



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 148

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2002

No. 72

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Bishop Neff Powell, the Episcopal Diocese of Southwestern Virginia, Roanoke, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

O God, the fountain of wisdom, whose will is good and gracious and whose law is truth, we beseech You so to guide and bless our Representatives in Congress assembled, that they may lead this Nation and enact such laws as shall please You, to the glory of Your name and the welfare of the people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TIAHRT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOME GUEST CHAPLAIN, BISHOP FRANK NEFF POWELL

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome Bishop Frank Neff Powell, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Southwestern Virginia, and one of my constituents, who has been chosen to serve as Guest Chaplain this morning.

Bishop Powell was born in Salem, Oregon. He was baptized at Saint Paul's Episcopal Church in Salem, Oregon, in 1948. Growing up in Salem he met his future wife, Dorothy Houck. He attended Claremont Men's College, in Claremont, California, graduating with a degree in history in 1970. During college, he was active at Christ Church Parish, Ontario, California.

Immediately following graduation, he married Dorothy and enrolled in the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. While there, he completed his field education at Church of our Savior in Milford, New Hampshire, and at St. Dunstan's in Ellsworth, Maine, graduating in 1973.

Bishop Powell began his ordained ministry as the curate at Trinity Parish in his home State of Oregon before being appointed vicar at Saint Bede's, Forest Grove, in 1975. These were fruitful years for the Powell family, marked by the birth of their three children, Charles Neff, Dorothy Louise, and Robert Bingham.

Bishop Powell was called to the diocese of New York in 1983 to serve as archdeacon and deputy for program, with a special emphasis on Christian education, stewardship, and small churches. He helped to develop the Carolinas and Virginia Small Church Leadership Training Program.

In 1991, he was called back to Oregon to serve as executive assistant to the bishop of Oregon. Most recently, on June 22, 1996, he was elected the fifth bishop of Southwestern Virginia. He is presently an associate of the Society of Saint John the Evangelist, a member of the Council of Associated Parishes for Liturgy and Mission, and a fellow of the College of Preachers. In addition, he was appointed to the Church Deployment Board of the National Episcopal Church in 1997.

Bishop Powell's life has been marked by continual service and dedication to the Episcopal Church and to the dictates of his personal faith. It is a distinct pleasure to welcome him to Washington today to open the United States House of Representatives in prayer, one of the finer traditions of this institution in which we humbly seek divine guidance and wisdom for the difficult tasks before us.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to welcome Bishop Frank Neff Powell, Bishop of Southwestern Virginia and one of my constituents, who has been chosen to serve as guest chaplain this morning.

Bishop Powell was born December 28, 1947, in Salem, OR. He was baptized at St. Paul's Episcopal church, in Salem, OR, on November 28, 1948.

Growing up in Salem he met his future wife, Dorothy Houck, in the church youth group. He attended Claremont Men's College, in Claremont, CA, graduating with a degree in history in 1970. During college, he was active at Christ Church Parish, Ontario, CA, and in the Episcopal students group.

Immediately following graduation, he married Dorothy, and enrolled in the Episcopal Theological School, in Cambridge, MA. While there he completed his field education at church of our savior in Milford, NH, and at St. Dunstan's in Ellsworth, ME, graduating in 1973.

Powell began his ordained ministry as the curate at trinity parish in his home state of Oregon, before being appointed vicar of St. Bede's forest grove, in 1975. While at St.

□ 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.

H3163

Bede's the liturgy was redesigned, Christian education expanded, the congregation began to actively engage the community, and a new church was built. These were fruitful years for the Powell family as well, marked by the birth of their three children, Charles Neff, Dorothy Louise, and Robert Bingham.

Bishop Powell was called to the diocese of North Carolina in 1983 to serve as archdeacon and deputy for program, with a special emphasis on Christian education, stewardship, and small churches. He helped to develop the Carolinas and Virginia small church leadership training program.

In 1991, he was called back to Oregon to serve as executive assistant to the bishop of Oregon, attending to administration, vocations, deployment, and secretary of convention and council.

Most recently, on June 22, 1996, he was elected the fifth bishop of southwestern Virginia during a special council held at St. John's church, in Roanoke. He was ordained and consecrated at Burriss auditorium on the campus of Virginia tech, later that year.

He is presently an associate of the society of St. John the evangelist, a member of the council of associated parishes for liturgy and mission, and a fellow of the college of preachers. In addition, he was appointed to the church deployment board of the national Episcopal Church in 1997.

Bishop Neff's life has been marked by continual service and dedication to the Episcopal Church and to the dictates of his personal faith. It is a distinct pleasure to welcome him to Washington today to open the United States House of Representatives in prayer, one of the finer traditions of this institution in which we humbly seek divine guidance and wisdom for the difficult tasks before us.

JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

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

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 363, nays 40, answered "present" 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

YEAS—363

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Berkley
Ackerman	Barcia	Berman
Aderholt	Barr	Berry
Akin	Barrett	Biggart
Allen	Bartlett	Billirakis
Andrews	Barton	Bishop
Army	Bass	Blumenauer
Baca	Becerra	Blunt
Baird	Bentsen	Boehlert
Baker	Bereuter	Boehner

Bonior	Greenwood	Miller, George
Bono	Grucci	Miller, Jeff
Boozman	Hall (TX)	Mink
Boswell	Hansen	Mollohan
Boucher	Harman	Moore
Boyd	Hastings (FL)	Moran (KS)
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Moran (VA)
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Morella
Brown (OH)	Hayworth	Myrick
Brown (SC)	Hill	Nadler
Bryant	Hilleary	Napolitano
Burr	Hinojosa	Neal
Burton	Hobson	Nethercutt
Buyer	Hoeffel	Ney
Calvert	Hoekstra	Northup
Camp	Holden	Norwood
Cannon	Holt	Nussle
Cantor	Honda	Oberstar
Capito	Hooley	Ortiz
Capps	Horn	Osborne
Cardin	Hostettler	Ose
Carson (IN)	Houghton	Otter
Carson (OK)	Hoyer	Owens
Castle	Hulshof	Oxley
Chabot	Hyde	Pallone
Chambliss	Inslee	Pascrell
Clay	Isakson	Pastor
Clayton	Israel	Paul
Clement	Issa	Payne
Clyburn	Istook	Pelosi
Coble	Jackson (IL)	Pence
Collins	Jackson-Lee	Petri
Combest	(TX)	Phelps
Condit	Jefferson	Pickering
Conyers	Jenkins	Pitts
Cooksey	John	Platts
Cox	Johnson (CT)	Pombo
Coyne	Johnson (IL)	Pomeroy
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Portman
Crenshaw	Johnson, Sam	Price (NC)
Crowley	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Putnam
Culberson	Kanjorski	Quinn
Cunningham	Kaptur	Radanovich
Davis (CA)	Keller	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kelly	Rangel
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Regula
Davis, Jo Ann	Kerns	Rehberg
Davis, Tom	Kildee	Reyes
DeGette	Kilpatrick	Reynolds
Delahunt	Kind (WI)	Rivers
DeLauro	King (NY)	Rodriguez
DeLay	Kingston	Roemer
DeMint	Kirk	Rogers (KY)
Deutsch	Kleczka	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Rohrabacher
Dicks	Kolbe	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	LaFalce	Ross
Doggett	LaHood	Rothman
Dooley	Lampson	Roybal-Allard
Doolittle	Langevin	Royce
Doyle	Lantos	Ryan (WI)
Dreier	LaTourette	Ryun (KS)
Duncan	Leach	Sanders
Dunn	Lee	Sandlin
Edwards	Levin	Sawyer
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Schakowsky
Ehrlich	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Schrock
Engel	Linder	Scott
Eshoo	Loftgren	Sensenbrenner
Etheridge	Lowey	Serrano
Evans	Lucas (KY)	Sessions
Everett	Lucas (OK)	Shadegg
Farr	Luther	Shaw
Ferguson	Lynch	Shays
Flake	Maloney (CT)	Sherman
Foley	Maloney (NY)	Sherwood
Forbes	Manzullo	Shimkus
Ford	Markey	Shows
Fossella	Mascara	Shuster
Frank	Matsui	Simmons
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)	Simpson
Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Skeen
Galleghy	McCullum	Skelton
Gekas	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Gibbons	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gillmor	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Gilman	McIntyre	Smith (WA)
Gonzalez	McKeon	Snyder
Goode	McKinney	Solis
Goodlatte	McNulty	Souder
Gordon	Meehan	Spratt
Goss	MEEK (FL)	Stearns
Graham	Meeks (NY)	Stenholm
Granger	Mica	Stump
Graves	Millender-	Stupak
Green (TX)	McDonald	Sullivan
Green (WI)	Miller, Gary	Sununu

Sweeney	Toomey	Waxman
Tanner	Towns	Weiner
Tauscher	Turner	Weldon (FL)
Tauzin	Udall (NM)	Wexler
Taylor (NC)	Upton	Whitfield
Terry	Velazquez	Wicker
Thomas	Vitter	Wilson (NM)
Thornberry	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Thune	Walsh	Wolf
Thurman	Wamp	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Watkins (OK)	Wynn
Tiberi	Watson (CA)	Young (FL)
Tierney	Watt (NC)	

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hefley	Sabo
Borski	Kennedy (MN)	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Stark
Capuano	Larsen (WA)	Strickland
Costello	Latham	Taylor (MS)
Crane	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
Cummings	Matheson	Udall (CO)
DeFazio	McDermott	Visclosky
English	McGovern	Waters
Fattah	Menendez	Watts (OK)
Filner	Obey	Weller
Fletcher	Olver	Wu
Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)	
Hart	Ramstad	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Lipinski Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29

Bachus	Hall (OH)	Roukema
Ballenger	Herger	Rush
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Sanchez
Bonilla	Hinchee	Saxton
Callahan	Hunter	Slaughter
Deal	Larson (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Ganske	Miller, Dan	Trafficant
Gephardt	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Gilchrest	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)
Gutierrez	Riley	

□ 1027

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 378, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session. The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo.

As soon as these preparations are complete, the House will immediately resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph. About 5 minutes after that, the House will proceed with the business of the House. One-minute recesses will be taken when the House reconvenes for business following the taking of the official photo.

For the information of the Members, when the Chair says, the House will be in order, we are ready to take our picture. That will be in just a few minutes.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1031

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 107th Congress.)

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 10:45 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 34 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 10:45 a.m.

□ 1045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON) at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, on Thursday, May 23, 2002, and Friday May 24, 2002, I was absent for several rollcall votes. Had I been here, I would like the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote 199, "yes" on rollcall vote 200, "yes" on rollcall vote 201, "yes" on rollcall vote 202, "no" on rollcall vote 203, "no" on rollcall vote 204, "yes" on rollcall vote 205 and "yes" on rollcall vote 206.

FINISH INS REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. FOLEY. Madam Speaker, in the last several days, there has been a lot of finger pointing and accusations about our agencies, the FBI and CIA. There is no question, we will do a thorough and complete review of what was known and what could have been done to thwart the terrorists on September 11. But the kind of cynical sniping at these fine agencies has to stop.

Our collective resolve against terrorism must remain united. We must stand beside our President and our leaders in order to extradite and remove these terrorists from our soil.

I strongly support major restructuring of the INS. We have passed a bill in this Chamber and sent it to the other end of the hall. That bill languishes on the Senate desk, and I urge the majority leader to start proceedings to hold a hearing or at least have a vote on that bill.

This past week in New York City, four Syrians arrested who had deportation orders against them, were released because they were not available to process them on Memorial Day. What a tragedy, that these criminals were in

our country and were not sent back to their own native country. They had the orders. They should have been deported.

I urge the Senate to adopt the INS reform bill and do so urgently.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that they should not urge the other body to take any actions.

PROVIDING CRITICAL INFORMATION TO PREVENT ABDUCTIONS

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I generally give my 1-minute each day on the issue of missing children, whether it is to talk about Ludwig Koonz, who has been abducted by his noncustodial mother to Italy, or whether it is talk about the Missing Children's Day, which we observed only a couple of weeks ago.

During that time, there was a survey that was done, it was done by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and ADVO, and it showed that many parents lack information critical to recovering children who have been abducted. The survey results show that many parents are missing opportunities to help prevent abductions.

Law enforcement tells us that information such as height, weight, eye color, and a recent photograph are critically important when searching for a child. However, the survey shows that 22 percent of parents do not know the height, weight, and eye color for all of their children; and in the event of an emergency, it is critical for parents to have readily available their child's accurate physical description and a recent photograph so that law enforcement can act immediately and effectively.

So, parents, take the time to get a good portrait ID-type photograph of each child, not just a low-quality snapshot. Parents need to take the responsibility of knowing about their children and being able and ready to respond in the event that something terrible happens such as that. Let us work to take care of our children.

DEATH TAX AND FARMERS

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, in my district in Pennsylvania we have some of the most productive farmland in America. In fact, it is known as the "Garden Spot" of America. Many of these farms have been in the same family for generations. A few of them date back to William Penn.

But these farms are in trouble. Taxes on the land are simply too high. Part of the problem lies right here in Washington. The estate tax, what some of us like to call the "death tax," takes as much as 60 percent of the farm's value when it passes from one generation to the next. Many times families have to sell half of the farm just to pay the death tax. That is not right.

Last year we voted to repeal the death tax; but unless we vote to get rid of it permanently, it will come back in 10 years.

Let us vote to kill the death tax for good and help Pennsylvania's and America's family farmers and small businesses stay in business.

CREATING A MEDICARE
PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the pressing need to create a prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

For almost a decade, Congress has been talking about a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and every time this issue comes up, excuses are made that it is just too expensive and we cannot afford it. Meanwhile, seniors are struggling every day to find ways to afford their life-saving medicines. They pay some of the highest prices in the world for their prescriptions; but because Medicare lacks a prescription drug benefit, 40 percent of the seniors pay for their prescriptions entirely out of pocket.

Last year, the Congressional Budget Office was projecting surpluses well into the next decade. We had the opportunity to do something about this. But instead of using the surpluses to create a Medicare drug benefit, we passed a bloated tax cut that eroded these surpluses and sent us back into an era of deficit spending.

This week we are going to take another vote to further extend these tax cuts. We have deficits as far as the eye can see, but the majority wants to dig that hole even deeper and pass tax cuts that will cost almost \$1 trillion over 10 years and will benefit less than 2 percent of the American people. Yet we tell seniors we cannot afford a prescription drug benefit.

COMMENDING SUNSET OF OUR
MEMORIES EXHIBIT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, today I recognize the students of Sunset High School's Holocaust Studies class and their instructor, Mr. Irv Madnikoff. Their hard work and dedication in remembering the Holocaust

through their class's exhibit "Sunset of Our Memories" should be commended.

This amazing class is one of its kind in Florida and has brought to our community this important presentation so that we can always remember the brave victims of the most deplorable time in the world's history. Over the past 3 years, 9,000 people have visited Sunset High School's interactive exhibit. One visitor commented that it was the best exhibit, next to the one in Washington, D.C., that he had ever seen.

I again want to express my sincere gratitude to Mr. Irv Madnikoff and his students at Miami's Sunset High School for taking an active role in keeping alive the memories of innocent Holocaust casualties.

CONDEMNING TERRORIST MURDERS IN ISRAEL

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, while America slept, another suicide bomber hit in Israel. Sixteen innocent people were killed, over 50 people were wounded, many of them critically. Our population is 50 times that of Israel. On a comparable scale, this would be like reading in our morning paper that 800 American citizens were massacred overnight, with some 2,500 wounded, many critically.

In his speech at West Point, the President clearly stated, "The only way to deal with terrorists is by preemptive action." We will have to do this wherever terrorists are planning to hit us, and the Israelis have to do it to protect their own citizens. This pattern of murder must come to an end.

ELIMINATING THE UNFAIR DEATH TAX

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

Mr. REHBERG. Madam Speaker, 2 decades ago Ronald Reagan reminded America that government does not tax to get money it needs, but will always find a need for the money it gets.

The death tax is an unfair burden designed to punish families that work to leave a better future for the next generation, and it is a tax the government can do without. Despite the class warfare being waged by some in this Chamber, eliminating the estate tax is not a tax cut for the rich; it is a desperately needed reform to save thousands of family businesses, farms and homes.

Madam Speaker, death should not be a taxable event. I urge my colleagues to abandon the gains of class warfare and send the Grim Reaper home empty handed this year by eliminating the death tax.

PROVIDING A FAIR PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN FOR SENIORS

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, the Bush administration wants to give seniors a prescription drug card that may save you 15 percent on your prescription drugs. "May save you."

Prescription drug charges are manipulated by the pharmaceutical companies. Take a look at this chart here in my district. When they bought their drugs with their card, they saved 12 cents. They advertised 30 to 40 percent savings, but actually saved 12 cents. When they came down here to buy their Combivent and their Diltiazem, if you take a look at it, with their card, they paid \$81.43. The cash price was \$47.49. There was no savings. The actual out-of-pocket increase was \$33.94. The drug companies manipulate these prices with or without a card.

The Democrats have a real plan. We believe every senior should have a prescription drug plan covered underneath Medicare and lower prices of the prescription drugs that we all need and use. So I would urge this body to reject any of the other plans that provide a card which is manipulated by the pharmaceutical companies and actually costs us money.

CONGRATULATING THE U.S. MEN'S SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. WALSH. Madam Speaker, early this morning while most Americans were sound asleep, about 1 billion people from all over the globe, myself included, watched a group of talented young American athletes do something truly remarkable.

Against all odds, the U.S. Men's Soccer Team defeated Portugal in the first game of the 2002 World Cup. The Portuguese were one of the favorites to win the World Cup outright, but our team prevailed 3 to 2. And it was no fluke. We took them apart in the first half with slashing attacks, and wore them down with tough defense in the second half. It was a balanced effort with everyone contributing under Coach Bruce Arena's guidance.

The win gave the U.S. the opportunity to move into the quarter finals, but they have more work to do. They play the host team Korea and then Poland, with the two best teams from the group moving on.

These young men have already exceeded expectations. They are off to the best start for any American team in history. Please tune in. Set the alarm clock for an early rise, brew some strong coffee and enjoy a great spectacle. They deserve our support.

