyes, I know the evil that is done under the sun. Because of the outstanding work of Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, I am able, and millions

are able, to know of these things, and the reality of them.

But let it not be said in this place that they have no comforter, that they have no defender; because in the days ahead, as we pause and reflect this weekend, each of us going to our own place of worship, I suspect many millions of Americans in churches and synagogues and mosques and in their own private devotions will pray.

We will, each of us, pray, not just for the safety of our troops, but we will pray for these who shed the tears of the oppressed. We will pray that God will have his mercy on all the innocent in the way of war, confident that our military will use extraordinary efforts to avoid casualties by noncombatants.

It is my hope that somewhere in the heart of hearts of the children in these pictures that I have shown today, and in the families they represent, there will be the knowledge that there is a defender; there is a nation, some 50 nations, that stand ready to end their oppression, to dry their tears, and to lead Iraq into a new dawn of civilization, a new dawn of freedom from oppression and torture and the abuse of women and the stifling of basic civil and human rights.

That is my prayer, that is my hope, and of that I remain confident, that the United States of America will, if need be by force, or by showing enough force that it is voluntary, lead Iraq into that bright future.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN FINDING A SOLUTION TO TERRORISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to try to craft and articulate the burden that so many of us feel as we hope to be part of a solution that respects life over death, and clearly captures the role and the position of the United States of America as the singular world power, the problem solver, the great humanitarian.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people every day epitomize a caring Nation, a population that is charitable and eager to be of help. I know that, Mr. Speaker, because none of us are the same since 9-11. We cried, we hoped, we prayed, and all we wanted to do was to embrace our brothers and sisters who had lost their loved ones; and even to find some sense of hope that more would be found alive. We watched steadfastly every day, every hour, every minute, every second as the

brave first responders were looking to find life.

So I know that Americans truly are those who care about people; and yes, where there is no justice, Americans desire to march in to create justice.

Mr. Speaker, we could find almost zero divide when Americans rose to the floor of the House in the United States Congress after 9-11 and authorized the President's authority to fight the war against terrorism. Not only did Members of the United States Congress offer themselves as soldiers in the political process of fighting the war on terrorism, but all of America joined.

As we looked around as far as the eye could see, and as far as we could hear, and as far as we could imagine, nations all over the world, Mr. Speaker, joined us in our horror, in our hurt and pain, but in our resolve. As I traveled on behalf of this Congress, whether it was in the Caribbean, in Africa, in Asia; whether it was in the Pacific or in South America, Australia and other places, they all, to a one, said, we are with you. We feel the pain of this Nation, and we wish to fight with you.

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing like a coalition of strength and resolve that will make democracy and freedom a breathing, living entity, not just words.

Mr. Speaker, I was eager to join my colleagues shortly after 9-11 and shortly after we began the war on terrorism as we went to Afghanistan. One of my major concerns, Mr. Speaker, was to make sure I greeted and met with the men and women of the United States military, as I have done, Mr. Speaker, in going to Bosnia during the middle of that war before the Dayton Peace Treaty was signed; meeting with the respective presidents at that time, Milosovic who obviously told an untruth and got his just to do by being tried before the war crimes tribunal. And then as I went to Kosovo to meet with General Wesley Clark near the muddy near Albania as we were in a collaborative effort with NATO raising our voices against ethnic cleansing, murderous acts, stopping that with our allies; and then going into Afghanistan to see the troops and to go into that nation to begin to hopefully encourage it to be a nation, and as well to see the pain that was there.

I do not have the pictures of the faces of children, but when you go to an orphanage with a thousand children's scars and sores all over their faces, you have a resolve to say America is here now; we are going to help you.

I mentioned Afghanistan last before I discussed this dilemma with Iraq because I have just heard the pleas of women from Afghanistan saying that even with the commitment of this Nation, there is fear in Afghanistan now because they wonder about America's resolve to help them. I am thinking, of course, of the battle fiercely going on there with our troops bravely fighting

against the Taliban that are in the respective mountains and caves that maybe which cleared the city.