SALUTING THE CITY OF CLEVELAND ON NEW SCHOOL

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, this morning I rise to salute the city of Cleveland; the CEO of the Cleveland Municipal School District, Barbara Byrd-Bennett; former mayor, Michael White; current mayor, Jane Campbell, because yesterday we broke ground on the first brand new school in the city of Cleveland in more than 20 years, AJ Rickoff Elementary School.

□ 1100

It will not only be a school center, but it will also have a library, and hopefully opportunities for parents to train from CCC College or Kiowa Community College.

It is just a wonderful thing, after Issue 14 passed last year, that we were able to break ground on a new school. We anticipate that we will build more than 40 new schools in the city of Cleveland over the next 5 years. Here is for education, here is for the Cleveland Board of Education, the Cleveland School Board, and here is for the children of the city of Cleveland.

I am thankful for the opportunity to be supportive. Let us build more schools.

OPPOSING RESURRECTION OF THE DEATH TAX

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against resurrecting the death tax. This tax allows the Federal Government to take up to 55 percent of the assets of an individual or small business when the owner dies, and this simply is not fair. These people have already paid taxes on everything they own. The death tax is simply a double taxation at the rate of nearly 50 percent higher than the highest income tax.

Countless farmers and small business owners in Kansas have urged me to do all I can to end this unfair tax. Who can blame them for wanting to leave their hard-earned businesses to their children?

I am proud that last year we voted to phase out the death tax, but this will become a hollow victory if a Senate provision allowing the death tax to be resurrected at the end of 7 years is allowed to stand. I am forced to tell my farmers and small businessmen that the death tax will not affect them, but only if they die in the year 2010.

Death should not be a taxable event. Let us finish what we started and kill the death tax once and for all.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

(Mr. RODRIGUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Madam Speaker, today I rise once again to ask for us to look at the prescription drug plan that would provide our seniors with immediate relief. As prices continue to soar out of control, our seniors struggle on fixed incomes. They struggle to pay for their blood pressure prescriptions, they struggle to pay for their anti-inflammatory medication that costs over \$1,800 a year.

Our seniors deserve better. They deserve to live their lives in dignity and without anxiety over whether they can eat or pay for their medication, or whether they can turn their heaters on or their air conditioners on. It is with great frustration that I continue to ask the Republicans to do the right thing, but they continue to push a limited plan that will not work. It will leave too many seniors behind.

Madam Speaker, it is time for us to bring a real prescription drug plan to the floor, one that is voluntary, one that is universal, one where every senior would have access, no matter where they live or what they do. Let us do the right thing and respond to our seniors.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE U.S. SOCCER TEAM

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

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), in extending congratulations to the U.S. Soccer Team.

Clearly, the greatest upset of the World Cup tournament has been this win of the U.S. team over Portugal. Coach Arena was extraordinarily bold in putting two great 20-year-olds in to ensure that they would have the chance to play a role in leading this team to victory.

Landon Donovan and DaMarcus Beasley are two new players who are obviously fighting very, very hard on behalf of the United States. As we head into the quarter finals, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) said, there are a billion people around the world who are following the World Cup, and I hope very much that more Americans are among them as we see a spectacular U.S. victory.

MIRANDA GADDIS AND ASHLEY POND FROM OREGON ARE STILL MISSING

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

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, on June 3 People Magazine featured two young women. I come before this House again today to alert those who may be watching in Oregon and across the Nation to the tragic

plight of two young teenagers from my district.

Miranda Gaddis and Ashley Pond, both 13 years of age, students at Gardiner Middle School in Oregon City and teammates on the school dance team, have been missing now for almost 3 months and 5 months. Ashley disappeared January 9; Miranda, March 8. Oregon City was shocked by the abduction of Ashley in January, and paid extra attention to keeping their children safe. Two months later and with their guard still up, the unthinkable happened and Miranda disappeared.

Both Ashley and Miranda were last seen by their mothers early in the morning as they left their homes at the Newell Village Creek apartments to catch the school bus. The FBI has confirmed that the disappearances appear to be related and that foul play is likely to be involved.

If Members have any information regarding Ashley or Miranda's whereabouts, I ask them to please contact their local FBI office. Let us not forget about our children. Let us not give up hope about our missing children.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE

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

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I stand in support of a comprehensive prescription drug plan. We need to do something for our seniors. Seniors are the ones that made our country great, and too often we forget their contribution and what they have done.

We have a responsibility. Today many of them are faced with a crisis, and I say with a crisis, because now they have to pay an abundance of dollars on a fixed income. It becomes so difficult for our seniors to put food on the table when they have to decide what to do: "Do I pay for medication that will relieve the pain and agony that I have?"

Some of these seniors have 15 to 30 prescription drugs that they have to pay for. It is too high. It has gotten ridiculous. This is not about profit, this is about taking care of the American people. This is about taking care of our seniors. We need to make sure that we come up with a comprehensive medical plan that covers them. We owe it to our seniors and we owe it to Americans, we owe it to this country.

I say, let us get behind a good, comprehensive plan that covers our seniors. They have suffered enough. Let us help them.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1372, EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2002

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 433 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 433

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1372) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Madam Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a normal conference report rule for the Senate bill, S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2002. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

In addition, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Madam Speaker, this should not be a controversial rule. It is the type of rule we grant every time for every conference report we consider in this House. The conference report itself is a strong step forward to help American manufacturers, American workers, and the American economy.

Madam Speaker, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2002 reauthorizes the bank for 4 years. The Ex-Im Bank plays a key role of promoting U.S. exports overseas and levelling the playing field of international trade, which is especially important to my area in North Carolina. The bank is an important tool for American manufacturers, enabling them to reach markets in which they would otherwise be closed out.

By reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank, we demonstrate our commitment to promoting U.S. goods throughout the world and the U.S. economy at home. It has important provisions that encourage small business transactions by increasing the small business mandate for Ex-Im from the current statutory minimum of 10 percent to a minimum of 20 percent of total Ex-Im financing, and that will help small business. It gives them a bigger share of the pie.

It also requires Ex-Im to conduct outreach and increase loans to socially-disadvantaged individuals, our women, and to businesses which employ fewer than 100 employees; again, a big help, especially when so many corporations and small businesses in our country are starting to do more export.

That is especially true in my area. We have a lot of small businesses that are exporting in the last couple of years North Carolina products that had never done that before, so we are always looking for ways to encourage that.

S. 1372 also contains strong provisions relating to the U.S. trade laws that will ensure Ex-Im does not contribute to the overcapacity or dumping of goods on U.S. markets. Again, that is an area that we have had a lot of problems with, with steel and with textiles, which is very, very important in my area of North Carolina, in South Carolina, and some of the other southern States.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), for his leadership in crafting this important provision.

Finally, I am pleased that this legislation requires that the bank, when considering whether to guarantee, ensure, or extend credit, will take into account the extent to which a nation has been helpful or not in efforts to eradicate terrorism. We must stop the flow of money from going to countries which support terrorism, and specifically those identified by the President as comprising the axis of evil.

To that end, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support the commonsense legislation it underlies.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased this conference report is on the floor today. It has strong bipartisan support, and I expect that it will pass overwhelmingly.

Since 1934, the Export-Import Bank has played a vital role in creating and sustaining millions of high-paying American jobs by supporting more than \$400 billion in U.S. exports. As American business and jobs have become more dependent on trade over the years, the importance of the Ex-Im Bank has only increased.

In today's world of global trade, the Export-Import Bank serves as an indispensable lender of last resort, filling financial gaps that would otherwise hurt many American businesses and their employees. Perhaps most importantly, the bank levels the playing field for many U.S. companies, allowing them to compete with foreign companies that have significant support from their own governments.

But Ex-Im Bank financing does more than support jobs at exporting companies. It helps sustain and create jobs at tens of thousands of U.S. suppliers around the country who participate indirectly in Export-Import Bank-financed exports. These indirect exporters, many of which are small businesses, supply components, services, and technology to U.S. exporters of a wide range of products and services as diverse as environmental technology, construction and agricultural equipment, amusement park rides, aircraft, furniture, and computer and telecommunications technology.

Export-Import Bank financing has a ripple effect. It sustains jobs at companies large and small throughout the U.S. economy in almost every State

and the great majority of congressional districts. Moreover, the bank makes good, sound investments for America. In fiscal year 2000, for example, the Ex-Im Bank used \$759 million as leverage to support more than \$15.5 billion in U.S. exporters. That has a tremendous bang for the buck.

In my north Texas district, where tens of thousands of jobs are directly dependent on exporting quality American products, we have seen firsthand just how important the Ex-Im Bank is to America's economy. For all these reasons, I am pleased that this conference report reauthorizes the bank for 5 years. That will provide U.S. companies and their workers with the certainty they need.

I urge the passage of this rule and of the underlying conference report.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the conferees, particularly my subcommittee chairman and friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for coming up with a good bill that will support our Nation's small manufacturing exporters.

Ex-Im is one of the few government programs that actually serves small businesses. Last year, 90 percent of Ex-Im's transactions and 18 percent of the dollar volume went to small exporters. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I am proud of what the conferees have done to further enhance exports from small firms. Many of our markets are saturated in this country. Ninety-six percent of the world's consumers live outside the U.S. This conference report recognizes this reality by helping provide small business exporters access to these tough but critical markets.

The conference report agreed with the House to double Ex-Im's set-aside for small businesses from 10 percent to 20 percent. This conference report directs more of Ex-Im's resources to small business outreach, including the very small businesses, those employing 100 workers or less, and women and minority-owned firms.

Finally, this conference report focuses on the importance of technology for small businesses, and directs Ex-Im to put out more of its applications process online and track its documents electronically to speed up its work.

This 5-year reauthorization bill is one piece of the puzzle to help manufacturers in the district I am proud to represent recover from the economic downturn. We are suffering immensely with an unemployment rate higher than the national average. Manufacturing has lost over 2 million jobs in the past 3 years, and northern Illinois has not been immune.

Compounding an already weak economy is the high value of the American dollar, stiff foreign competition, high

prices for steel, and tightening of credit, particularly for export finance. This conference report provides one tool to help offset the effect of the difficulty of obtaining trade finance for small business exporters.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It will help ensure that quality and price, not the lack of adequate export financing, is the key for a small business exporter to win a sale abroad.

□ 1115

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to the Export-Import Bank, and I do that as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade.

Madam Speaker, there is growing anger and frustration in this country at the increasing greed and illegal activities in corporate America. The American people are sick and tired of CEO salaries in the tens of millions of dollars, in the hundreds of millions of dollars that are now on average 500 times greater than what the average American worker receives. The American people and workers are sick and tired of CEOs slashing pension programs and health benefits for their retirees while corporate profits are soaring. The workers of this country are sick and tired of corporate America shutting down American plants, throwing American workers out of the street and taking our jobs to China, to Mexico where desperate people are forced to work for 20 cents an hour.

The American people are sick and tired of accounting gimmicks that cheat investors and employees. They are tired of CEOs setting up phony post office box companies in Bermuda so while the middle class pays more and more in taxes, CEOs and their corporations avoid their responsibilities in terms of taxes. And basically the American people are tired of corporate welfare. We are going to hear a whole lot in this body about making poor people responsible when it comes to corporate welfare. What about the CEOs and the major multinational corporations who get tens and tens of billions of dollars from the working families of this country? Some of my colleagues are going to tell us Export-Import Bank creates jobs, it does some good. Sure, it does. We give them a billion dollars a year, and we put at risk through loan guarantees some \$15 billion a year; and if one sat out on a street corner and one gave away a billion dollars a year, he would also do some good.

But the issue is are we getting value for the amount of money that we are spending, and the answer is obviously no. Madam Speaker, the outrage of the Export-Import Bank is that we are giving billions of dollars to the major job cutters in America. Yes, that is true.

The largest corporations who come into Export-Import to get their corporate welfare laugh all the way to the bank because these are precisely the people who lay off American workers and then say, thank you, workers, for subsidizing our efforts.

Let us look at these desperate companies that are getting the corporate welfare from Export-Import. It is Boeing, General Electric, Caterpillar, Mobil Oil, certainly in need of taxpayer support, Westinghouse, AT&T, Motorola, Lucent Technologies, IBM, Enron. Enron getting helped from Export-Import. The irony here is that not only should the taxpayers of this country not be supporting profitable multinational corporations but the irony is we give them money and they say thanks, we are moving to China, we are moving to Mexico. General Electric, a major recipient of export import, we give them a lot of money. What is the result? From 1975 to 1995, GE reduced its workforce from 667,000 American workers to 398,000. Boeing, the same thing, huge job layoffs.

Jack Welch, interestingly enough, the former CEO of GE, when he gets on the welfare line he said, "Ideally what you would have is to put every company on a barge." In other words, what he says is thank you for the money; but we are going to go anyplace in the world where we can get cheap labor.

In addition to its being corporate welfare, in addition to our, through Ex-Im, giving money to companies who have contempt for American workers, what also must be understood is that Export-Import is part of a failed trade policy. The United States trade deficit was \$346 billion in 2001, and the trade deficit in goods was \$426 billion. Let us wake up and understand that the permanent normalized trade relations with China is a failure. Yes, we gained some export jobs; but we are losing far, far more in terms of jobs being lost because companies have taken our jobs to China.

Over the past 4 years we have lost a total of 2 million factory jobs, representing 10 percent of our manufacturing workforce.

So the point here is Export-Import is part and parcel of a failed trade policy. Whether it is the most favored nation status with China, permanent normalized trade relations with China, NAFTA, that policy is failing. And it is time that we say we cannot continue to hemorrhage American jobs. Let me repeat. Under this great trade policy which Republican leaders talk about, some Democratic leaders talk about, corporate America and editorial boards say it is great; if it is so great, why between 1994 and 2000 have more than 3 million decent-paying manufacturing jobs been lost?

In 2001, the manufacturing sector lost 1.3 million jobs. In my own State of Vermont, a small rural State, small plant after small plant after small plant is closing down because they cannot compete against imports coming in

from China where workers are being paid 20 or 25 cents an hour. And it is time that this body finally said enough is enough. Yes, we get millions and millions of dollars from corporate America for our campaigns; yes, that is great that they come to \$25,000-a-plate fund-raising dinners. But what about the workers in rural Vermont, in California, in Illinois, in Ohio, who have lost their jobs? Maybe somebody should stand up for them. What about the high school graduates who used to be able to go out in the workforce and get a manufacturing job and make a living wage who today flip hamburgers at Burger King or McDonald's. Maybe they need a decent job even if they cannot contribute huge sums of money to this institution in terms of campaign contributions.

Our trade policy is a failure. Ex-Im is part of that trade policy. Let us defeat it for that reason. Let us end corporate welfare. Where are all of my conservative friends who want a balanced budget? Do you really want to give a billion dollars a year to some of the largest, most profitable corporations in America?

There are many reasons to defeat Ex-Im, but it is time that we stood up for the American taxpayer. It is time we stood up for the American worker. And it is time we told corporate America get off the welfare train. Start respecting American workers. Start respecting the United States of America. Do not sell our country out. Do not sell our workers out. Let us defeat Ex-Im.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). He is the chair of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises today in support of H. Res. 433, the rule under which the conference report of the Export-Import Bank or Ex-Im Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001, S. 1372, will be considered.

As is customary for conference reports under this privileged rule, there will be an hour of debate divided between the majority and minority with no amendments being made in order, of course.

As the chairman of the House Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade of the Committee on Financial Services, which has jurisdiction over this effort, the Member, of course, has a special interest in the Ex-Im Bank legislation. And, therefore, this Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the House Committee on Rules; the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the House Committee on Rules; and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), who is managing the time on our side of the aisle, for their efforts in bringing this rule before the House floor. In addition, I want to

thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the House Committee on Financial Services, for his leadership on the Ex-Im issues, and the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member of the House Committee on Financial Services, and the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), who he and I worked together on this legislation in compatible fashion, for their efforts on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

In contrast to what we have just heard, this is legislation which actually creates jobs in America, a great number of jobs.

The Ex-Im Bank is an independent U.S. Government agency that creates and sustains American jobs by providing direct loans to buyers of U.S. exports, guarantees to commercial loans to buyers of U.S. products and insurance products which greatly benefit short-term small business sales. So we are talking about American exports going abroad, things that are produced here by our American workers or farmers.

The Ex-Im Bank finances exports such as civilian aircraft, electronics, engineering services, vehicles, agricultural products; and the list is just as broad as you can possibly imagine.

To illustrate the importance of the Ex-Im Bank, in fiscal year 2000 the bank supported over \$15.5 billion in U.S. exports through an appropriation of \$759 million. It is important, however, to remember that the loans and loan guarantees that the bank issues, the transactions, are risk-based costs and insurance fees, so no Export-Import Bank is charging for the money loaned or loans guaranteed. And in almost every year in its 60-year existence, Ex-Im has produced a net profit for the Treasury over the appropriations given. Last year that net profit was over \$1 billion.

Madam Speaker, in the past 60 years, the Ex-Im Bank has supported more than \$300 billion in U.S. exports. Of course the Export-Import Bank is only intended to be a lender of last resort and not intended to compete with private lenders. Therefore, only about 2 percent of our exports use Ex-Im Bank transactions. For example, the Ex-Im Bank supports U.S. exporters in risky markets, and private financial institutions sometimes are unwilling or unable to do that. Yet the net default rate is less than 2 percent.

In fact, over the last 20 years, the Ex-Im Bank has an average loan default rate, as I said, of less than 2 percent of its total authorization. This bank was last reauthorized in 1997 for a 4-year period that initially expired on September 30. By extension, it will now expire on June 14 of this year. And the legislation which will be brought to this floor under the rule will be for a 5-year reauthorization.

When drafting the Export-Import Bank, the Member utilized the suggestions and recommendations of the distinguished chairman of the full committee and the ranking members of the committee and subcommittee and those of other members of the committee. We had a very democratic process in the subcommittee which extended into the committee deliberations. And many items in this important reform legislation, in many respects, came from the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, on May 1, we passed this House legislation by voice vote; but we are now at the point where we are prepared to take up the conference report. After a conference of only about 4½ hours, we reached numerous important decisions to bring the Congress this conference report. Importantly, we also clarified and resolved the dispute between the Export-Import Bank and the Treasury Department. I have every indication that the President will sign this legislation, and I thank the Committee on Rules and the House leadership for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, foreign trade has long been a critical component of our economy. So long, in fact, that it predates the founding of our Nation. And despite the ups and downs of the local global market, there is absolutely no doubt that the American economy is dependent on trade. Yes, we import far more goods than any other nation; and, yes, we have a trade deficit. I do not like it. No one likes it. But the only way to remedy it is to enhance our export sector. But when we examine the trade deficit, let us remember that we already export more goods and services than any other nation.

Those exports represent 10 percent of the United States' GDP; and they support 12 million jobs, including one in five manufacturing jobs. They are not all huge multinational conglomerates like a General Motors. The overwhelming majority, 97 percent, are small- and medium-sized businesses. In Oregon, these businesses and family farms are the backbone of our economy. They provide good paying and rewarding jobs, and it is my goal to make sure that there are a lot more of them.

If there is a company that wants to sell its goods to a new market, particularly one that poses some degree of risk as well as profitability, then all too often the only financing for them is from the Export-Import Bank.

□ 1130

Furthermore, Ex-Im financing does more than support jobs at exporting companies. It creates an enormous ripple effect in the supply chain.

For many companies that export, tens of thousands of U.S. suppliers around the country are indirect export-

ers, many of which are small businesses, supply component services and technology providers.

Madam Speaker, the evidence is clear. Overseas sales are no longer optional for most U.S. companies. To compete and succeed, they must play on a global stage, and Ex-Im Bank can provide the U.S. companies with the financing tools they need to accomplish this.

While not perfect, it is the best tool for the job at hand, and I ask my colleagues to support the conference agreement.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time. I thank the proponents of this legislation and those who have brought this compromise or conference report to the floor, I thank them for their work.

Madam Speaker, the business of America is creating jobs and it is business, and frankly I think it is realistic to understand the global markets that we now live in. When we think of countries like Germany and France and England, there is a large proponent or a large part of their economic framework that is supported by the government, companies owned by the particular nation, giving them the upper hand. That is the global market or the global business world of which many of our companies compete with.

Although I may have some concerns about the whole issue of trade without regulation, I believe the Export-Import Bank is a good balance because what it does is it gives an even playing field or maybe even a leg up, a reasonable leg up to the businesses of America who are trying to compete internationally, competing against the major discounts and the major waivers that are given to corporations owned by the particular country of which they have to compete with.

I am very glad that in this legislation we have the tied aid credit fund which then requires those donor countries who are receiving benefit from the Export-Import Bank to buy resources from the United States. That creates jobs.

I am also pleased how this impacts our agricultural community, giving them the opportunity to have a two-way street.

The Advisory Committee for Sub-Saharan Africa, having been a supporter of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and listening now to ambassadors from Africa and presidents from Africa, in the sub-Saharan continent they are saying that it is working, but they are also looking for added enhancement, and this advisory committee should get busy by creating opportunities for businesses in the United States to do more business in sub-Saharan Africa.

This will generate these countries from being dependent to independent, along with, of course, the balance of debt relief which I so strongly support.

We also are very pleased that there is an anti-dumping order in this legislation; that the legislation includes issues on human rights, anti-terrorism, renewable energy and, of course, anti-fraud and corruption. That is key because we have seen over the last couple of months and the last year a falling from grace of many of our corporations that have not been following the rule of law or the ethics of which we would expect for them to do.

This should not be a wasteful legislative initiative. This should not be where we are taken advantage, but it should open the doors of opportunity.

My last point, however, Madam Speaker, is my concern. Yes, it is good that we move from 10 percent to 20 percent in assisting small businesses, but I believe we should move to 30 and 40 percent. Small businesses are the backbone of America. I would like to see them engage in international activities and trade and business. They can do so with the Export-Import Bank at a higher percentage of participation for them.

I would encourage my colleagues respectfully to consider that, and finally, Madam Speaker, I would simply say we must create businesses and lessen corruption. We can do that by supporting international businesses and jobs in America with supporting this legislation.

Madam Speaker, the Export-Import Bank has a very specific mission related to the promotion of American exports. This mission is to create and sustain American jobs by helping to finance American exports that would otherwise not be available in over 150 countries.

The Bank is required to not compete with the private sector, but rather steps in where commercial bank financing is insufficient or unavailable. They support exports that, due to the absence of competitive financing, otherwise would not take place—meaning loss of a sale and an impact on American jobs.

The Ex-Im Bank operates in a very competitive international environment, in which export credit agencies in other countries are increasingly aggressive in supporting the exports of our competitors. The Bank is critical in countering these transactions, by providing leverage for the U.S. to negotiate a gradual reduction in export subsidy activities among OECD members.

In a word, absent the Export-Import Bank, American exporters would find themselves competing against foreign exporters who receive government subsidies. Consequently, with the loss of key export markets, American exporters would lose export-oriented jobs. These jobs pay 18% more on average than non-export jobs.

The Ex-Im Bank does more than just provide a level playing field for American exports. The Bank has the charge of providing critical export financing in cases where there is a market failure in private lending. Frequently, these failures relate to the nature of the exporter. For example, small businesses often face problems attaining private credit for export transactions. For this, the Ex-Im Bank has

been a critical source of support for small business exporters nationwide.

The Export-Import Bank does not exist to promote exports by subsidizing American companies who are engaged in fair and open practices for business. The Ex-Im Bank does exist to defend American companies engaged in non-competitive markets. Therefore, the Bank's ultimate goal is to discourage these non-competitive practices.

In fiscal year 2001, the Ex-Im Bank supported \$12.5 billion of American exports to emerging markets around the world, enabling many American companies to maintain and even expand their workforces. And 90 percent of the total number of Ex-Im Bank-supported transactions in fiscal year 2001 were in direct support of small business. Ex-Im Bank financing has a ripple effect that sustains jobs at companies large and small throughout the American economy, in almost every state and the great majority of congressional districts.

Ex-Im Bank steps in where the competition is toughest for American exporters, where they must compete to win export sales against foreign companies backed by their government's official export credit agencies.

Market failures are related to the nature and location of the export market. Markets in Sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere in the developing world are frequently overlooked by private export credit. Ex-Im goes where private lenders are unwilling to go, to the ultimate benefit of these developing countries, the United States, and the global economy.

Ex-Im's charge to go into under-served markets is particularly relevant today, when economic engagement with other countries is an essential element of foreign policy and national security. In the months since last September, we have had to move very quickly to determine how best to reach out to countries and people who were previously of too little interest to the United States and other wealthy countries. Certainly, much has been achieved already in the war on terrorism by high-level engagement between the Bush Administration and foreign leaders. But top-level diplomacy will ultimately fail if it is not supported by bottom-up engagement in the political, social and economic spheres.

Here is where institutions like the Ex-Im Bank have a critical role to play. With each export transaction supported by the Bank, we have made a new connection and developed a new familiarity with a market, a people, and a country that had previously been slightly more foreign to us. With thousands of these transactions, we take a thousand steps forward toward a world of interdependence and prosperity—in short, a world in which terrorism finds it hard to exist.

S. 1372 emphasizes the need to expand outreach to small businesses. There are barriers to the Ex-Im Bank assistance for small business. Technology enhancements are critical to any meaningful effort to expand services for small businesses. However, for small businesses, working with the Ex-Im Bank may be a daunting prospect. This legislation can go a long way toward bringing in new small businesses and serving them better by expanding the use of technology throughout the transaction process. As a result, the legislation expands the budget authority for technology upgrades and provides guidance to the Ex-Im Bank on the implementation of new technologies.

The Ex-Im Bank has supported \$1 billion in American exports to sub-Saharan Africa during the last two years, covering products and services ranging from bread-making equipment and agricultural machinery to commercial aircraft and construction equipment.

The Ex-Im Bank is an integral part of the American government's initiative to expand our country's economic engagement with sub-Saharan Africa.

In 2001, the Ex-Im Bank expanded its Sub-Saharan Africa pilot program to 16 countries in the region, allowing the Bank to support exports to certain markets in which the Bank would not otherwise be open for business. The program provides short-term insurance coverage to help businesses in the region buy American goods such as spare parts, raw materials, and agricultural commodities.

The Ex-Im Bank is working hard with African banks such as the PTA Bank in Nairobi and African regional development banks such as the ECOWAS Fund in Togo, pursuing agreements and partnerships to encourage these financial institutions to lend to customers purchasing American goods and services.

There is probably no market in the world where the the Ex-Im Bank has worked harder during the last two years than Nigeria. The Bank has financed exports ranging from solar-powered billboards and printing equipment to cement bagging equipment, a metal frame warehouse and dredging equipment for the Port of Lagos.

By providing guarantees for South African rand and CFA franc-denominated loans, the Ex-Im Bank has made it easier for American exporters to sell their products to Southern and West Africa.

As we require the Ex-Im Bank to expand its assistance and outreach to small businesses in developing societies, we should provide more, not less, funding for the administrative expenses that will come with this effort.

I support this bill and urge my colleagues to support as well.

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her statement. She has described some of the very important new reforms in the legislation, and I would just say to the gentlewoman that I, too, and the whole subcommittee and committee and the conferees of both Houses would like to see more small business involvement in the Ex-Im Bank.

I would say this. Over half the transactions of the Export-Import Bank do involve small business. We would like to see more than 18 percent of total resources going to small business, and that is why we are pushing them a little higher to a figure of 20 percent.

We started out, at the gentleman from Vermont's (Mr. SANDERS) initiative, aiming for an even higher level. I would like to see that at a higher level, but over half the transactions do involve small businesses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his work and I appreciate that.

Whenever I have gone into the district, as my colleague well knows, all of us probably have a higher percentage of small businesses in our respective communities than maybe our large corporations, so we appreciate them both, and I have always sought to encourage them to see the world in a larger viewpoint. I think these kinds of very valuable resources should help them.

I am glad to know that a large percentage are participating, and I hope that as we work through that increase, 20 percent can go up higher as well, and I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

One more thing I might say. We found that the technology in the office of the Export-Import Bank was very obsolete. They recognized that fact but they have not spent enough money to improve it. If we make that situation better, small business is going to have better access to the Bank. Currently small businesses do not have the capacity to work the Ex-Im Bank process as easily as some of the larger firms. So we think by mandating improvement in this area, setting aside a separate budget category for updating the technology in the office, the Ex-Im Bank will be more accessible to small business. That, too, I think is an advance.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would simply say, as my colleague well knows, the vice chair of the Export-Import Bank is Eduardo Aguirre who hails from Texas and knows that he has a balancing concern about small businesses. I applaud the technology issue, and I would encourage, I do not know how many times they have done this, I would encourage the Export-Import Bank to get out on the road as well, do a little bit more of that and do some educational outreach to our small business community around the Nation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, that is good advice, and I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. FROST. Madam Speaker, we have no further requests for time. I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of our time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 433, I call up

the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1372) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 24, 2002 at page H3064.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, under clause 8 of rule XXII, I seek to control one-third of the time in opposition to the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) favor the conference report?

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I favor the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the time will be divided three ways. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge passage of the conference report to accompany S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2002. This is a sound piece of legislation that will help U.S. exporters reach markets overseas, will maintain U.S. manufacturing jobs and will help the economy grow.

We have worked in a bipartisan manner throughout this process, and the House measure passed the Committee on Financial Services by voice vote and also passed on the floor of the House on May 1 by a voice vote, also. It is important to note that this support carried through to the conference report which was signed by every conferee, save one.

Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERUTER); the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), my esteemed colleague; and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER) for their hard work on the conference com-

mittee. Without the dedication and hard work of these Members, this reauthorization would not have reached the floor today.

Madam Speaker, our manufacturers face stiff competition from foreign companies seeking to expand the sale of their goods overseas. There is little argument that goods made in the U.S. are the highest quality and are in great demand. However, foreign companies receive significant assistance from their export credit agencies in finding markets and negotiating prices for their goods.

Without the Ex-Im Bank, U.S. exporters would be forced to compete in this international marketplace with one hand tied behind their backs. Ex-Im levels the playing field of international trade by allowing U.S. companies to compete on the quality of their products.

In a perfect world, we would not need export credit agencies, and the free market would operate without distortions. Because foreign manufacturers receive aid through export credit agencies, the United States must have a strong Ex-Im Bank in order to fight fire with fire.

Currently, some 70 governments around the world have export credit agencies like Ex-Im providing more than \$500 billion a year in government-backed financing. Madam Speaker, as long as foreign governments are financing export credit agencies, we must support Ex-Im to ensure that our manufacturers and workers remain competitive in the global marketplace.

This conference report is about U.S. jobs. Without the Ex-Im Bank, many companies would lose bids to supply U.S. manufactured goods overseas or would simply move their production operation to other countries where they could receive export credit financing.

In testimony before the Committee on Financial Services last year, the president of a division of Case New Holland, Richard Christman, stated that when the company was deciding whether to construct a combine assembly plant in the U.S. or in Brazil, one of the primary factors they took into consideration was whether export credit financing would be available to sell their goods overseas. Because there was the possibility of Ex-Im Bank financing for the goods produced in the plant in the United States, Case decided to build their plants in the U.S.

This one decision created hundreds of jobs in our country and ensured that suppliers and other businesses affected by the operation of a major assembly plant would continue to benefit as a result of the Ex-Im Bank. These are real jobs and real exports that directly affect our economy.

Critics of Ex-Im claim that it is corporate welfare for the largest companies in the United States. That charge is simply not accurate for several reasons. First, approximately 90 percent of Ex-Im's transactions are with small

businesses. Those businesses rely on Ex-Im to help them access overseas markets that they would otherwise not be able to reach. This conference report seeks to continue to increase the exposure of small businesses to Ex-Im Bank products by doubling the minimum dollar value of small business financing that the bank must pursue.

Second, while many of Ex-Im Bank's higher dollar transactions do go to larger companies, we should remember that those large companies utilize supplies from many small- and medium-sized businesses in order to create those products.

Third, Ex-Im serves as the lender of last resort for U.S. exports when commercial financing is not available for export sales. Without the Ex-Im Bank supplying this kind of high risk financing, many sales would not be made, and many U.S. workers would be without jobs.

Finally, let me make it clear that Ex-Im financing is not free. Ex-Im charges interest on its direct loans and premiums for its guarantees and insurance costs that the U.S. exporter usually passes through to its overseas customer. From the exporter's and customer's point of view, the bank does not subsidize the cost of financing an export transaction. Ex-Im is no less expensive to use than a commercial bank or other financial intermediary.

The opponents of this conference report have been trying to paint this as a giveaway for U.S. corporations, and it is most certainly not. This conference report goes a long way to protect workers, to encourage more small business transactions, to aid the environment and to protect human rights. I encourage my colleagues who may instinctively be opposed to this measure to take a good hard look at this conference report, think about how it will benefit U.S. business and the economy, and then support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1145

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

I am pleased to rise in support of the conference report authorizing the Export-Import Bank through 2006. I want to commend the full committee chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), most especially the chairman of the relevant subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BERUTER), who has worked on these issues so arduously over the years, but also very especially my friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), for his diligence in focusing attention on workers' issues and the role that the bank should play in job creation. Especially as a result of his efforts, this legislation clearly establishes that the bank's objective in all of its transactions shall be to contribute to maintaining or increasing the employment of workers in the United States.

The conference report contains many strong provisions, and I would like to highlight just a few. The legislation doubles the share of small business transactions that must be undertaken by the bank. It also emphasizes outreach to women and minority-owned businesses as well as businesses employing 100 or fewer workers. The bank will be required to report on progress toward increasing transactions and expanding outreach in each of these areas on an annual basis.

With the active participation of members of the steel caucus, we were able to strengthen language that prohibits Ex-Im transactions in areas where there has been a violation of our trade laws. The language also raises the bar for consideration of transactions when preliminary determinations of economic injury have been made. As a whole, this language will ensure that Ex-Im does not support projects, steel-related or otherwise, that would contribute to the oversupply of a good in a way that would cause harm to our domestic economy.

The legislation also establishes new requirements and guidelines on renewable energy, human rights and efforts to combat terrorism, fraud and corruption in foreign markets. I would like to recognize a handful of Democratic Members for the role they played in helping to craft many of these provisions: the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for their work on the fraud and corruption provisions; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her efforts on outreach to women and minority-owned businesses; the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) for his efforts on antiterrorism measures; and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her work on improving human rights assessments in Ex-Im transactions.

In sum, though it is long overdue, this is a strong reauthorization bill that benefited from substantial input from Democratic Members, and I believe it will enable the Ex-Im Bank to fulfill its mission in the years ahead.

Finally, let me respond directly to the charges of corporate welfare that are often leveled against the Ex-Im Bank. First, it is a simple fact that each export transaction supported by the bank either supports existing American jobs or creates new American jobs. Absent Ex-Im support, thousands of export transactions would go unfunded each year, transactions involving big companies and small businesses, as well as those involving large export markets, like Mexico, and small export markets like that of Namibia.

As much as we hear about Ex-Im support for very large companies, the fact is that fully 90 percent of the bank's transactions last year directly supported small businesses and, as a result, helped to support thousands of small businesses and their workers in communities both urban and rural across the entire United States.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Our current trade policy is an absolute disaster. Export-Import Bank is an inherent part of that disastrous trade policy. The gentleman I am going to ask to speak in a moment comes from the State of Ohio, as does the chairman of the full committee, and they should know that between 1994 and 2000, under our disastrous trade policy, in Ohio alone 135,000 jobs were lost because of our disastrous trade policy.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who has been a strong fighter for the working people of his State and his country.

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the conference report.

Madam Speaker, when the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act was considered on the House floor on May 1, I offered an amendment that requires this bank to have applicants for financing disclose whether they have been found to have violated the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Critically, the amendment also requires Ex-Im to maintain its own list of entities that have violated this act.

Under my amendment, I stated on the floor of the House that Ex-Im would request that applicants report whether or not they have been found guilty by a U.S. court to have been in violation of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Ex-Im would also independently keep a list of companies that have violated the act.