But Afghans will tell you the Taliban are still there, that the terrorists still abound. What does this say to America and our foreign policy and to this Congress? Unlike 20 years ago, we cannot abandon Afghanistan and so Afghanistan becomes a front that deals with the needs for American military to be present, and in essence the needs for us to continue our war against terrorism.

But how do we do that, Mr. Speaker? We are now yielding to what I consider an untimely move toward war in Iraq, when in actuality our job is not finished in Afghanistan. And in fact we have options to be able to address the question in Iraq. There is no doubt that a despot rules that country. I hesitate to say, Mr. Speaker, tragically we could probably list 30 to 31 nations with that kind of despotic leader; and so the United States has to be methodical, we have to work with coalitions, we have to be able to reflect upon history.

We have to look at the Berlin Wall and as Americans saw that wall crumbling brick by brick. How did it go so? Because the United Nations, the allies and America had a resolve to have a strong defense and to be able to allow the German people to see a better way; and it crumbled from within, not without, of course, a strong military from the allies making it known to Germany that we would not tolerate the continued existence. The resolve brought the wall down. And out of that, we saved thousands of lives without going to war.

Russia, the Soviet Union, is not the Soviet Union of yesteryear. And the independent European countries that used to be part of the Soviet Union are clamoring to be part of NATO. How did we do that with our resolve and our persistence in a coalition?

There is nothing worse than this Nation going forward unilaterally and preemptively against Iraq. What we will be intending to do may not be the result because all of those wonderful people that we want to save, those 6-year-old babies, 2-month-old babies, those elderly women, elderly men, those young families who are seeking nothing but a better life will be the collateral damage, how cold a word, of our unilateral attack on Iraq and Baghdad. Lives will be lost, and certainly large numbers of the brave young men and women in the United States military who without one bit of criticism are there in the Mid East now will be lost.

War should be the last option, Mr. Speaker. I have not said war should never be an option because I do not believe in this Nation being a wimp. And I believe that if this Nation needed defending, every American would step over each other in order to be on the frontline. But you cannot characterize one patriotism on the basis of raising the doubts of a war at this juncture

with Iraq, unilaterally and preemptively, or with what I call an unwilling coalition.

Both Britain and the United States would do well to look to the options that have been represented by the U.N., which is more projected, extended, defended U.N. inspections. Hans Blix truly believes that he has made some successes; and of course, we will hear further tomorrow. And maybe the added time that Canada wants to have until the end of the month, maybe the added time that some of our allies want to have extended time are worthy of one building a willing coalition, but as well preparing the innocent lives, the victims, the people of Iraq for what might come and find a way to minimize the loss of life. Is that not important to the United States?

What about an option, Mr. Speaker, of gathering the religious leaders of the world in an intense closed-door negotiations? How do we know that we might not find the pathway for the exile of Saddam Hussein? We have not asked them. This is religious leaders from all denominations. We have just heard from the Pope yesterday. This past Sunday I called for weeks and months of prayer to instruct the leadership of the world and our Nation to be able to find a way to end this deadlock without a war. Many may say that Saddam Hussein is playing games with us and he will dismantle the missiles and then start up again.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the U.N. inspectors while they were there were able to disarm Saddam Hussein more than the Gulf War of 1991, 1992; and so we do have options. That is what is important. We want to give those babies in Iraq the option to live, those mothers the option to live. We want to provide them with the milk and medicine that they need to live. We want to create individuals who clamor after democracy, not hate America because they view that we are going to do this unilaterally. We want a peaceful solution in the Mid East between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We want a free and independent Israel. We want the Palestinians to abhor as we do the suicide bombings and we want them to stop so there can be co-existence and freedom. We cannot do that if we do not give attention to a solution, full attention.