This independent list is crucial in order to deter applicants from withholding information about prior violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. Now, upon offering this amendment, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade of the Committee on Financial Services expressed his support for the measure. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1, 2002, his words were, and I quote, "The gentleman's amendment, I think, is highly appropriate. This kind of information should be made available and, in fact, generated, if necessary, within the Export-Import Bank."

Clearly, then, the distinguished chairman understood the intent of my amendment, information on Foreign Corrupt Practice Act violators would be gathered both by requiring applicants to disclose prior violations and by requiring the Export-Import Bank itself to independently and internally compile a list of violators.

Unfortunately, Madam Speaker, the report has come out of the House-Senate conference on this bill, and it thoroughly guts this critical provision. Rather than require the Ex-Im Bank to independently search court records and compile a list of FCPA violators, the

report only requires the bank to maintain a record of all applicants that have volunteered information on their Foreign Corrupt Practices Act history. Moreover, an applicant for Ex-Im financing only need disclose the violations that have occurred in the prior 12 months.

Consider what this means. The only way the Export-Import Bank can find out whether an applicant has violated the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act is if the company volunteers this information. And if the violation occurred more than a year before a company seeks Ex-Im funding, the company does not even have to mention it. So if a company lies about prior violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, if they lie about it, the Export-Import Bank would never know it.

Madam Speaker, the Enron debacle should make it clear to all of us that certain corporations will do absolutely anything to increase their profits. So what is the net result of the amendment that I offered and that the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade supported on May 1? Nothing.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand against allowing the Enrons of the world to continue to bilk the American taxpayer for enormous sums of money; and perhaps more importantly, I urge my colleagues to take a stand in favor of the rules of this hallowed House. I offered an amendment, the intent of which was made perfectly clear in my floor statement, was clearly understood and supported by the chairman of the relevant committee, and approved by the Members of this body. And the result, after conference, is the wholesale gutting of the provision's intent.

Conferees do not have the authority to read duly passed legislative provisions any which way they please, in gross contradiction of the duly established legislative history of the measure.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on the conference report.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, who has been a force throughout this whole process.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

This is important legislation. Furthermore, the conference report makes very important, very substantial, highly desirable changes and reforms to the transaction ability of the Export-Import Bank. I am pleased to see that so many Members have made contributions.

The gentleman from New York has mentioned a number, appropriately, on his side of the aisle that have specific provisions which resulted in this legislation being advanced and improved;

and I would like to also mention, of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), who will be speaking shortly about his provisions that are extremely important and make sure that we are not helping by providing assistance to American exporters to increase steel production abroad, for example. He will enlarge on that issue. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) for his effort on behalf of small business.

If we have problems for our workers because of what some people deem to be inadequacies in our trade law, or because of the competition we face from foreign export credit agencies, well, we should not cut off the hand of one of our workers in the process and expect we are going to do better. If we would defeat this legislation to disarm the Export-Import Bank, that is exactly what we would do.

This legislation, indeed, as the chairman said, is about jobs. It has created an extraordinary number of jobs; and it turns a profit for the American Treasury on top of it, last year over \$1 billion of net income to the United States. Why? Because not only did we expand our exports, and that results in revenue, but this bank charges risk-based transaction fees and costs. Overall, of course, we want the private sector to provide the credit, and they have. Only 2 percent of our exports are financed with the loans or loan guarantees of this entity.

We have made important reforms and clarifications in the relationship between the Treasury and the Export-Import Bank that will assure that in those small number of cases, but very important cases, where we face unfair competition, subsidies from export credit agencies of other major exporting companies, that we have a chance to assist our exporters. That is about 2 percent of the total provisions. Actually, we have only used it two or three times a year and probably underutilized the so-called "war chest."

I would like to address specifically the comments of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH). I remember well that colloquy, and in fact section 19 addresses important information to be considered by the Export-Import Bank in considering their transactions. While it is true that we rely to some extent upon the information provided to the Export-Import Bank for their determinations, section 21 also enlarges the Chafee amendment to ensure that we have enforcement of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the Arms Export Control Act, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, and the Export Administration Act. All of these are new reforms, additions to the Chafee language.

And I will say there are a very small number of violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act that are pursued in our country, and we know which ones they are. So it is not just that we are relying on the information pro-

vided by the applicant for a transaction. That information is readily available. There are not that many, fortunately, violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. I wish we could say the same for other countries whose export credit agencies we face in competition.

I would say that the resources we make available focus to a major extent on small businesses, and we are trying to improve that, are really very inadequate compared to our gross national product. In fact, in absolute terms, six countries, major export countries, including our neighbor Canada, provide much more in the way of resources for assistance to their exporters than we do. But this is a step forward, a big step forward.

The advisory committee on sub-Saharan Africa is reauthorized. We provided additional assistance to try to make sure American exporters do focus on exports to Africa. We have made a number of other initiatives that make sure that minority-owned businesses are given special consideration. And those things are due to a bipartisan effort on the part of the subcommittee and committee members.

So Members of the House, this is good legislation. We have worked out our difficulties in a conference with the Senate. It creates an IG at the insistence of the Senate. We welcome that kind of addition. We want to make sure that the resources of the Federal Government, even though they are repaid and redoubled, are spent well and in a manner that Members can feel good about. And that is what this legislation does.

Madam Speaker, this Member rises today in support of the conference report for S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization (Ex-Im Bank) Act of 2001, which is being considered under a Rule. This important legislation extends the authorization of the Ex-Im Bank until September 30, 2006, and makes other appropriate changes to the charter of the Ex-Im Bank. The authorization of the Ex-Im Bank is set to expire on June 14, 2002. This Member, as the Chairman of the House Financial Services Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, has a special interest in the Ex-Im Bank, which has jurisdiction over this subject.

This Member would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the Chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, (Mr. OXLEY) for his leadership on Ex-Im Bank issues. This Member would also like to thank both the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Ranking Member of the House Financial Services Committee, (Mr. LAFALCE) and the distinguished gentleman from New York, the Ranking Member of the House Financial Services Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, (Mr. SANDERS) for their efforts in bringing this conference report to the House Floor.

This Member would also like to thank all the other conferees of this legislation, including the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, the Chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, (Mr. SARBANES) and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Ranking Member

of the Senate Banking Committee (Mr. GRAMM).

As this Member mentioned earlier during the discussion of the rule for this conference report, the Ex-Im Bank is an independent U.S. Government agency that creates and sustains American jobs by providing direct loans to buyers of U.S. exports, guarantees to commercial loans to buyers of U.S. products, and insurance products which greatly benefit short-term small business sales. It is also important to note that the Ex-Im Bank charges risk-based interest and fees on the users of its products. As a result, last year, the Ex-Im Bank generated \$1 billion of net income to the Treasury of the U.S. Government.

On September 10, 2001, this Member introduced the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001 (H.R. 2871). On October 31, 2002, the House Financial Services Committee passed this legislation by a voice vote. Thereafter, on May 1, 2002, this legislation was passed by the House Floor by voice vote. Furthermore, a conference committee was then convened with the Senate on their version of the Ex-Im Bank legislation. On May 21, 2002, the conferees met and resolved the remaining outstanding issues in the conference report. On May 24, 2002, the conference report for the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001 was filed with the signatures of 15 of the 16 conferees.

This Member would like to briefly summarize the following seven provisions of this conference report:

1. Reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank;
2. Reauthorization of Sub-Saharan Africa Advisory Committee and added emphasis on Africa;
3. Small business;
4. Increase in statutory Ex-Im Bank statutory ceiling for loans, grants, and insurance;
5. The Ex-Im Bank/Treasury relationship over the Tied Aid War Chest becoming explicit;
6. The \$18 million guarantee approved by the Ex-Im Bank to support the sale of computer software by American exporters to Benxi Iron and Steel Co. in China; and
7. The inspector general.

First, the conference report of S. 1372 reauthorizes the Ex-Im Bank until September 30, 2006. As a result of this provision, the program budget, which supports the loans, guarantees, and insurance products of the Ex-Im Bank, and the administrative budget, which pays for all salary and overhead expenses, are both effectively authorized for such sums as are appropriated through FY2006.

Moreover, during the Subcommittee's first hearing on this subject, the Ex-Im Bank personnel testified that they were in desperate need of a technology upgrade which would particularly benefit small business users of the Ex-Im Bank. As a result, this conference report creates a technology budget subcategory within the Administrative budget.

Second, this conference report focuses on the efforts of the Ex-Im Bank in Sub-Saharan Africa. For example, the 1997 Ex-Im Authorization Act required the expansion of its financial commitments in Sub-Saharan Africa and reauthorized an advisory committee on this subject to make recommendations to the Board of Directors on how the Ex-Im Bank can encourage and facilitate greater support for American trade with Africa. This conference report would reauthorize the Sub-Saharan Africa Advisory Committee until September 30, 2006.

Third, this conference report makes very important changes which will encourage additional small business transactions with the Ex-Im Bank. It would require that the Ex-Im Bank earmark at least 20 percent of its total financing for small businesses. Under current law, the Ex-Im Bank is required to use only 10 percent of its total financing for small businesses. As of FY2000, the Ex-Im Bank provided about 18 percent of its total financing for small business. In addition, this conference report requires the Ex-Im Bank to focus on technology improvements, including allowing customers to use the Internet to apply for the Ex-Im Bank's small business programs. These efforts will greatly improve small business outreach.

Fourth, the Ex-Im Bank has a current \$75 billion statutory ceiling on its portfolio of loans, guarantees, and insurance that are outstanding at any one time. Under this conference report, this statutory ceiling would be increased to \$100 billion by FY2006. Increasing the Ex-Im statutory portfolio ceiling is one of the remedies needed to authorize the financial resources for the Ex-Im Bank to enable it to protect American exporters against unfair competition from the much more generous resources of our major export competitors. For example, according to the latest available data, the U.S. Export-Import Bank has a substantially lower level of export credit resources than the following seven countries: Japan, France, Korea, Canada, Germany, and the Netherlands.

Fifth, you will be interested to know that this legislation also would make very important clarifications in the administration of the Tied Aid War Chest which finances tied aid transactions. The Tied Aid War Chest was intended to be used by the Ex-Im Bank to protect American exporters by matching the concessionary financing of foreign export credit agencies. Unfortunately, the Tied Aid War Chest has been grossly under-utilized, which is due in part to the disagreements between the Ex-Im Bank and the Department of Treasury on how to use the Fund. In recent applications for the Tied Aid War Chest, there has been an obvious communication and organizational breakdown between the Ex-Im Bank and the Treasury Department. Moreover, the Ex-Im Bank and the Department of Treasury have had different legal interpretations as to their current statutory role over the use of the Tied Aid War Chest. The Conference Report resolves that issue.

Therefore, this legislation would address these past problems by creating a new definitive step-by-step process to be followed by the Ex-Im Bank and the Treasury Department regarding how the Tied Aid War Chest is to be administered. This conference report requires the Department of Treasury and the Ex-Im Bank to set the principles, process and standards on how the Tied Aid War Chest is used. It requires Ex-Im Bank, not the Treasury Department, to make case-by-decisions on the use of the Tied Aid War Chest. This conference report strikes the current language in the Ex-Im charter which states that the use of the Tied Aid War Chest "must be in accordance with the Secretary of the Treasury's recommendations . . ."

It is important to note that an addition was made to the Tied Aid War Chest section. The conference report explicitly states that the Ex-Im Bank will not approve a use of the Tied Aid War Chest if the President determines, after

consulting with the Ex-Im Bank and the Secretary of the Treasury, that the extension of tied aid would materially impede the enforcement of existing Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) arrangements or future negotiations within the OECD. Giving the President an opportunity to stop any transaction is entirely appropriate and only makes explicit powers the President already has. This Member was pleased to endorse this change as were the House and Senate conferees who accepted it. The legislative language in the conference report is clear that such presidential power is not transferable to the Treasury Department or any other agency.

The industry groups continue to be in strong support of this tied aid clarification. U.S. exporters have a vested interest in the tied war chest becoming a viable tool in fighting and deterring concessionary financing by foreign export credit agencies.

Sixth, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) successfully offered an amendment at the House full Committee markup of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001, which passed by voice vote, that addressed the \$18 million guarantee approved by the Ex-Im Bank on December 19, 2000, to support the sale of computer software by American exporters to Benxi Iron & Steel Co. in Benxi, Liaoning, China. The Toomey amendment conforms Ex-Im lending to current U.S. trade laws by barring any Ex-Im loan or guarantee to an entity for the production of substantially the same product that is the subject of a countervailing duty or anti-dumping order or a Section 201 determination by the International Trade Commission. In addition, this conference report also requires the Ex-Im Bank to develop procedures and set up a comment period for loans or loan guarantees to a business which is subject to a preliminary countervailing trade duty or anti-dumping determination of material injury.

The conference report includes the exact language of the Toomey amendment with one addition which was offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and accepted by the conferees. This addition requires the Ex-Im Bank to consider, for transactions over \$10 million, Section 201 investigations that have been initiated at the request of the President, the USTR, the Senate Committee on Finance, the House Committee on Ways and Means, or by the International Trade Commission. Also, the conference agreement requires the Ex-Im Bank to conduct a comment period for these types of transactions.

Lastly, it is important to note that the House conferees did accept the provision from the Senate Ex-Im bill which creates a Presidentially appointed inspector general for the Ex-Im Bank. According to a General Accounting Office (GAO) report on this subject dated September 6, 2001, the Ex-Im Bank has the largest budget authority of any Federal entity currently that does not have an inspector general.

Madam Speaker, in conclusion, over the last sixty years, the Ex-Im Bank has supported more than \$300 billion in U.S. exports. Because the Ex-Im Bank creates and sustains American jobs, it needs to be reauthorized. Moreover, this Member fully expects the President to sign this conference report into law when it is presented to him.

For the reasons stated and many others, this Member urges his colleagues to pass the conference report to the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001.

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York City (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank our ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this important bill.

I am pleased to rise today in support of the conference report for the Export-Import Bank through 2005. Today's vote has been a very long time in coming. Over the past year, Congress has passed a 6-month extension and a series of 30-day extensions to keep the bank in business as work on the conference report moved forward.

□ 1200

Madam Speaker, this final conference report represents the sum of all that work, and I believe it sets the bank on a strong course for the next couple of years. As some of my colleagues have stated, the Ex-Im Bank is a successful government entity that facilitates and supports American businesses and worker interests by making exports possible to areas of the world that would otherwise be closed to U.S. companies.

The conference report builds on the past successes of the bank which supported \$12.5 billion of U.S. exports in 2001, and has supported a total of over \$400 billion of U.S. exports in its 68-year history. It is very important to the district that I represent. Since 1995, the Export-Import Bank has supported over \$1 billion in exports out of my district alone.

While outreach to small businesses has been an increasing emphasis for the bank in recent years, the conference report strengthens this program. It directs the bank to improve its customer service and technology interface with small businesses, and doubles the value of bank support that must go to small businesses from 10 to 20 percent of the bank's total. Having recently met with a group of small business leaders and exporters in my district, I can tell Members this is a positive step and I would certainly support, as some of my colleagues have mentioned, a greater proportion going to small businesses.

Members concerned about small businesses should also be aware that this language in the conference report coincides with the signing of a memorandum of cooperation between the bank and the Small Business Association last month. Under this agreement, a new joint marketing campaign will be launched to attract small businesses to the bank. The report also builds on the bank's existing mandate to support

exports to Africa, and it imposes new safeguards on transactions that may fall under an existing countervailing duty, antidumping or section 201 ruling.

Finally, the conference report retains an amendment I offered in committee giving the bank explicit authority to turn down an application for Ex-Im Bank support for companies that have a history of engaging in fraudulent business practices. One of the main reasons that I believe the bank is important to the U.S. is that it allows us to compete with foreign export credit agencies such as those in Japan, Germany, France, Canada, and other countries. There are over 70 different ECAs that we must compete with. I believe in this global economy, the U.S. must not fall behind our international competitors. I praise the bipartisan leadership in getting to the point we are today, and I support the conference report and urge a yes vote.

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

Madam Speaker, opposition to the Export-Import Bank is not a progressive idea, it is not a conservative idea, it is an idea that should be supported with today's vote by any Member of Congress who wants to protect our taxpayers and protect American workers.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), who occasionally has different philosophical points of view from me, but I am pleased to have him speak in opposition to the Export-Import Bank.

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. This bill is nothing more than subsidies for big corporations. If one were to look at the Constitution and look for authority for legislation of this sort in article I, section 8, it would not be found. That in itself should be reason to stop and think about this, but we do not look at that particular article too often any more.

Also for moral reasons, I object to this. Even if we accepted the idea that we should interfere and be involved in this type of activity, it is unfair because the little guy gets squeezed and the big guy gets all of the money. It is not morally fair because it cannot be.

One thing that annoys me the most is when Members come to the floor and in the name of free trade say we have to support the Export-Import Bank. This is the opposite of free trade. Free trade is good. Low tariffs are good, which lead to lower prices; but subsidies to our competitors is not free trade. We should call it for what it is. We have Members who claim they are free traders, and yet support managed trade through NAFTA and WTO and all these special interest management schemes, as well as competitive devaluation of currencies with the notion that we might increase exports. This has nothing to do with free trade.

I am a strong advocate for free trade, and for that reason I think this bill should not be passed. There are good economic reasons not to support this. Because some who favor this bill argue that some of these companies are doing risky things and they do not qualify in the ordinary banking system for these loans and, therefore, they need a little bit of help. That is precisely when we should not be helping. If there is a risk, it is telling us there is something wrong and we should not do it. It is transferring the liability from the company to the taxpayer. So the risk argument does not hold water at all.

The other reason why economically it is unsound, is that this is a form of credit allocation. If a bank has money and they can get a guarantee from the Export-Import Bank, they will always choose the guarantee over the nonguarantee, so who gets squeezed. The funds are taken out of the investment pool. The little people get squeezed. They do not get the loan, but they are totally unknown. Nobody sees those who did not get a loan. All we see is the loan that benefits somebody on the short run. But really on the long run, it benefits the big corporations. Many times it doesn't even do that.