We cannot make Afghanistan whole and rid ourselves of the Taliban and get rid of those cells that are growing terrorists if we do not pay attention to Afghanistan; if we do not pay attention to women who are still being abused and treated disrespectfully and unequally. And I respect the Muslim faith. I know that the Muslim faith is quite different from the Taliban autocratic rule that extinguishes all rights. America is the single world power, and there is much responsibility that comes with privilege. And they are lining up, Mr. Speaker, and in a war with Iraq takes the toll where there may not be a solution that we would wel-

come. And then we have the crisis in Afghanistan, we have the terrible horrific loss of life, the jeopardy to the homeland security. And frankly, Mr. Speaker, we have North Korea, the North Korea that I believe this administration should be engaged in with policies that will recognize that they pose a problem with nuclear weapons.

We know that North Korea in 1998 succeeded in developing a No Dong missile with a range estimated at up to 900 miles capable of covering South Korea and most of Japan. And North Korea reportedly deployed nearly 100 No Dong missiles by 2003. On August 31, 1998, North Korea test-fired a three-stage rocket, apparently the prototype of a Taepo-Dong One missile. The third stage apparently was an attempt to launch a satellite. In 1998, officials told CNN that North Korea is constructing at least two new launch facilities for medium-range missiles as we have just noted.

It is well known that North Korea has the capacity, Mr. Speaker, in fact, an atomic reactor with the capacity of about 5 electrical megawatts constructed between 1980 and 1987, reportedly is capable of expending enough uranium fuel to produce about 7 kilograms of plutonium annually, enough for the manufacture of a single atomic bomb annually. North Korea in 1989 shut down a reactor for about 70 days. And our intelligence officials believe that they removed some of the fuel rods from the reactor at that time.

The information I shared is public knowledge. And so we have an ongoing crisis that requires us to not singularly look to Iraq as the solution to our concerns about terrorism, threats against Americans, and the despotism of the world. Because, Mr. Speaker, there are human rights violations all over the world, as I said earlier, in upwards of 30 countries. And interestingly enough, the United States has been effective in negotiations with a strong military.

Why not take up the offer of leaders of government, heads of religious organizations doing an intense negotiations to extract Mr. Saddam Hussein out of there? Do we not recognize that we can be strong in diplomacy?

Mr. Speaker, I would also argue that this Congress needs to assess options. Why do I say that? Because the Constitution clearly dictates that the Congress declares war under article 1, section 8. The President is the Commander in Chief. I respect that. And as I stated, I said that if these troops are deployed, there is no quarrel with the United States military. No quarrel with the troops. We will be in full support of the efforts that they are making. Let the resounding sound of the vote that we took yesterday make it very clear that there is no divide on our appreciation for the Reservists, the enlisted personnel, the civilians who are now fighting for our freedom. Let it be known, of course, that our prayers are with them and there will be no divide on the work that they are doing for us.

That is why I have come to the floor today, Mr. Speaker, because I believe there are options. We can have a strong military presence and Saddam Hussein will have nowhere to run. And we can allow those U.N. inspectors to vigorously be in Iraq, and we can save lives, and we can build a coalition of allies enthusiastically supporting this effort, similar to the effort in 1991.

And in this Congress there was a difference of opinion. But the coalition was strong, the debate was strong, the debate was knowledgeable. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the debate was right before the invasion or the launch of our efforts, right before.

□ 1645

So all of the people had all of the facts. The Congress knew about anything that needed to be known about, and there was disagreement but there was authority given. We debated the Iraqi resolution when no one knew about North Korea, those facts were not given to us. I was represented to us that we could have a willing coalition, with NATO would be with us. The facts are different now, Mr. Speaker.

So I want for this country the best. I want for Americans the best. I want the world to know that these are the best people you could ever get to know.

We have shed the ugly American. There is no such person, because we care about what happens to people in this world. I know that because my constituents every day sign up and volunteer for the United States military to go and fight for people who cannot fight for themselves, including United States of America.

But this war in Iraq will turn the tide, and it may not get the results we would like, but what I think is important to know for Americans is that as we make these decisions, a war decision will push us into the center of Baghdad for 20, 30 years while we have to be in the center of Afghanistan for 20 or 30 years, while we have to be in the center or North Korea for a long time.

Is not it preferable, Mr. Speaker, to try the options of negotiations? Is it not worth trying to save American lives as well?