Take a look at Enron. We have mentioned Enron quite a few times already. If we add up all of the subsidies to Enron, it adds up to \$1.9 billion. That is if we add up the subsidies from OPIC as well. And look at what Enron did. They ran a "few" risks, and then they lost it. Who was left holding the bag? The taxpayers.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge a no vote on this bill. If Members are for free trade, they will vote against this bill, and will vote for true free trade.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), a member of the conference committee.

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

I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for crafting a good bill, which I believe is going to make the Ex-Im Bank more accountable to the taxpayers. Specifically I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for working closely with me to ensure that the Ex-Im Bank is not in a position to reward foreign countries or industries that are in violation of U.S. trade law, and thank the gentleman for including me as a conferee on this report.

This is an important bill which reauthorizes the bank through 2006. There are several significant changes, one I would like to focus on in particular. To illustrate this provision that I wanted to focus on, I want to review very briefly the crisis that is facing the American steel industry. I think we are aware that the American steel industry has been devastated by a flood of imports. Foreign governments subsidize steel production, which creates a glut

of steel, and prices in turn are depressed. The result has been devastating.

Over 33 American steel companies have been forced into bankruptcy. Bethlehem Steel, headquartered in my district, filed Chapter 11 last year. This is having a devastating impact on steel workers, their families, their communities and retirees who depend on these steel companies for their health care benefits.

In the face of this huge, global overcapacity, shockingly to me in late 2000, the Ex-Im Bank unfortunately provided financing for a project which would actually increase global capacity, specifically financing an \$18 million project to increase by 1.5 metric tons the steel-making capacity at a Chinese steel company. This action was taken despite the recommendations to the contrary by the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, the Congressional Steel Caucus and others.

The good news is in this conference report we have a provision for the first time which would prevent a similar situation from ever recurring. There is a provision which prohibits the Ex-Im Bank from extending any loan or guarantee to any foreign company found in violation of U.S. trade law. Specifically, it would prohibit the Ex-Im Bank from providing a transaction to an entity for the resulting production of a product which is already subject to a countervailing duty or antidumping order, and prevent any loan or guarantee for an entity which is subject to an affirmative injury determination by the ITC under section 201. The bottom line is that we would not grant loans to companies that are already proven to be violating U.S. trade laws, and taxpayer funds could not be used to assist foreign corporations in aggravating an existing American economic problem.

While this provision was inspired by this Chinese steel company transaction, it is not specific to any industry or product; rather it would apply to any product or commodity for which there are violations of U.S. trade laws.

Again, I commend the leadership of this committee on both sides of the aisle for the hard work they have done in crafting a good bill. I would also like to thank the American Iron and Steel Institute, the American Steelworkers of America and the Congressional Steel Caucus for their support, and urge my colleagues to vote yes on this conference report.

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report, and I commend the chairman and ranking member of the full committee as well as the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for putting together what I think is a very well-balanced bill.

The bill has been through a number of iterations from the subcommittee to the full committee, and then through the conference. A number of the proposals, such as what the gentleman from Pennsylvania just discussed with respect to funding of industries where we have either dumping or countervailing duty issues at play have been addressed in the underlying bill. I think it shows that the Congress is willing to respond to criticisms which have been raised with respect to our various aid programs, including export finance programs.

A lot of critics will get up and argue that this bill is either unnecessary for libertarian reasons and that we ought to allow for free market to rule in worldwide trade; and others will argue that this does nothing other than really export U.S. jobs.

I would argue that both of those arguments are flawed. With respect to the free market aspect, over the years we have found that the United States, when compared to other export-oriented nations, funds export finance at a much smaller margin than most of our competitors do. So all we are doing in this instance through the Export-Import Bank is providing a modest amount of support when compared to other competing nations. I think it is something that we should not cede the field.

With respect to my colleague from Vermont and others, and I think the gentleman from Vermont is very well meaning in his approach, but I think his approach is unworkable. I think it takes the viewpoint that this is a zero sum game. Either we have jobs domestically or jobs abroad; whereas I think in the economy and what we are trying to accomplish through export finance is to expand the base of jobs that we have in the United States and abroad. I hope my colleagues support this bill. I think it is well drafted, and I rise in strong support of it.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, if we are going to extend a Federal tax benefit, if we are going to take the money of the American working people and give it to corporations, should we ask something in return? Just a little something? The answer in this legislation is, no. We should not. Here is the subsidy, do whatever is desired.

Let us take a no-brainer here which was knocked out. Should companies that set these new triangular tax scams to avoid both taxes on their overseas production and on their U.S.-based production by doing the Bermuda Triangle, should they be prohibited from receiving this subsidy? That is, they are not paying any taxes any more in the United States of America. They have set up a scam which the wonderful accounting companies have figured out. Should they receive these subsidies? The answer in this report is, yes. There was language in there to

prohibit this that was taken out. These companies are not paying any U.S. taxes, but we will give them a subsidy.

We hear a lot about small businesses. Yes, a large number of the transactions do involve small businesses. That is true. But the real measure is what percentage of the U.S. taxpayers' dollars in subsidies are going to the small businesses. It is less than 10 percent.

So what we are saying here is a large number of transactions and a tiny amount of the money are going to help small businesses, and the largest amount of the money, more than 80 percent, is going to the largest corporations in the world. All Fortune 500. Could we have just a little bit more of a restriction there and a real direction towards small business? This conference report says no.

□ 1215

Then we just heard, we have prohibited in this bill a repeat of the Benxi Steel Company. Well, guess what? No, this bill does not prohibit that. The original version might have prohibited it, but the language that has now been adopted in the conference report is so watered down that, indeed, I would challenge either the ranking member or the Chair to stand up and say definitively that the language in this bill would prohibit a repeat of that travesty, U.S. taxpayer money going to fund a corporation in China to steal jobs from United States workers. It will not.

Then finally, we can go to the issue of future here. AT&T, they are going to get an \$87.6 million loan under the condition of the Chinese Government that they can begin to sell telecommunications products in China. Good news for U.S. workers? Well, it might have been, except that the Chinese Government also said that within 5 years, all of the production for all the equipment sold in China must be based in China. We are going to subsidize that. United States workers, taxpayers, are going to subsidize this.

A colleague stood up before me and said this should not be about the measure of where the jobs are, U.S. or overseas, that it does not matter. It matters a hell of a lot to me and the people I represent and to the U.S. taxpayers. Yes, the jobs should be based here in the United States of America.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), also a member of the conference committee.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Madam Speaker, I would like to commend Chairmen OXLEY and BEREUTER for their leadership in crafting a very reasonable bill, and I rise in support of H.R. 2871.

California is the fifth largest economy in the world, but it benefits from the strategic role of the Export-Import Bank.

During fiscal years 1996 to 2000, 722 companies from California benefited from the assistance; 225 communities

benefited; total value of exports were \$8.3 billion; and 120,403 jobs were sustained. Most importantly, regardless of the rhetoric we have heard on the floor today, 72 percent of the transactions assisted small businesses; and that is most important, for small businesses are the engine that keeps this economy moving.

Far too often when we talk about numbers and figures, we do not apply it to a name and a face. Services provided by the Export-Import Bank to small businesses are overlooked, really; and that is a big issue today. But there are a lot of success stories, including ZMG Enterprises in Walnut, California, owned by Mr. Joe Gomez. ZMG Enterprises is a long-standing user of the bank's short-term, multibuyer insurance policy to cover the sale of nearly \$11 million in annual sales of canned vegetables, fruits and table sauces, primarily to Mexico. For a small company, a family-owned business, \$11 million is a lot of revenue to generate for a company. Mexico has traditionally been a COD country. This insurance policy backed by the bank enables Mr. Gomez to offer short-term credit to Mexican supermarkets so that the grocers can purchase more of his product in a single sale and there are reasonable guarantees. There is no money being lost. It is benefiting entrepreneurs in this country, specifically in California, the State and the district I represent. This is a good bill. I would encourage any individuals who have questions to take time to read the bill before they listen to some of the rhetoric on this floor.

Mr. LAFALCE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I would like to preface and qualify my remarks by saying that I am not at all opposed to the comments that emanated from the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) because losing jobs overseas is indeed an acute problem, especially in my district where Indiana alone has lost over 90,000 jobs to foreign corporations.

I am going to speak in favor of this legislation in terms of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank. If it passes today, of course it reauthorizes the sub-Saharan Africa Advisory Committee until September 30, 2006. It requires the bank to continue to report to Congress annually for each of the 4 years on steps taken in sub-Saharan Africa to increase U.S. exports and to consult with the Commerce Department and the Trade Promotion Coordinating Council on the bank's Africa activities.

In the year 2000, trade with sub-Saharan Africa was 2 percent of total U.S. exports and 1 percent of total U.S. imports. Three-fourths of total U.S. trade with sub-Saharan Africa is with just three countries: Nigeria, South Africa, and Angola.

When the 106th Congress passed major legislation to improve economic

relations between the U.S. and sub-Saharan Africa, known as the African Growth and Opportunity Act, I supported that enthusiastically and thought that this country was taking a major step forward in terms of the enhancement of our partnership with Africa and African business.

So I think that this bill for Indianapolis where we just celebrated a major exporter of businesses, the George F. Cram Global Company in Indianapolis just received a major award for outpacing others in terms of exporting this globe.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, under our disastrous trade policy from 1994 to 2000, we lost over 3 million jobs due to our trade policies. The State and the country which has suffered the most is California, which lost over 300,000 jobs due to our trade policy.

I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this 5-year reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. First and foremost, let us recognize that this Congress has been very forceful in welfare reform aimed at getting poor Americans off of government subsidies and off of government handouts and into their self-sufficiency. Why is it that we cannot do for big American corporations what we have been doing to America's poorer people, insisting that they be self-sufficient? No, let us get America's biggest corporations off the dole. If we are going to focus on poorer Americans, let us make sure we also get these big American corporations off the dole.

According to the supporters of this bill, the Export-Import Bank sustains free trade. That, of course, pulls that definition way beyond any of the boundaries of logic. The reality is that the bank allows for privileged trade. Certain corporations are given the privilege of taxpayer-guaranteed investments so that they will have the privilege of moving their production out of the United States, making deals with another company in another country in order to set up a manufacturing unit in the other country, financed by the U.S. taxpayers no doubt.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), who suggested in his remarks that he will now vote for the Export-Import Bank, during the last debate on this issue, went into excruciating detail how thousands, 72,000 steelworkers' jobs had been lost and in the middle of this overproduction of steel there was, yes, an Export-Import Bank guarantee for a Chinese company to add even more, 1.5 million metric tons more of steel production in China, and how he is going to vote for the Export-Import Bank because there has been a guarantee in this bill that no more money will go to foreign companies that violate U.S. trade laws.

The question we must ask ourselves is, Why is any U.S. money, our taxpayer money, going to set up corpora-

tions in foreign countries in the first place? What is going on here? Oh, yeah, it is not going to go to companies now that violate U.S. trade laws that are setting up manufacturing units overseas. Why are we spending American tax dollars to build up manufacturing units in other countries when our own people need the jobs? What is going on here? As I say, we are too interested instead of getting poorer people off of welfare than we are to look at something like that.

Yes, and the fact is that if we have all those jobs going overseas that we are subsidizing, there will be more people on welfare. Who are the companies that will actually benefit from this? The companies that are being helped, yes, Boeing Corporation is being helped and a few other major companies that we have heard about, AT&T. But the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) pointed out that quite often what happens in these companies, it is not just that they are selling their product and then we have jobs here; but instead China and these other countries are insisting that they set up manufacturing units in those countries in order to get the deal. Yes, we have just about created an aerospace industry in China that will now be competing with our aerospace workers in my district. AT&T has created an electronics industry in order to make that sale. And part of the sale, of course, is a guarantee by the taxpayers that that manufacturing unit is going to be financed so that we can set up that job-producing company in China.

This makes no sense whatsoever. It makes no sense for us to subsidize these large companies in order to set up manufacturing units. That is what is going on with the Export-Import Bank. Do not let anybody kid you. I would vote against reauthorization and ask my colleagues to join me.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), Chair of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. This report must be passed for one simple reason and that is the support for U.S. jobs. It is really easy to characterize this as a handout for big businesses. Well, those businesses mean jobs. They are the people who hire. In our global economy, U.S. companies must constantly be seeking new markets for our products. Our government needs to support these efforts because it supports U.S. jobs. Unfortunately, we do not live in a world in which our trading partners play fair. Our businesses must compete with businesses which are directly subsidized by the nations in which they operate. To add some level of fairness to this competitive disadvantage, the U.S. created the Export-Import Bank. In my area of New York, this has translated into over \$70 million which has benefited both large and small businesses involving thousands of jobs in

my district alone and tens of thousands of jobs in New York State.

The international market presents many problems for United States businesses seeking new opportunities. We must work to alleviate these problems for U.S. employers so the incentive to move jobs overseas will not be there. In this present economy, every one of us has to make a commitment to ensure more products bearing the "Made in the USA" label get to the markets abroad by supporting this legislation.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this conference report.

In this committee's review of the Ex-Im's performance we determined that a greater effort must be made to increase the amount of funds which go to small businesses. This Conference Report requires a ten percent increase in the volume of funds going to small businesses.

Ex-Im provides an invaluable service for U.S. workers. Many U.S. products and services would never have been able to find new buyers in the global market place without the assistance of Ex-Im.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Vermont in opposing the disastrous trade policies that the United States has employed over the last decade. They have led to the largest trade deficit in the history of mammalian life.

The trade deficit affects people; \$300 billion and more of trade deficit with a rough approximation of 40,000 jobs lost for every \$1 billion of deficit.

We do not live in a perfect world. We live in a world in which Europe and Japan subsidize their exporters, and the only thing worse than us subsidizing ours through the Export-Import Bank, would be our failure to do so to partially balance what Japan and Europe do for theirs.

I also want to commend the conference committee for leaving a provision that was added by amendment in the House bill to require that when the Export-Import Bank makes its decisions, it include as an important criteria: whether the country involved is one that is cooperating with us in the war on terror. I think increasingly in all of our trade and foreign aid, we ought to ask that question.

I might add that the Export-Import Bank has to be contrasted with the World Bank, which is planning right now to loan \$755 million to Iran. Iran was branded just two week ago by the State Department as the number one sponsor of terrorism among all the governments in the world.

□ 1230

So let us support the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, and let us be wary when the World Bank appropriation comes to this floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), one of the outstanding fighters in this Congress for American workers.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I have watched this Import-Export Bank for years, and the idea when it was set up in 1934 was to promote U.S. exports. I have even been questioning the name Export-Import Bank because it seems to me it has been much more successful at increasing imports into this country, displacing our manufacturing base year after year after year, than promoting exports. Look back to the loan that was made in the 1970s in Brazil to mine ore and help to create a Latin American steel industry that has contributed to the global steel overcapacity that her now swamped this Nation's industry. Not only is something fundamentally wrong with the way this organization functions but with our trade policy in general. America's trade deficits have never been larger. Why should we approve a bill for an organization for 5 more years that has helped to spawn our competitors? They are not creating export markets for us. They are creating export platforms where steel and electronics and apparel and aerospace products are U-turned back into this country displacing U.S. jobs. We should reject the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on its final reauthorization today.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Export-Import Bank conference report. We are considering legislation necessary to help level the playing field for American exporters by guaranteeing that the Export-Import Bank will be there to help our Nation's companies compete against exporters subsidized by foreign governments. As our Nation has become a leader in advanced technologies, exports have become an increasingly important part, of course, to our economy. The Ex-Im Bank is critical in making sure that our companies are able to compete effectively in global markets. This institution levels what would otherwise be a tilted playing field and make sure that the debate is over the quality of the products of services, not who has the most subsidized prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that in the past I have always been critical of the Ex-Im Bank. Past actions have cast doubt over whether it was truly taking into consideration the needs of America's workers and our national security. For example, just a couple of years ago, Ex-Im made a loan for Benxi Steel in China to expand its steel-producing capacity when at the same time China was being investigated for dumping steel.

But the bottom line is that I am pleased to have had the opportunity to

work with Chairman OXLEY, who has done a wonderful job, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). There are guarantees in here that make sure that our businesses are not hurt, and I would urge support of the conference report.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to rise today in support of the conference committee report. I think we have heard already on the floor of this Chamber that the Ex-Im Bank is good for American business and it is not free money. It charges interest and it is overwhelmingly a net benefit to the United States Treasury. I have had the pleasure previously to talk about how it is good for my State, which is definitely an export-dependent State, in Oregon.

We have seen in the last 5 years Ex-Im finance a quarter billion dollars in Oregon exports, supporting 59 businesses, 44 of which are small businesses: in my community, Danner Boot, a small high-quality boot product; Calbag Metals Company, an outstanding family-owned environmentally sensitive metals and recycling company. I talked previously about the freightliner company that pays union family wages to machinists and painters that help create high-quality trucks. Without Ex-Im they would not have had an opportunity to sell these high-end units in Latin America.

But my special interest as a Member of Congress deals with protection of the environment, and I have been pleased to watch the work that has been done here demonstrating the evolution of the Ex-Im Bank in environmental exports programs. Last year Ex-Im supported \$12.5 billion dollars of United States exports, almost a half billion of which were environmentally-beneficial goods and services. Environmental technology in this country is a \$200 billion industry, but only 11 percent of that is currently exported.

Our competitors export almost twice as much of that. I have seen in my own community and around the country that this is an emerging market. With the help of the Ex-Im Bank, we will be able to help American business with critical environmental services that will improve the quality of life around the world. I urge support for the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has 4½ minutes, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has 5½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) has 2 minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least three good reasons to oppose the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

First, the Export-Import Bank is an integral part of a failed trade policy. If you like the fact that between 1994 and 2000 the U.S. has lost more than 3 million decent-paying manufacturing jobs in Ohio, in Indiana, in New York State, all over the country, in my small State of Vermont, if you like and want to continue a failed trade policy, vote for the Export-Import Bank.

The second reason to oppose the reauthorization is corporate welfare. This country has a \$6 trillion national debt and a growing deficit. We cannot take care of our veterans, we cannot take care of education, we cannot take care of affordable housing. But, yes, we do have hundreds of millions and billions of dollars available to subsidize the largest, most profitable corporations in America, corporations which shut down plants in this country and move to China and Mexico, corporations which pay their CEOs huge salaries while they lay off their employees.

Lastly, I think it is time to tell the CEOs of America they have to get off of the corporate welfare line; they have to produce jobs in America, not in China; they have to protect the taxpayers of this country.

Those are at least some of the reasons to oppose the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, indeed there is a basic trade policy issue involved in this debate, and that is whether we want to shape trade policy, whether we want to shape the terms of competition, or we do not. Do we believe that trade as it expands is always better, regardless of its nature and its terms? I do not think it is. I think we have to shape trade policy.

Ex-Im is part of that picture. In competing with other nations who help their companies in terms of their exports, those other nations do so, and the question is, are we going to effectively compete with those nations? We are not going to help keep jobs in the United States by destroying the Ex-Im Bank. That is just not the way to do it.

There is talk about downsizing, for example, at Boeing. Ask the machinists who work at Boeing whether they want us to end the Ex-Im Bank. Their answer is no. Ex-Im Bank helps Boeing. It helps them produce goods in the United States that are exported to other places.

There have been problems with Ex-Im in terms of small business. There has been an effort to address those. We can probably still do better.

There has been a problem in terms of companies that violate U.S. trade laws. There is an effort to address this in this bill. We can probably still do better.

But the answer in terms of an effective shaped American trade policy,

which I believe in, is not to eliminate the Ex-Im Bank. We can do better, surely, in terms of shaping our trade policy, and I have been active in the efforts to do that. But it is misguided to say, those of us who believe you shape American trade policy, that you eliminate the Ex-Im Bank. I rise in support of the conference report.

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

Mr. Speaker, as you may recall, when this Ex-Im Bank was debated on the floor of the House, I offered an amendment that received 135 votes, including a majority of the Democrats and 22 Republicans, and that very simple amendment said that a company receiving Ex-Im funds must not lay off a greater percentage of U.S. workers than workers abroad. Frankly, during the conference committee, I was not surprised that that amendment was rejected. We did not win it on the floor of the House.

But let me tell you about another amendment that I offered. I offered an amendment that would simply require companies that receive assistance, now, we are talking about billions of dollars for corporate America, that those companies that receive this assistance sign a pledge, a nonbinding pledge, that they believe in employing U.S. workers at livable wages.

Now, imagine that: corporate America comes in, they get billions of dollars, and we want them to sign a non-binding pledge that does no more than says they believe in employing American workers at a livable wage. I could not even get that amendment past the conference committee. I do want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for that amendment, but we could not get the majority to support it.

So the issue comes down to the fact that when you give billions of dollars to the largest corporations in America, what do the working families of this country have a right to expect? I think at a minimum when you are giving money to Boeing, when you are giving money to General Electric, when you are giving money to AT&T, you simply cannot have them accept this money from American taxpayers and say, Thank you very much. By the way, I am on my way to China because we just shut down a plant in your district, throwing American workers out on the street, and we are opening a factory in China. Thank you very much, suckers, in the United States for that taxpayer support.

I think the time is long overdue for the American people to be able to say that, corporate America, you finally have got to have some responsibility to the workers of this country, to the taxpayers of this country, and we should oppose the Ex-Im Bank.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just say little evidence exists that the Ex-Im Bank's credit assistance creates jobs. The Ex-Im Bank is a prime example of corporate welfare. The majority of the Ex-Im subsidies go to Fortune 500 companies. It is time to derail this kind of effort that selects favorites and distorts free trade.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of corporate welfare. As we eliminate the fat from the federal budget, we should recommit ourselves to making sure all projects and programs are closely examined—not just the politically easy ones.

The Export-Import Bank (Eximbank) subsidizes loans and loan guarantees to American exporters. The experts agree; Eximbank should be abolished.

The Congressional Budget Office makes the following observation: Eximbank has lost \$8 billion on its operations, practically all in the last 15 years; and little evidence exists that the Eximbank's credit assistance creates jobs.

The Congressional Research Service writes that: Most economists doubt that a nation can improve its welfare over the long run by subsidizing exports; and at the national level, subsidized export financing merely shifts production among sectors within the economy, rather than adding to the overall level of economic activity; export financing subsidizes foreign consumption at the expense of the domestic economy; and subsidizing financing will not raise permanently the level of employment in the economy. The Heritage Foundation recommends Congress "close down the Export-Import Bank."

Heritage further states: Subsidized exports promote the business interest of certain American businesses at the expense of other Americans; and little evidence exists to demonstrate that subsidized export promotion creates jobs—at least net of the jobs lost due to taxpayer financing and the diversion of U.S. resources into government-favored export activities at the expense of non-subsidized businesses. According to Heritage, phasing out subsidies will save 2.3 billion over 5 years.

The former Director of Regulatory studies at the Cato Institute calls the subsidy activity of Eximbank "corporate pork." He stated, "Even in the face of unfair international competition, the U.S. government doesn't have a right to use tax dollars to match equally stupid subsidies."

Export financed by Eximbank actually hurt competitive U.S. exporters not selected for subsidies. The bank chooses winners and losers in the economy. The winners are selected foreign consumers and selected U.S. corporations.

The Eximbank is a prime example of corporate welfare. The majority of Eximbank subsidies go to Fortune 500 companies that could easily afford financing from commercial banks: Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, Westinghouse Electric, General Electric, and AT&T.

To raise funds for its lending and guarantee programs, Eximbank puts additional pressure on Treasury borrowing, driving up interest rates for private borrowers. That's all of us. From a corner barbershop wanting to expand to a young family trying to finance their first home. We all pay the price. Sadly, there's more.

Eximbank appears to have wasted money on frivolous items as well. After 50 years with

the same agency logo, Eximbank decided it needed a new one. Designing a new logo—including creation, copyright search, and the redesign of bank brochures and literature—cost nearly \$100,000 last year. And in 1993, Eximbank spent \$30,000 to train 20 employees how to speak in public—including chairman Kenneth Brody. An outside consultant was paid \$3,000 a day for this task.

Mr. Speaker, I believe government shouldn't choose winners in the economy. With Eximbank the big winners are foreign consumers, large corporations and professional speech coaches. The losers are the American taxpayers.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that in a theoretical world that we might develop, there should be no need for an Ex-Im Bank, because no country should be engaging in subsidies of its exports. But we do not live within that theoretical world, we live within the real world; and within the real world, virtually every country in the world, most especially our major trading competitors, engage in the subsidization of their exports. That being the case, were we not to reauthorize Ex-Im Bank, we would be engaging in unilateral disarmament; and I, for one, do not favor unilateral disarmament.

Having said that, let me also say that it has always been my hope that administrations, both Democrat and Republican, would have been much more aggressive in negotiating a reduction or an elimination of export subsidies.

□ 1245

This is difficult to do with other countries, and it is difficult to do domestically. Other countries have been quite critical of our own Congress because of the recent agricultural bill that we passed saying that we have raised the bar considerably through the exports of our crops and agricultural products in a manner that they believe violates international law.

So we have to look to ourselves, too, but we should be negotiating a reduction or elimination so we could have multilateral disarmament rather than unilateral disarmament.

One more point, too. The Ex-Im Bank is a misnomer. Some individuals will say, well, they do more to help imports than they do exports. The fact is they do zero, nothing, to enhance imports; they do everything, 100 percent of all their programs, all their products, all of their services, all of their assistance, to promote exports of goods, products, and services made in the United States of America and sold abroad.

So one of the things we always should have done and I always favored is to simply strike the word "import" because of the misleading impressions that could be created. One Member got up on the floor and gave evidence of the misleading impression that has been created.

Having said that, in order for the United States to compete internationally within the trading arena, passage

of today's reauthorization bill, a very good one, a balanced one, one with Democratic and Republican input, is imperative. I would commend all Members to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), for his stellar efforts throughout this process; and also particularly the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). He would perhaps deflate a couple of rather incongruous statements made during the course of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Yes, indeed, this agency focuses exclusively on exports, despite the name. I want to say definitively that now, when we have a 201 determination or a final order under Title VII, no American exporters may export products to those sectors abroad that are in violation of those two parts of our trade law. That is a major advance offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). There was no retreat from that; in fact, in conference it was actually strengthened. We traded a very important procedure for a report; a very big advance.

Another point here: Ten percent of the resources of the Export-Import Bank do not go to small business, as suggested; 18 percent. Over 90 percent of all the tax credits are for small business, and we are pushing them to go even much further by the mandate here.

I do not like American exports of jobs, jobs going abroad; but this legislation actually keeps American exporters producing products here, products, manufactured goods and services, and helps our exporters compete, sometimes against subsidized tax credits transactions, by other foreign export credit agencies. Yet, only 2 percent of all of the loans ever go into default.

The Export-Import Bank has a net return of resources year after year after year to the U.S. Treasury. Why? Because we charge risk-based insurance and fees. So the idea of this being a large corporate giveaway or a huge subsidy is just not the case.

I would say to the gentleman from California, for example, or the gentleman from Texas, California is number two in terms of exports abroad coming out of that State because of the Export-Import Bank, and Texas is number three. Think about those aerospace workers and what it means to California, Washington State, and other States involved.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the conference report.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank

Conference Report. The Export-Import Bank has, as its main goal, the focus of helping businesses compete in the global arena. Since its creation in 1934, the Export-Import Bank has been successful in supporting U.S. businesses by providing needed assistance that allows these businesses to expand and promote their goods in other countries. Without this assistance, many of these businesses would not see this goal realized. Furthermore, as many countries provide higher levels of export financing subsidies to their companies than the U.S., the Export-Import Bank plays a crucial role in helping to even out this imbalance for U.S. firms in the international market.

The Export-Import Bank has to its credit many positive outcomes. It has not only been able to sustain vital U.S. jobs in both small and large companies, but it has also created many jobs around the country. In FY 2001 alone, the bank supported over \$12.5 billion in U.S. exports to markets all over the world. Companies across the country see the benefits of working with the bank, as more than 2,000 American companies of all sizes utilize its services each year. In my home state of Michigan, the value of exports supported by the bank since October 1997 is well over \$500 million.

The conference report strengthens the ability of the Export-Import Bank to continue its commitment to assisting U.S. companies. The report increases the loan ceiling for the bank each year, culminating in \$100 billion in FY 2006. It also contains other important provisions, including anti-dumping, antiterrorism, and human rights provisions that are important factors when considering possible transactions with other countries. The conference report also requires the Export-Import Bank to improve its technical capacity that will strengthen its ability to touch more small businesses and will facilitate the usage of the bank's services for all companies.

The conference report increases the bank's small business requirement to 20 percent from its current level of 10 percent. While this represents a positive step forward, I join with my colleagues in urging a higher percentage level of support in years to come and encourage the bank to do all it can to expand its outreach effort to small businesses, specifically minority and women-owned businesses. The report also strengthens U.S. export efforts in Africa, which I strongly support.

I thank my colleagues, particularly Chairman OXLEY and Ranking Member LAFALCE, for their hard work and commitment in putting forth a strong bill that will enhance the Export-Import Bank's ability to assist U.S. companies of all sizes as they look to expand and compete in the global market.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I have been a strong supporter of the Ex-Im Bank since coming to Congress in 1981. The Bank plays a very significant role in US trade policy. It ensures that US businesses will not be denied access to overseas markets because of market imperfections that prevent them from obtaining financing from the private sector or because of unfair competition from foreign export agencies. Ex-Im has initiated thousands of transactions in foreign markets that commercial banks deem too risky to enter. Because of the Ex-Im, U.S. businesses export more goods and develop new and stronger trading relationships abroad.

The world of finance and the international trading system are changing fast. Other coun-

tries are finding more sophisticated ways of assisting their exporters and new financing mechanisms are being developed. Instead of placing restrictions on the Ex-Im and cutting its funding, we should be working to enhance the banks capabilities to assist business abroad my making sure they have the tools necessary to assist US exporters in this changing global economy.

If fiscal year 2001 Ex-Im Bank financed nearly \$12.5 billion of US exports world wide which supported millions of US jobs. Nearly 90 percent of Ex-Im Bank's transaction in fiscal year 2001 was on behalf of small businesses.

In New Jersey alone, the Ex-Im Bank has supported over 214 companies and 138 communities. It is estimated that over 44,974 jobs are sustained by Ex-Im efforts. For example, JB Williams Company located in Glen Rock, New Jersey, is a small, 45-employee manufacturer of specialty soaps and bath products that has been using Ex-Im Bank's short-term export credit insurance since 1998 to expand its exports to Saudi Arabia, Poland, Korea, Colombia, and other counties.

This legislation extends the charter of the U.S. Export-Import Bank for 4 years and creates offices on Small Business Exporters within the Bank. It also increases the value of transactions that the Bank can hold in its portfolio at any time, raises the percentage of small business transactions the Bank should pursue, and improves the operation of the Tied Aid Credit Program. This measure further mandates that the Bank take into consideration U.S. trade laws when considering a transaction, examine whether a recipient company has been involved in any corrupt practices prior to a transaction's approval. And, in the context of our need to fight a war on terrorism, this bill requires the Bank to assess whether a country has been helpful in U.S. efforts to combat terrorism.

This bill raises the level of total Ex-Im portfolio (loans, guarantees, and insurance) outstanding at any one time from the current level of \$75 billion to \$100 billion by FY 2006. The mandate for small business activity will be raised from 10 percent to 20 percent of the total value of Ex-Im transactions, with 8 percent of the total going to businesses with less than 100 employees.

The Ex-Im Bank improves America's competitiveness overseas, promotes small business and creates and sustains U.S. jobs. I urge my colleagues to support this Conference Report.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Export-Import Bank, and in support of this conference report.

For nearly eight years, I've been a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. This Subcommittee provides the funding for Ex-Im's program budget. During this time I've become very familiar with the Bank's operations and the important role it plays in supporting U.S. jobs, assisting small U.S. businesses, and helping to finance development in emerging markets around the world.

Support for Ex-Im means real jobs for real people. In its 68-year history, Ex-Im Bank has supported over \$400 billion of U.S. exports, sustaining and creating millions of high-paying U.S. jobs. In fiscal year 2001 alone, Ex-Im Bank supported \$12.5 billion of U.S. exports to developing countries, enabling many U.S. companies to maintain and even expand their workforces.

Ex-Im's impact is felt throughout America and affects companies of every size, but the Bank's positive impact is particularly strong on small businesses. Ninety percent of the total number of Ex-Im Bank supported transactions in fiscal year 2001 was in direct support of small businesses.

Ex-Im Bank aggressively reaches out to small businesses through a variety of partnerships with lenders, city and state trade offices, small business associations, Congressional offices, and other federal agencies such as the Small Business Administration. I commend Ex-Im for this effort.

Exports are crucial to the U.S. economy. Overseas sales are no longer optional for most U.S. companies. Exports accounted for over one-quarter of U.S. economic growth over the last decade and support an estimated 12 million American jobs. In order to grow the U.S. economy and increase the number of jobs, export opportunities need to grow as well. The Export-Import Bank has a critical role to play in this effort.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Export-Import Bank and supporting this conference report.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the conference report on S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act.

The purpose of the Export-Import Bank is to create American jobs for American workers. Unfortunately, the Bank has a history of providing assistance to companies that have been exporting American jobs and hiring cheap, foreign labor. For example, the Export-Import Bank insured a \$3 million loan to help General Electric build a factory where Mexican workers will make parts for appliances that will be exported back to the United States. As a result, 1,500 American workers will lose their jobs to Mexican workers who will be paid only two dollars per hour.

When the House of Representatives considered its version of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act, an amendment was offered to ensure that the Bank does not subsidize companies that are exporting American jobs instead of American-made products. Unfortunately, this amendment was not adopted.