Just to show my colleagues that we do lose civilians overseas, in Vietnam we lost civilians in high numbers. Looks like we lost close to 30,000 it seems in the embassy bombings in Beirut, 1983; embassy bombing, Kenya, 1998. Civilians lives being lost to a non-military, and that is not 30,000. I think that is less than that.

I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, as we think about the decisions that have to be made that we look at the option for peace. I, too, want a free and democratic Iraq. It is important to note that it will not come overnight and it is all in the way we do it.

There is now a united Germany. There is now a united number of Soviet countries, united around the concept of democracy, and the Soviet Union does not stand.

I believe it is imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we look at options other than war, and I will continue to work with colleagues who believe, as many Americans believe, that we can find an option to save lives. We do not know what the toll will be, and by not knowing what that toll will be, we cannot factually say that the results will be as we would desire it, but we do know that if we continue in negotiation and strength, and that we are steadily, methodically disarming Iraq and Saddam Hussein, we know that, we have seen that proof, there is no reason why we could not continue that path because America has the strength, the resolve and the power to be able to win a war with Iraq. There is no doubt.

Do we have the strength and the power and the resolve to rebuild the alliances, to be able to have a coalition that has resolve to help us in Iraq? That is success. I am concerned that that may not be the full case, and so I do want to acknowledge the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, who said that in order to find peace we must become ecumenical and not sectional; that the judgment of God is upon us; that we must find a way to live in this world as brothers and sisters.

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not a simplistic perspective. It is not an imagined perspective. I am a realist, Mr. Speaker, but I said at the beginning, democracy is not about simple words. It is to be practiced, and the way we can convince the world is because we are a democracy and not a monarchy and that the people's voices can be listened to.

I believe there are people of goodwill in America who would be welcoming of negotiations that could be extending so that we could negotiate a peaceful resolve in Iraq, and then, Mr. Speaker, that if the ultimate results did not resolve themselves, that the case may have to be ultimately made for that last option, but it seems to me with a domestic agenda rising, it is imperative that we be concerned about America's destiny, its senior citizens, its children, those suffering and not having mental health services, those needing health care services, those needing housing, those who are addicted to drugs or infected with HIV/AIDS. Every day there is a cry for help, those needing funding of the children protective services, all of those, the homeless youth, homeless veterans, veterans who need to have service.

Mr. Speaker, the list is long, but I would simply say to my colleagues that we can find a better way than the loss of lives of hundreds of Americans overseas that I have just noted in Vietnam and Beirut in 1983 and Kenya in 1998. We can find another way, and I hope to work over the next week, as I said, with coalitions who are eager to work in a manner that will generate the freedom and the expression of freedom through the practicing of America's democracy by showing to the world that we know with our resolve

how to negotiate, how to be part of the United Nations, how to embrace our allies and get the job done. We can do this peacefully, but with resolve and that is what my commitment is.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me on this.

BLOCKING PROPERTY OF PERSONS
UNDERMINING DEMOCRATIC
PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS IN
ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. 108-45)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have exercised my statutory authority to declare a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy interests of the United States posed by the actions and policies of certain individuals who have formulated, implemented, or supported policies that have undermined Zimbabwe's democratic institutions.

Over the course of more than 2 years, the Government of Zimbabwe has systematically undermined that nation's democratic institutions, employing violence, intimidation, and repressive means including legislation to stifle opposition to its rule. This campaign to ensure the continued rule of Robert Mugabe and his associates was clearly revealed in the badly flawed presidential election held in March 2002. Subsequent to the election, the Mugabe government intensified its repression of opposition political parties and those voices in civil society and the independent press calling on the government to respect the nation's democratic values and the basic human rights of its citizens. To add to the desperation of the besieged Zimbabwean people, the current government has engaged in a violent assault on the rule of law that has thrown the economy into chaos, devastated the nation's agricultural economy, and triggered a potentially catastrophic food crisis.