I am especially concerned by the fact that the Conference Committee deleted the Office on Africa provision from the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act. The House version of this legislation included a requirement that the Export-Import Bank establish an Office on Africa to monitor Export-Import Bank lending for projects in African countries. This provision was supported by both the Financial Services Committee and the full House of Representatives, and there was no reason for the Conference Committee to delete it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose S. 1372, the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the

point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 344, nays 78, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—344

Abercrombie	English	LaFalce
Ackerman	Eshoo	LaHood
Aderholt	Etheridge	Lampson
Allen	Evans	Langevin
Baca	Farr	Lantos
Baird	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Baker	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Baldacci	Fletcher	Latham
Ballenger	Foley	LaTourette
Barrett	Ford	Leach
Barton	Fossella	Lee
Becerra	Frank	Levin
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (CA)
Berkley	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Berman	Gallegly	Lewis (KY)
Berry	Gekas	Linder
Biggert	Gephardt	Lipinski
Bishop	Gibbons	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Gillmor	Loftgren
Blunt	Gilman	Lowey
Boehert	Gonzalez	Lucas (KY)
Boehner	Goodlatte	Lucas (OK)
Bonilla	Gordon	Luther
Bono	Goss	Lynch
Boozman	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Borski	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Boswell	Graves	Manzullo
Boucher	Green (TX)	Markey
Boyd	Green (WI)	Mascara
Brady (PA)	Greenwood	Matsui
Brady (TX)	Grucci	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (FL)	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Brown (SC)	Gutknecht	McCollum
Bryant	Hall (OH)	McCrery
Burr	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Buyer	Hansen	McGovern
Callahan	Harman	McHugh
Calvert	Hart	McIntyre
Camp	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Cantor	Herger	Meehan
Capito	Hill	Meek (FL)
Capps	Hinchey	Meeke (NY)
Capuano	Hinojosa	Menendez
Cardin	Hobson	Mica
Carson (IN)	Hoeffel	Millender-
Carson (OK)	Holden	McDonald
Castle	Holt	Miller, Gary
Chambliss	Honda	Miller, George
Clay	Hooley	Moore
Clayton	Horn	Moran (KS)
Clement	Houghton	Moran (VA)
Clyburn	Hoyer	Morella
Collins	Hulshof	Murtha
Combest	Hyde	Myrick
Cooksey	Insee	Napolitano
Costello	Isakson	Neal
Coyne	Israel	Nethercutt
Cramer	Issa	Ney
Crenshaw	Istook	Northup
Crowley	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Cummings	(TX)	Obey
Cunningham	Jefferson	Olver
Davis (CA)	Jenkins	Ortiz
Davis (FL)	John	Osborne
Davis (IL)	Johnson (CT)	Ose
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Oxley
DeGette	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell
DeLaunt	Johnson, Sam	Pastor
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Payne
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Pelosi
Diaz-Balart	Keller	Phelps
Dicks	Kelly	Pickering
Dingell	Kennedy (MN)	Pitts
Doggett	Kennedy (RI)	Pombo
Dooley	Kildee	Pomeroy
Doyle	Kilpatrick	Portman
Dreier	Kind (WI)	Price (NC)
Dunn	King (NY)	Pryce (OH)
Edwards	Kingston	Putnam
Ehlers	Kirk	Quinn
Ehrlich	Kleczka	Radanovich
Emerson	Knollenberg	Rahall
Engel	Kolbe	Ramstad

Rangel	Shows	Towns
Regula	Shuster	Turner
Rehberg	Simmons	Udall (CO)
Reyes	Simpson	Udall (NM)
Reynolds	Skeen	Upton
Rodriguez	Skelton	Velazquez
Roemer	Smith (NJ)	Vislosky
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Vitter
Rogers (MI)	Smith (WA)	Walden
Ros-Lehtinen	Snyder	Walsh
Ross	Solis	Watkins (OK)
Rothman	Souder	Watson (CA)
Roybal-Allard	Spratt	Watt (NC)
Rush	Stenholm	Watts (OK)
Ryan (WI)	Stump	Waxman
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Weiner
Sabo	Tanner	Weldon (FL)
Sanchez	Tauscher	Weldon (PA)
Sandlin	Tauzin	Weller
Sawyer	Taylor (MS)	Wexler
Saxton	Taylor (NC)	Whitfield
Schakowsky	Terry	Wicker
Schiff	Thomas	Wilson (NM)
Schrock	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)
Scott	Thompson (MS)	Wolf
Serrano	Thornberry	Woolsey
Sessions	Thune	Wu
Shaw	Thurman	Wynn
Shays	Tiahrt	Young (AK)
Sherman	Tiberi	Young (FL)
Sherwood	Tierney	
Shimkus	Toomey	

NAYS—78

Akin	Duncan	Oberstar
Andrews	Everett	Otter
Armey	Filner	Owens
Baldwin	Flake	Pallone
Barcia	Forbes	Paul
Barr	Goode	Pence
Bartlett	Hayes	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Hayworth	Petri
Bilirakis	Hefley	Platts
Bonior	Hilleary	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Burton	Hostettler	Royce
Chabot	Hunter	Sanders
Coble	Jackson (IL)	Schaffer
Condit	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Kaptur	Shadegg
Cox	Kerns	Smith (MI)
Crane	Kucinich	Stark
Cubin	Matheson	Stearns
Culberson	McInnis	Strickland
Davis, Jo Ann	McKinney	Stupak
Deal	Miller, Jeff	Sullivan
DeFazio	Mink	Sununu
DeLay	Mollohan	Tancredo
DeMint	Nadler	Wamp
Doolittle	Norwood	Waters

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus	Gilchrest	Riley
Bentsen	Hilliard	Roukema
Blagojevich	Miller, Dan	Slaughter
Ganske	Peterson (PA)	Traficant

□ 1313

Messrs. KERNs, BARTLETT of Maryland, CRANE, HEFLEY, SUL-LIVAN and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. GEKAS and Mr. HERGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTING IN AMERICA'S FUTURE ACT OF 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1315

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 432

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill. Each section of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 432 is a fair, open rule providing for consideration of H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2003, 2004 and 2005 for the National Science Foundation.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

Additionally, the rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pro-

vides that the bill shall be considered for amendment by section. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has the authority to accord priority in recognition of Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

As an independent Federal agency, the National Science Foundation's mission is to support science and engineering among all disciplines. Currently, the NSF funds research and education activities at more than 2,000 universities, colleges, schools, businesses and other research institutions throughout the United States.

Federal investment in educating America's youth in the foundation areas of math, science and technology is the only way to maintain our competitive edge in a global economy and to create economic prosperity here at home. The ever changing world of science demands that the research behind it keep pace with the times.

This legislation will provide a 15 percent annual increase for NSF through fiscal year 2005, providing critical financial support that will ensure our Nation's continued advancement in science, education and research. Much like this Republican-led Congress has kept its commitment to double funding for the National Institutes of Health, this legislation will initiate a plan to double NSF moneys over a 5-year period.

This kind of increase is consistent with President Bush's focus on education improvements, such as the Math and Science Partnership Act and the Undergraduate Math and Science Education Improvement Act. This increase will also supply dollars for the countless major research equipment projects that have been approved but simply await funding.

Technology, science and research are powerful components in our development of society. Continually advancing science and research will discover new cures for diseases, improve our quality of life and create jobs and economic growth across America. As someone who hails from a State and region that has fully embraced the value and potential this type of scientific research offers, I can attest to how important this investment is to our future.

NSF-funded projects often bring national and even international attention to towns and cities across America, and sustained research efforts and collaborations have meant growth and new employment opportunities in those areas. This ripple effect energizes communities and attracts young Americans to fields and job markets like science and engineering, areas that are key to making American industry more competitive across the globe.

The long-time president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, physicist Karl Taylor Compton, once said, "Modern science has developed to give man-

kind a way of securing a more abundant life." Through this important investment in science, technology and research, this Congress can help ensure for the American people and communities across our Nation a more abundant life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this fair and open rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair and open rule for a noncontroversial bill. H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act, will reauthorize the National Science Foundation, including an increase in funding for the NSF by 15 percent for each of the next three fiscal years. This increase will result in the doubling of the NSF budget over the next 5 years.

NSF is a critical institution whose mission is to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity and welfare; and to secure the national defense.

In doing so, NSF has worked with and funded research institutions all across the country. For example, NSF has granted over \$311 million to Massachusetts last year, including \$3.3 million to the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and \$1.9 million to the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth to fund very, very important projects that are vital to our national security and our national defense.

This reauthorization bill was unanimously referred to the House by the Committee on Science. The funding level called for in this legislation is above the President's request, and it addresses the growing imbalance between Federal support of biomedical research and physical sciences research. It also helps to ensure that America's present and future scientists and engineers are globally competitive.

The 21st century holds a great deal of promise, but there are also serious challenges ahead. Fortunately, the United States has some of the finest researchers and research institutions in the world. We must ensure that the scientific community in this country has the resources they need to meet our challenges.

The bill before us today I think is an important step in that effort. Mr. Speaker, I commend the members of the Committee on Science for their bipartisan work on this important bill. I ask Members to support this open rule and to support the Investing in America's Future Act.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, this legislation is

named the Investing in America's Future Act because that is really what it is. Basic research is what is needed to develop new ideas for products that the world demands. It is how we develop ways to increase the efficiency and productivity in the way we produce those certain products. Basic research, which NSF has done such a tremendous job in its peer review, is really key to not only our economic security but our national security. Smart weapon technology come from basic research.

Let me for just a moment quote a previous statement from NIH, the National Institutes of Health. They said if you do not do more research, basic research coming from NSF, we are going to have to set up our own division for basic research in NIH. Adequate basic research is key to our health, key to our economy, key to our national security.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

In preparation for the discussion of the bill itself, I would just like to offer some general comments about the nature of basic research and the importance of funding basic research because that often raises questions in the mind of the public and, consequently, questions in the minds of the Congress.

Basic research is that research which is done to understand the basic underpinnings of science, the basic underpinnings of the nature of our universe and how it operates. It is very broadly based. It is not specifically directed toward any particular problem in society and sometimes not even toward a problem in the sciences. It is an effort to really learn more about the universe and how it and all its composite parts work.

That makes it very difficult to defend in the political process, but let me simply point out to my colleagues some of the results of basic research that we take for granted today.

In the 1930s, there was some research done on a very esoteric topic called stimulated coherent emission of radiation. This was theoretical work. It was very low cost work. The National Science Foundation did not exist. It was done by a professor and a few others working together, and they deduced that it was possible to have stimulated emission of light where one would have one photon, one particle of light, hitting an atom in an excited state, and one would have another photon come out that was exactly like the one that came in, and yet the one that came in would be unaffected. So one obtains double the amount of light and the light was coherent; that is, the wavelengths matched and the light was in phase.

This was essentially an unremarkable result in 1930 because no one

had yet imagined a way in which it could be done, but after World War II, during which we learned a lot about more advanced physics, and researchers began investigating this with microwave radiation and discovered, in fact, it did work; this work was done by Charles Townes, a good friend of mine, a good physicist, who is now at Berkeley. He discovered that he could direct a microwave photon at an excited atom and get two microwave photons out that were coherent, traveling in exactly the same direction, in phase, and with identical frequencies.

He immediately recognized that this could also lead to light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation, and so the laser was developed about 1960, or in that time frame. It was a laboratory curiosity.

I remember the first time I saw a laser and played with it. It was almost a toy, and we had fun with it. What an amazing thing, that one could amplify light! And yet everyone today is familiar with lasers; They have become ubiquitous. We use them for everything from lining up sewers to making certain that the tiles in the ceiling of a building are level, to conducting surgery of various types, on to many other uses, cutting metals and cutting cloth. Most likely the dresses and suits that are being worn here today were cut by laser initially before they were sewn together. All of this is based on the initial research work done in 1930.

Let me take another example, nuclear magnetic resonance, an esoteric bit of research which occurred while I was in graduate school. Who really cared about the nuclear spins and magnetic moments of hydrogen nuclei? Yet that nuclear magnetic resonance work which forms the basis for what we today call magnetic resonance imaging, a fantastic medical advance, diagnostic tool, the MRI, which look inside our bodies and tell us whether we have cancer, or a torn muscle, or something else. Similarly, the CT scan came out of research in high-energy elementary particle physics, an esoteric topic as far removed from everyday life as we can imagine.

□ 1330

The question is, so what? The point is simply that during the past decade the marvelous economic expansion we enjoyed was, according to Alan Greenspan and other experts, almost entirely based on the basic research that we funded some 30 to 50 years ago. If we want to continue to enjoy economic growth and expansion, if we want to continue to lead the world, we have to also continue leading the world in basic research.

That is what this bill is all about, continuing to lead the world in basic research so that our children and grandchildren are going to have the same economic advantages that we enjoy today, just as our parents and our grandparents invested in basic research so that we could enjoy the fruits

of that today. That is what this bill is about.

That is why the Congress must pass this bill so that we adequately fund basic research and continue the economic base and growth that we enjoy today, and so that we can continue to expand our basic understanding of the universe and all it contains, and learn about the scientific processes that constantly occur.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. And this is the first time I have had him yield to me in his capacity as a member of the Committee on Rules. We are all very proud of that accomplishment for him and thank him for his great leadership there and on this bill, which is a very important one.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and in support of the legislation, and I commend the Committee on Science for their excellent work on this reauthorization for the National Science Foundation funding. For a long time, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), has sponsored a bill and given us all the opportunity to register our support for drastically increasing the funding of the National Science Foundation. I am so pleased now that the Committee on Science has taken up that leadership, and the considerable leadership of the chairman, et cetera, of the committee to make this a possibility; that we would be on a path to doubling the National Science Foundation budget.

Mr. Speaker, I serve as a member of the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations. A number of years ago, we set off on this path to double the funding for the National Institutes of Health. We are in our last year of that doubling effort. It was very important to the health of the American people. So, too, is the doubling of the National Science Foundation. Not only do we have to do this, but we should do more.

We had the Tech Talent Act, which encourages young people and mentors them in studying math and science so that we have the seed corn for us to have the scientists who will maintain and improve and enhance our technological base, and as well, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) said, our economic base as well.

Our progress in the National Institutes of Health, the Human Genome Project and other progress, really springs from the improved instrumentation that came from the technology side of it, the hard sciences, physical sciences side of it, the nonbiomedical science. So we all benefit across the board in terms of biomedical research, which is so important to the American people; the economic success, which is so important to our country; and also the fulfillment of the young people who have the talent and should be encouraged to study math and science and become scientists.

So I am absolutely delighted today that in this bipartisan way we can come to the floor. I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee and the subcommittee, as well as the Members on both sides of the aisle, for making this a reality for the Congress to take this vote and make it a reality for our country; and I will do everything in my power working with them to ensure that this can be translated not only into an authorization but an appropriation as well.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT).

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in support of the rule and as a cosponsor and strong supporter of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, or Investing in America's Future Act.

I want to commend the members of the Committee on Rules for this open rule, and the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) of the Committee on Science; as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH); and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), for expeditiously ushering this bill through that committee and to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, a distinguished committee, chaired by Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman, released a report on national security at the beginning of 2001. While it did not receive a lot of public attention at the time, the Hart-Rudman report has been revisited often since September 11. One aspect of the report with particular relevance to the bill we are considering today is its finding and recommendation on the importance of basic research. According to the Hart-Rudman report on national security, and I quote, "The U.S. Government has seriously underfunded basic scientific research in recent years. The quality of the U.S. education system, too, has fallen well behind those of scores of other nations. The inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine."

The report goes on to recommend doubling the Federal Government's investment in science and technology research and development by 2010. Mr. Speaker, the bill we pass today takes an important step in the right direction.

In addition to supporting basic research at colleges and universities nationwide, the NSF works to ensure that American teachers and professors have the skills, training, and equipment to prepare future scientists and researchers. This is critical as science and technology become increasingly important

to our economy, our health, our environment, and our national security.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say that this is a good rule. It is an open rule. It is nice to have an open rule. More importantly, this is a good bill and deserves the support of all our colleagues.

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

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

Since the dawn of man, the human race has been ingrained with a fascination and need to slip beyond its boundaries and explore the unknown. From across the continents to the depths of the ocean and to the far reaches of space, that pioneer spirit continues to this day.

The National Science Foundation embraces that spirit with its record of excellence in research, education, technological advancement, and discovery. They make possible the pioneer spirit within us all.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supplying the necessary tools to the National Science Foundation so they can continue along the path of important contributions to America and to mankind. Their programs are an important demonstration of how efficient government investment can return great dividends to society. There is no better time to invest in America's future.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 432 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4664.

□ 1339

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, with Mr. ISAKSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to bring to the floor today H.R. 4664, the Invest in America's Future Act, which was approved unanimously by the Committee on Science. This landmark bill would put the National Science Foundation on a track to double its budget over the next 5 years, while, at the same time, imposing strict new management requirements to ensure that the National Science Foundation continues to spend our money wisely.

This Congress has already demonstrated its faith in and reliance on the National Science Foundation several times in recent months, and I hope and expect that we will continue to do so today. Earlier this year, by the overwhelming margin of 400 to 12, we passed a cybersecurity bill that relied on NSF to fund the research needed to protect our Nation's computer systems and networks. At this time last year, we passed by voice vote a bill to initiate the President's math and science education partnerships, a program that NSF is now beginning to carry out; and we have passed appropriation bills that have included generous, if still insufficient, increases for the National Science Foundation.

So the 107th Congress is already on record as acknowledging the vital role played by NSF in both research and education, and we have already recognized the Foundation's need for additional funds. Today, we take the next logical step.

The scale of NSF's budget today is simply not commensurate with the breadth and importance of its mission. Congress reached that same conclusion about the National Institutes of Health, and we have followed through by doubling that research agency's budget. But health research is not the only kind of research on which our Nation depends. And, indeed, even health research itself depends on advances outside of biomedicine, the kinds of advances that produce new research tools and new understandings of chemistry and physics.

So it is time to give NSF, a much smaller agency than NIH, a budget commensurate with its mission. When we look at the new fields of science and engineering that will boost our economy in this new century, fields like nanotechnology, where do we turn to ensure that our Nation's researchers stay at the cutting edge? The National Science Foundation. When we look at the field of information technology, which facilitates every activity in today's economy, where do we turn to ensure that the U.S. remains at the cutting edge? NSF. When we consider our even more urgent need for a highly skilled technologically-literate workforce, where do we turn to ensure that our education system, from kindergarten through postgraduate work, is preparing the people we need? You

guessed it, the National Science Foundation.

We turn to the National Science Foundation to solve some of our most pressing problems. We cannot turn from NSF when we decide where to invest Federal funds. It is time to give NSF the money it needs.

But do not take my word for it. Do not even take the word of all the university and research groups that have endorsed this bill. They are the obvious beneficiaries. Instead, listen to the major industrial entities that are backing this bill, groups like the National Association of Manufacturers, the Semiconductor Industry Association, and Technet. They understand that federally funded basic research, research which industry has little incentive to fund, is needed to keep the American economy humming.

But some may still wonder, despite the support for raising NSF's budget, whether the agency can handle such a significant increase. I would argue that there is no agency better placed to handle it. NSF is a lean agency that spends little of its budget on administration. It is the only agency in the entire Federal Government that received a green light rating from the Office of Management and Budget for the quality of its operations. It is repeatedly cited as a model of how Federal agencies should be run.

But despite NSF's stellar record, this bill will not allow the agency to rest on its laurels. The bill imposes several new management requirements to ensure that Federal taxpayer dollars are wisely spent.

□ 1345

There is a new report NSF must submit to Congress explaining how it decided to allocate its funding. There is a new requirement to ensure that the public has greater access to National Science Board meetings. There is a new joint NSF-NASA advisory committee on astronomy research.

Most importantly, there is a new process to prioritize major equipment projects and to manage them more consistently. Right now, there is no way for anyone outside the foundation to understand how these large projects, like new telescopes and research stations, are selected or ranked.

Under our bill, the director and the board will have to agree on a list of projects in priority order that will be submitted to the Congress. Actual budget proposals may still have to depart from that order, but at least we will all be starting with the same information in evaluating such budget proposals.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible bill, it is a needed bill, it is a bill that has garnered widespread support in committee and outside this Chamber, and it deserves support from all of us today. In passing this bill, we do nothing more, and nothing less, than reaffirm some basic principles: That being the world leader in research is impor-

tant to our Nation's health, defense, and economic well-being; that improving science and math education is critically important; that a great Nation should not skimp on its investments to improve human understanding of natural phenomena.