As a result of the unusual and extraordinary threat posed to the foreign policy of the United States by the deterioration of Zimbabwe's democracy and the resulting breakdown in the rule of law, politically motivated violence, and the political and economic instability in the southern African region, I have exercised my statutory authority and issued an Executive Order which, except to the extent provided for in regulations, orders, directives, or li-

censes that may be issued pursuant to this order, and notwithstanding any contract entered into or any license or permit granted prior to the effective date:

Blocks all property and interests in property of the individuals listed in the Annex to the order;

Prohibits any transaction or dealing by United States persons or within the United States in property or interests in property blocked pursuant to the order, including the making or receiving of any contribution of funds, goods, or service to or for the benefit of the persons designated pursuant to the order.

The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized to designate any person determined, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to be owned or controlled by, or acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly for or on behalf of, any persons designated in or pursuant to the order. The Secretary of the Treasury is also authorized in the exercise of my authorities under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to implement these measures in consultation with the Secretary of State. All Federal agencies are directed to take actions within their authority to carry out the provisions of the Executive Order.

This Executive Order further demonstrates the U.S. commitment to supporting the Zimbabwe's democratic evolution, and strengthens our cooperation with the European Union in efforts to promote that evolution. The European Union has acted to freeze the assets of 79 individuals responsible for the political, economic, and social deterioration of Zimbabwe. With the exception of two individuals no longer associated with the Government of Zimbabwe, this order encompasses all those identified by the European Union.

I have enclosed a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 6, 2003.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ETHERIDGE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of a death in the family.

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. LEWIS of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAHUNT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BALDWIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALLEN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 10, 2003, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

969. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Loss Assistance Program 2001 (RIN: 0560-AG61) received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

970. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Livestock Indemnity Program (RIN: 0560-AG33) received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

971. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Review and Foreign Investment Disclosure Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hard White Wheat Incentive Program (RIN: 0560-AG71) received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

972. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Apple Market Loss Assistance Payment Program III (RIN: 0560-AG85) received February 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

973. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mexican Fruit Fly; Addition of Regulated Area [Docket No. 02-121-2] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

974. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — AQI User Fees: Extension of Current Fees Beyond Fiscal Year 2002 [Docket No. 02-085-2] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

975. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exotic Newcastle Disease; Additions to Quarantined Area [Docket No. 02-117-3] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

976. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Swine Health Protection [Docket No. 03-008-1] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

977. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Remove Texas From Lists of States Approved to Receive Stallions and Mares From CEM-Affected Regions [Docket No. 03-004-1] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

978. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Exotic Newcastle Disease; Additions to Quarantined Area [Docket No. 02-117-4] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

979. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Witchweed; Regulated Areas [Docket No. 02-042-1] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

980. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animal Health Protection Act; Revisions to Authority Citations [Docket No. 02-076-1] received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

981. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of the United States Warehouse Act (RIN: 0560-AG45) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

982. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Marketing Quotas, Acreage Allotments and Production Adjustment (RIN: 0560-AG51) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

983. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dairy Indemnity Payment Program (RIN: 0560-AG08) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

984. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grazing Payments for 2001 Wheat, Barley, or Oats (RIN: 0560-AG22) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

985. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule —

Collecting Guaranteed Loss Payments From FSA Farm Loan Program Borrowers (RIN: 0560-AG44) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

986. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Limitations on the Amount of Farm Service Agency Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0560-AG64) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

987. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation Reserve Program-Farmable Wetlands Pilot Program (RIN: 0560-AG38) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

988. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Purchase of Flue-Cured Tobacco Across County Lines (Florida and Georgia) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

989. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conservation Reserve Program-Good Faith Reliance and Excessive Rainfall (RIN: 0560-AG37) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

990. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Boll Weevil Eradication Loan Program (RIN: 0560-AG69) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

991. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — 2002 Farm Bill Regulations-Termination of Peanut Market Quota Program and Revised Flue-Cured Tobacco Reserve Stock Level (RIN: 0560-AG75) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

992. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Review Group, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Tobacco Marketing Quota Regulations (RIN: 0560-AG40) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

993. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revisions to Regulations for Permits, Approvals and Registration and Related Regulations [MD 128-3097a; FRL-7450-4] received February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

994. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California state Implementation Plan, Ventura Air Pollution Control District [CA 266-0383; FRL-7454-4] received February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

995. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; New Source Review/Prevention of Significant Deterioration Revision [CT-068-7225a; A-1-FRL-7445-9] received

February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

996. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Reorganization of and Revisions to Administrative and General Conformity Provisions; Documents Incorporated by Reference; Recodification of Existing SIP Provisions; Correction [VA085/086/089/102/103-5046a FRL-7455-7] received February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report responding to Section 8171 of the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-117); to the Committee on International Relations.

998. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the implementation of United States-Israel Free Trade Agreement, pursuant to Section 3105 of the Trade Act of 2002; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

999. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's plan for the construction and operation of the mixed oxide (MOX) facility at the Savannah River Site in Aiken, South Carolina, pursuant to Section 3182 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2003; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce.

1000. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft bill entitled, "Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 2003"; jointly to the Committees on Resources, the Judiciary, International Relations, and Ways and Means.

1001. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's legislative initiatives for inclusion in the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2004; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Resources, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. BOEHNER: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 14. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements to and reauthorize programs under that Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 659. A bill to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act regarding the requirements for mortgage insurance under such Act for hospitals (Rept. 108-27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 663. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely affect patient safety, and for other purposes;

with an amendment (Rept. 108-28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1109. A bill to establish a Financial Markets Oversight Commission in order to combine the functions of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission in a single independent regulatory commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, 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. TOWNS (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FORD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HALL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1110. A bill to extend Federal funding for operation of State high risk health insurance pools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. HOSTETTLER):

H.R. 1111. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the rules relating to the court-ordered apportionment of the retired pay of members of the uniformed services to former spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINGSTON (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. SCHROCK):

H.R. 1112. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINGSTON:

H.R. 1113. A bill to authorize an exchange of land at Fort Frederica National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BURR, Mr. MICA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. McCRERY):

H.R. 1114. A bill to establish legal standards and procedures for the fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos

exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. COX, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend the procedures that apply to consideration of interstate class actions to assure fairer outcomes for class members and defendants, to outlaw certain practices that provide inadequate settlements for class members, to assure that attorneys do not receive a disproportionate amount of settlements at the expense of class members, to provide for clearer and simpler information in class action settlement notices, to assure prompt consideration of interstate class actions, to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow the application of the principles of Federal diversity jurisdiction to interstate class actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PASCARELL):

H.R. 1116. A bill to reform the medical malpractice insurance business, to provide for Federal alternative medical malpractice insurance, and to limit frivolous lawsuits; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. COX:

H.R. 1117. A bill to improve health care choice by providing for the tax deductibility of medical expenses by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 1118. A bill to establish the SAFER Firefighter Grant Program; to the Committee on Science.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. DUNN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BOEHRNER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. HART, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. BONO, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. COLE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KELLER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OTTER, Mr. OSE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BAKER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SHAD-EGG):

H.R. 1119. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RAHALL):

H.R. 1120. A bill to ensure and foster continued patient safety and quality of care by clarifying the application of the antitrust laws to negotiations between groups of health care professional and health plans and health care insurance issuers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 1121. A bill to limit the period of validity of driver's licenses and State identification cards issued to nonimmigrant aliens to the period of validity of nonimmigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide funding for the clean up of MTBE contamination from underground storage tanks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 1123. A bill to authorize States to regulate the receipt and disposal of out-of-State municipal solid waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1124. A bill to reduce the cost of medical malpractice insurance, to enhance patient access to medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LEACH, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HART, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1125. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FROST, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. CANNON, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 1126. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the expense treatment for small businesses and to reduce the depreciation recovery period for restaurant buildings and franchise operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 1127. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a combat artillery medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. HART, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1128. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Horsham, Pennsylvania, as the "Victor J. Saracini Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 1129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for installment reporting of certain gain from the sale of an interest in a service business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WU, Mr. FORD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELAURIO, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. FILLNER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LEACH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FROST, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. CASE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MENEDEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr.

UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BACA, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BELL, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1130. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to implement the final rule to phase out snowmobile use in Yellowstone National Park, John D. Rockefeller Jr. Memorial Parkway, and Grand Teton National Park, and snowplane use in Grand Teton National Park; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the enhanced deduction for charitable contributions of computers to provide greater public access to computers, including access by the poor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to promote homeownership among low-income individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1133. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary exclusion for members of reserve components of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees serving in a combat zone and to extend the exclusion for serving in a combat zone to Department of Defense civilian employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the work opportunity credit and welfare-to-work credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 1135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide increased incentives for business investments in low-income communities and small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1136. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to repeal the Federal Charter for Retired Enlisted Association, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM (for himself, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. COLE, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. NUSSLE):

H.R. 1137. A bill to exempt small trailer manufacturers from enhanced early warning reporting requirements under the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation (TREAD) Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1138. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for Alzheimer's disease research and demonstration grants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 1139. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of

frequent flyer mileage awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 1140. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to stimulate economic development by enhancing the availability and benefits of small issue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H.R. 1141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction to individuals for credit card interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

H.R. 1142. A bill to establish a commercial truck highway safety demonstration program in the State of Maine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1143. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit States to expand Medicaid eligibility to uninsured, poor adults; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. CASE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BACA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. LANTOS):

H.R. 1144. A bill to provide, with respect to diabetes in minority populations, for an increase in the extent of activities carried out by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WATSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WATT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1145. A bill to provide additional appropriations for the fiscal year 2003 for the Peace Corps; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1146. A bill to end membership of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1147. A bill to improve the safety of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 1148. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out activities to assess and reduce the vulnerabilities of public transportation systems; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 1149. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out programs regarding the prevention and man-

agement of asthma, allergies, and related respiratory problems, to establish a tax credit regarding pest control and indoor air quality and climate control services for multi-family residential housing in low-income communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. COX, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROYCE):

H.R. 1150. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to Orange County, California, for intercounty express bus service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 1151. A bill to provide that transit pass transportation fringe benefits be made available to all qualified Federal employees in the National Capital Region; to allow passenger carriers which are owned or leased by the Government to be used to transport Government employees between their place of employment and mass transit facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 1152. A bill to increase the cap on qualified small issue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTER (for himself, Mr. CANON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1153. A bill to accelerate the wilderness designation process by establishing a timetable for the completion of wilderness studies on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. AKIN):

H.R. 1154. A bill to provide that the International Criminal Court is not valid with respect to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio (for herself, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CRANE, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California):

H.R. 1156. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to increase the ceiling on the Federal share of the costs of phase I of the Orange County, California, Regional Water Reclamation Project; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER,

Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FARR, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. OLVER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. STARK, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 1157. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to exempt bookstores and libraries from orders requiring the production of any tangible things for certain foreign intelligence investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. SANDLIN:

H.R. 1158. A bill to modify the antitrust exemption applicable to the business of medical malpractice insurance, to address current issues for health care providers, to reform medical malpractice litigation by making available alternative dispute resolution methods, requiring plaintiffs to submit affidavits of merit before proceeding, and enabling judgments to be satisfied through periodic payments, to reform the medical malpractice insurance market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. FOLEY):

H.R. 1159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment for foreign tax credit limitation purposes of certain transfers of intangible property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERWOOD (for himself, Mr. OBEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SWEENEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. QUINN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BACA, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BERRY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. HART, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. PITTS, and Mrs. EMERSON):

H.R. 1160. A bill to impose tariff-rate quotas on certain casein and milk protein concentrates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WAMP, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs.

JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PENCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. HART, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. VIS-CLOSKY):

H.R. 1161. A bill to prevent trafficking in child pornography and obscenity, to proscribe pandering and solicitation relating to visual depictions of minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct, to prevent the use of child pornography and obscenity to facilitate crimes against children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. REYES, Mr. COOPER, Mr. JOHN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CASE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida):

H.R. 1162. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Service Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for certain distributions from a controlled foreign corporation to encourage companies to invest in worker hiring and training, infrastructure investments, capital investments, financial stabilization of the company, and research and development; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 1163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain interest amounts received by individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY (for himself and Mr. MCNULTY):

H.R. 1164. A bill to extend the deadlines under part I of the Federal Power Act for commencement of construction of two hydro-electric projects in the State of New York; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STARK, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. OWENS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GILCHREST, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1165. A bill to establish a grant and fee program through the Environmental Protection Agency to encourage and promote the recycling of used computers and to promote the development of a national infrastructure for the recycling of used computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. RENZI, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BALLANCE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. CASE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1166. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand and improve the assistance provided by Small Business Develop-

ment Centers to Indian tribe members, Native Alaskans, and Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico:

H.R. 1167. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit remarried surviving spouses of veterans to be eligible for burial in a national cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution expressing support for a peaceful, just, and lasting settlement to the Cyprus problem; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BOEHLERT (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. OWENS):

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to efforts of the Peace Parks Foundation in the Republic of South Africa to facilitate the establishment and development of transfrontier conservation efforts in southern Africa; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution condemning the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for its announcement that it has restarted a nuclear reactor at Yongbyon and for the provocation caused by the interception of a United States Air Force reconnaissance plane by North Korean military aircraft; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOSTETTLER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. THORBERRY):

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress on commemorating the 20th Anniversary of President Ronald Reagan's vision for protecting the United States against ballistic missile attack and commending President George W. Bush's commitment to a multi-layered ballistic missile defense system to protect the homeland of the United States from ballistic missile attack; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution honoring the victims of the Cambodian genocide that took place from April 1975 to January 1979; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. MOORE):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, presented by the people of Kansas, for placement in the

Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 130. A resolution electing Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York:

H. Res. 131. A resolution expressing the gratitude of the House of Representatives to the people and Government of Malaysia for their support, cooperation, and assistance in combating international terrorism; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. OSE (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. HERGER, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. BONO, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. HAYES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RENZI, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. NUNES):

H. Res. 132. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in *Newdow v. United States Congress* is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment and should be overturned, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. OTTER, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. PITTS, Ms. HART, Mrs. MYRICK, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida):

H. Res. 133. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to establish a discretionary spending ledger and a mandatory spending ledger; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 2: Mr. DELAY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. COX, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 5: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 12: Mr. REGULA, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 33: Mr. BOOZMAN and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 111: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 132: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 151: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 167: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 168: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 173: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 205: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 218: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 220: Mr. WAMP and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 236: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 284: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 286: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 303: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 328: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WATT, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 339: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 444: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. DUNN, Ms. HART, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 487: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 488: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 552: Mr. BONNER and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 525: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HILL, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WATT, Mr. SHAW, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 529: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 543: Mr. WOLF, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H.R. 545: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 570: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 571: Mr. HILL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 583: Mr. OWENS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. ROSS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 588: Mr. TIBERI and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 594: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 627: Mr. OLVER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 643: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 655: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 660: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WELLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 678: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 715: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 728: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 735: Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 760: Mr. JANKLOW.

H.R. 768: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 779: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 780: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 784: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 786: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 792: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 804: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 806: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 808: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 811: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 813: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 814: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 815: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 817: Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 830: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 839: Ms. DUNN and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 847: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 857: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 859: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 870: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 871: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 876: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 894: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 896: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 897: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 919: Mr. BAIRD, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 926: Mr. LINDER, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 934: Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 937: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 953: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 973: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 997: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HAYES, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 1022: Mr. REYES, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BACA, Mr. FROST, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1029: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1032: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1039: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1043: Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. NEY, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 1056: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1068: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CASE, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LEE, Mr. FORD, and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1077: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1093: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FROST, and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1108: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. PITTS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. JOHN, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. FATTAH.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. CASTLE.

H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Res. 59: Mr. ENGLISH.

H. Res. 50: Mr. TERRY, Ms. HART, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 72: Mr. FOLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 684: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 936: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.