It is through NSF that we turn those principles into actions. To paraphrase Daniel Webster, it is a small agency, but there are those of us who love it. I urge support for this bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Investing in America's Future Act of 2002, H.R. 4664, a 3-year reauthorization bill for the National Science Foundation.

The bill represents a bipartisan effort by the Committee on Science to provide the level of resources necessary to sustain the important work of the National Science Foundation in science and engineering research and education.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the ranking Democratic member, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for their efforts to craft this bill. I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for his leadership in working closely with this side of the aisle in developing the bill.

NSF is our premier agency for support of basic research at academic institutions in the physical sciences and the nonmedical biological sciences, in mathematics, and in engineering. Basic research discoveries launch new industries that bring returns to the economy far exceeding the original public investment.

The Internet, which emerged from the research projects funding by DOD and NSF, strikingly illustrates the payoff potential of such research expenditures. In fact, over the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic productivity can be attributed to the technological innovation and the science that has supported it.

Unfortunately, the simple truth is that during the 1990s we underinvested in the fields that NSF supports.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences provides specific examples that make this case. The report shows that between 1993 and 1999 Federal research support at academic institutions fell by 14 percent in mathematics, by 7 percent in physics, by 2 percent in chemistry, and by 12 percent in electrical engineering.

Inadequate funding for basic research in such important fields imposes a price on society, because new ideas are lost that would otherwise underpin future technological advances.

Of even more importance, anemic funding of academic science and engineering research reduces the numbers

of new young scientists and engineers who constitute the essential element necessary to ensure the Nation's future economic strength and security.

H.R. 4664 authorizes funding growth for NSF of 15 percent per year for 3 years, bringing the total authorization level to \$7.3 billion by the third year. This follows a funding path to double NSF's budget over 5 years, as was proposed by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) in the NSF authorization bill she introduced, and I cosponsored, last year.

We were not alone in calling for substantial funding increases. Such prominent figures as Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, former House Speaker Gingrich, and former presidential science advisor Allan Bromley have pointed out the importance of increasing support for basic research in science and engineering.

The coalition for National Science Funding, a group of 80 scientific, engineering, and professional societies, universities, and corporations, specifically called for providing a 15 percent funding increase for the NSF this year as the next step in doubling the NSF budget.

The funding growth proposed by H.R. 4664 will enable the foundation to expand its investment in cutting-edge research initiatives and shore up its core research programs.

Equally important, the bill will increase efforts to improve the skills of K-12 science and math teachers, develop better science and math curricular materials, and attract more women and minorities to careers in science and engineering.

H.R. 4664 is an important bill that will help ensure the Nation maintains a vigorous basic research enterprise, which is an essential component for a strong economy for our national security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) to control the time for the remainder of the debate.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation to increase the National Science Foundation budget by 15 percent for next year. This bill will put us on the path to double the NSF budget over the next 5 years.

Science inspires us to conquer the unknown, invent what does not exist, and improve what already exists. It all begins with research.

President Bush's budget proposal recognized the importance of science funding with a 9 percent increase in science and technology spending. That is the

good news. But among the various science agencies, the increases in amounts varied greatly.

The National Institutes of Health, NIH, received the lion's share of funding under the administration's proposal. The NIH budget has increased to a point where it is now larger than the rest of the budgets of the science agencies put together, and the proposed increase alone in NIH funding is larger than the research budget of the National Science Foundation.

Biomedical research is important and the NIH should receive adequate funding. The administration's proposed budget rightly recognized the importance of our physical health. But, Mr. Chairman, our citizens' economic health is just as important as their physical health.

The NSF funds the cutting edge research that allows the U.S. to dominate the high technology field. Our commitment to the funding in the bill ensures that our technological preeminence will continue. Scientific research at the NSF has greatly enhanced our lives and has advanced science and technology. Consider the benefits of better weather forecasting, the saved lives that result from MRIs, the promise of faster semiconductors, and breakthroughs in nanotechnology that will drive our scientific efforts in the new century.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4664 improves the quality of math and science education with \$200 million in funding for the Math and Science Partnerships Initiative, which encourages more students to enter graduate level science studies.

In our technology-driven economy, math and science skills are essential. If we want to prepare the next generation with the skills they need for success, we must increase their knowledge of science. Either we continue to invest in the sciences, or risk losing the ability to lead the world in research. This legislation recognizes the priority of research and development, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) for allowing me to share this time, and for their leadership and imagination in bringing H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act of 2002 before us today for our consideration.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this important piece of legislation. I have long been a passionate advocate for the National Science Foundation and the work they oversee. This work begins the laudable goal of doubling NSF's budget over the next 5 years.

Competition for NSF grant funding is very intense. Every year NSF receives about 30,000 proposals for research in education projects. Of these, about one-third only are funded. These grants usually go to colleges, universities, academic consortia, nonprofit institutions, and small businesses. The NSF also supports collaborative projects between universities and industry, as well as U.S. participation in international cooperative research and education efforts.

By increasing the amount of money available for grants, the NSF will be able to greatly enhance opportunities for scientific inquiry, and will generate invaluable progress in a wide range of fields. The resulting discoveries will help drive economic growth and enhance the quality of life for all Americans.

NSF is the second largest source of federal funds for academic research. Students of mathematics, science, the environment and engineering will be better able to compete in the global marketplace because the investments made by NSF will generate exciting opportunities to enhance their studies.

I believe our Nation is well served by increasing the resources available for NSF. For these and many other reasons, I am proud to support this bill and I know this measure will pass the House today with overwhelming bipartisan support. This day will mark a day when we make the future of this country immeasurably brighter and bigger because investing in science is always a good investment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the angel of NIST.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the guardian of the Committee on Science for yielding the time to me.

It is with great pleasure that I rise as a very proud cosponsor to speak on behalf of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Reauthorization Act. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the ranking members for their leadership on this issue. This committee has had a congenial disposition; but the bipartisan nature under which we have operated to produce this bill is a true tribute to the leadership and consensus-building skills on both sides of the aisle. I hope we can continue to work together to produce this kind of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago we made a historic pledge to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health. It took a lot of hard work to get the initial commitment, and even more to see it through. Despite a war on terrorism and an economic downturn, Congress and the administration kept its word and fulfilled that promise. The NIH is funding twice the work it did a mere 5 years ago. That is a tremendous accomplishment. In the 21st century, revolutions in our understanding of biol-

ogy will rival those of physics in the 20th, and work sponsored by the NIH must continue to be a priority.

However, their initiatives cannot and must not be pursued exclusively. Science has become intricately interconnected; discoveries in one drive innovations in others. Without adequate research into the underlying fields of physics and chemistry, advancements in biology and medicine will stall. If we expect the myriad achievements of recent years to continue, we must support the underpinning science and engineering more robustly. As such, I believe we need a more balanced portfolio and need to champion the traditional areas of research, as well as the exciting new projects that have generated so many headlines of late.

□ 1400

In addition, we must do a better job of training the next generation of scientists and engineers. Fewer and fewer Americans are undertaking technical careers, accepting the torch from elder scientists and building on the accomplishments of generations past. We have made up for this shortfall largely by relying on foreign students and post-docs to fill the ever widening void. This is a poor long-term solution, and we must find ways to arrest the decline of American scientists.

The National Science Foundation is uniquely positioned to accomplish both of these goals. As the premier supporter of the overall scientific enterprise, the NSF has the exclusive ability to balance research and education dollars. They already reach across the entire scientific spectrum, touching all of the major disciplines, and can ensure underfunded areas of science and technology receive adequate support.

They are also the primary Federal agency when it comes to science education. They more than anyone else are responsible for supporting new scientists in all of the physical disciplines, and they are prepared to target traditionally underrepresented groups to fill the gaps.

I myself had the opportunity to work with NSF on the Congressional Commission on the Advancement of Women, Minorities and Persons with Disability in terms of recognizing the important contribution that they can make to the development of our next generation of scientists and engineers. As our society becomes more and more technologically focused, we must ensure that our educational system is training our youth to meet the rigorous demands of the future. The NSF has a vital role to play. I know that they are up to the task.

What is more, the NSF has consistently scored at the top of all government agencies when it comes to efficient and effective use of resources. The GAO routinely gives them favorable evaluations. They are one of only a few agencies to successfully comply with GPRA requirements. They have all the tools, and they know how to use

them. All they need are the resources. With this bill, they will have them.

I have been a consistent advocate of an increased science portfolio. This is the way to go. The NSF deserves our support. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the NSF reauthorization. H.R. 4664 is a good bill, it is a bipartisan bill; and I want to compliment Chairman BOEHLERT, Chairman SMITH, and the ranking members for closely working together so that both sides are well represented in this legislation. Even during these tight budget times, investing in basic research like that at NSF is a wise and fiscally-prudent decision. I strongly believe we must make significant long-term investments in this Nation's sciences. This bill does just that.

The need for increased funding at NSF is clear. Recent data published by the National Academy of Sciences on Federal funding for basic research shows us that we are not meeting today's challenges. Sadly, there is strong evidence of declining basic research funding in many of the physical science areas. However, since NSF is the source of 36 percent of the Federal funding for basic research that is performed at universities and colleges in the physical sciences, we now have a chance to reverse course.

In my home State of California, NSF partners with the University of California on numerous research proposals in the physical sciences. I know that this bill will continue to support those needed partnerships for our long-term science and research needs. It is clear that in this instance, the returns to the Federal Government far exceed our public investment. That is why I urge my colleagues to support this bill to increase the NSF budget.

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to add to the comments I made a moment ago under the discussion for the rule but apply those comments specifically to the National Science Foundation.

Over the past decade, we have had some interesting trends in the funding of scientific research in the United States. However, we have failed to keep pace with that of other nations. At the moment, we are spending less on research compared to GDP in the United States than Japan does and the gap is increasing, not decreasing. Even worse, we are spending less compared to our GDP than Germany does. Even worse, we are rapidly being overtaken by South Korea. We are losing ground. Yet

we are supposed to be the superpower, the world's leader, not only in military might but also in research and advancement. We have to change that trend. We made a good step in that direction a few years ago when we doubled the NIH budget over a period of 5 years. It is high time we do precisely the same for the National Science Foundation.

Just to illustrate the impact of what has happened and how things have gotten out of balance, I have here a very small chart, which I hope my colleagues can read, and at least see the trend lines, which shows very clearly what has happened to NIH, as shown on the top line. A few years ago NIH was bundled fairly closely to NASA and Department of Energy research. We decided to double it, and it has shot up exponentially as happens when you double things, whereas NASA is holding its own or slightly down, and DOE, the Department of Energy, has gone down.

We are spending less on research in the Department of Energy now than we did 10 years ago, in real dollars. The National Science Foundation, our most important basic research entity, is struggling along at the bottom of the chart. It had slight increases over the past decade, but very slight. I maintain that that is out of balance. As the rate of NIH goes up, NSF should also go up, because the National Institutes of Health builds its research on the basic research that is done under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. They go to the well of this basic research periodically and build on what has been developed there. But if they go to the well and the well is empty, all the money that we have spent for NIH is not going to count for much. It is essential that we proceed with the doubling that is proposed in this bill for the National Science Foundation. I commend Chairman BOEHLERT and Chairman SMITH for leading the charge in this effort. It is something that we must do and that we can do.

To those who are worried about budget busting, let me simply point out that this year's increase in the National Institutes of Health is greater than doubling the NSF budget will be. In other words, this year's increase in NIH is greater than the total current budget of the National Science Foundation. At the very least, we can easily afford to double the NSF budget; and by doing that over 5 years, we are spending one-fifth of what we have been spending each year to increase NIH.

This is a good bill. I urge that my colleagues vote for it. I urge that we pass this bill and put this doubling program into effect.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me

this time and Chairman BOEHLERT and Ranking Member HALL and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for their efforts in getting this bill. I am proud to be a co-sponsor as well.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act. This legislation, that will increase the funding for the National Science Foundation, is critical and it is probably more critical at this time than anyone can imagine. I believe that maintaining our Nation's global scientific and economic leadership provides the best justification for funding basic research, and that is really what we are talking about here. I also believe that a solid academic foundation in math and science education is critical to our success as a Nation in the 21st century.

As the lead source of Federal funding for basic research at colleges and universities, NSF supports research and educational programs that are crucial to technological advances in the private sector and for training our next generation of scientists and engineers. NSF funds cutting-edge research in science and technology that is critical in the United States. The research funded by the foundation has played a pivotal role in raising the standards of living in the United States as well as around the world.

As we have already heard from others, with a very small portion of Federal spending, the National Science Foundation has had a powerful impact on national science and engineering. Every dollar invested in this agency returns manifold in its worth in economic growth. For example, over 25 percent of the Federal support for academic institutions for basic research is provided through the National Science Foundation and almost 50 percent of the funding for nonmedical research at universities is provided through the National Science Foundation. NSF also provides 46 percent of the basic research in engineering performed at colleges and universities and also helps train more than 25,000 graduate students each year. I am pleased with the accomplishments that NSF has made in research and education initiatives, and I strongly support the doubling of NSF's budget by the proposed increase of 15 percent over the next 3 years in pursuit of this effort.

As the former superintendent of schools of my home State of North Carolina, I have worked for many years to improve science and mathematics education in our schools. We need better science and mathematics education in the K-12 classrooms if we are going to have it in university students. Quality instruction is the key to helping students learn in these critical fields. At a time when we are trying to improve the quality and quantity of science and mathematics in America, appropriate investments in NSF is critical to enabling our students to compete in today's knowledge-based economy. This increase in NSF budget will

help ensure that improving science and mathematics education remains a national priority. I urge the vote and signature by the President.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI).

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act. This bill would reauthorize the National Science Foundation at its highest level for the next 5 years, placing it in an unprecedented doubling track. I thank Chairman SMITH and Chairman BOEHLERT for the time on the floor today to speak on this very important issue and for their leadership on this increasingly important issue.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation. H.R. 4664 not only takes a decisive step to doubling the funding for the National Science Foundation but also is a clear example of the support of this House in scientific discovery and growth. Now more than ever science and technology are leading the way to not only expand America and make it the best it can be but also to protect our citizens and improve our homeland security. Technologies such as radiation detectors and highest-level x-ray are keeping our homes, our businesses, and our transportation systems safe every day. But these critical technologies originate from the same place, from the Federal laboratories and university research that benefit from the National Science Foundation. Basic research is key to generating these ground-breaking and important technologies that we utilize in our lives every day.

My district is the home to leaders in basic research, the Brookhaven National Laboratory and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. These great institutions have benefited greatly from the support and funding from the National Science Foundation, advancing their endeavors and educational opportunities for students and scientists alike.

□ 1415

I am pleased that the bill includes important language clarifying the selection process of the Major Research Equipment Account. These large scale research projects are some of the best science our Nation has to offer, and it is imperative that a clear selective process is in place with congressional oversight. I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for his leadership on this issue and for including this language in the bill.

The National Science Foundation represents the best in math and science education. In order for our Nation to remain a world leader in discovery and innovation, we must strive to educate our younger generation, engaging them in math and science activities.

It is no surprise that the bill is entitled the Investing in America's Future Act, because that is exactly what we will succeed in doing by passing this legislation. Educational programs funded by the National Science Foundation offer students opportunities for exciting studies in innovative fields of learning. From as early as grade school through to the post-doctoral level, the National Science Foundation provides the much-needed support to those students striving to achieve in the science field.

Again, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this very important legislation and thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for the time to speak here today. I look forward to the passage of this exciting bill and urge a "yes" vote from my colleagues.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4664, to authorize funds for the National Science Foundation. As a proud cosponsor of this legislation, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) and the ranking members for their excellent work on this; but I also want to reinforce my strong support for the \$50 million funding for the Advanced Technological Education Program in FY 2002 and \$55 million for the program in 2003.

The Advanced Technological Education Program is an NSF program designed to help community colleges train high-tech workers. It is the only NSF program focused solely on community colleges. This program provides funds for both existing and new ATE programs.

These programs will become increasingly important as our economy becomes more dependent on technologically skilled workers. In fact, every single one of the top 10 fastest-growing occupations identified by the Department of Labor will require specialized knowledge in the fields of math and science. ATE programs will fund technology, math and science programs that will directly contribute to student success in those fields.

A few weeks ago my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and I introduced H.R. 4680, the Science Undergraduate Community College Education Enhancement Act, or, as we call it, SUCCEED. This bill will further direct ATE money to important science, math and technology two-year education programs.

Almost half of all college students in America are enrolled in community colleges, but many of the core math and science programs at these institutions are now severely underfunded. This is unacceptable, especially at a time when our knowledge-based economy depends on a workforce with a solid grounding in math and science.

The SUCCEED Act will function in several areas. First of all, it will ex-

pand the scope of existing grant programs to not only focus on the advanced upper division courses, but on the basics in math and technology skills and science skills that are necessary for success in more advanced course work.

In addition and importantly, it will expand partnerships between 2-year and 4-year institutions. Increasingly, our 2-year community colleges are partnering with 4-year institutions, and the SUCCEED Act will provide funding for integrated research between community and 4-year colleges.

This bill will also provide access to state-of-the-art equipment for our classrooms. We cannot expect our students in the community colleges to learn the kind of advanced skills they need if we do not have the fundamental infrastructure and equipment for them to learn those skills.

Finally, this bill will establish an external advisory committee to study how the effectiveness of this legislation is proceeding and to disseminate critical information to share that with other 2-year institutions.

Again, I want to thank the staff of the Committee on Science for their outstanding work, and my own staff member, Ms. Kate Sinner, for her work on this. Thanks again to the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank everyone involved with this, but none more than the gentleman I am about to introduce to consume the balance of our time. The gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH) is the spark plug behind this legislation. He is serving with great distinction on that very important Subcommittee on Research, and he constantly reminds us every single day about the importance of the work we are about.

Before yielding the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH), I would like to note that we have a staff that is second to none on the Committee on Science, Republicans and Democrats, all professionals working well together to fashion the type of product that we can bring to the floor with a great deal of pride. This is one such product, and the man most responsible for it is the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) be allowed to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT) for those gracious remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I feel privileged to be allowed to be the sponsor of this legislation, H.R. 4664. But, as we all know, we have a fantastic scientific community out there, and NSF is one of the lead agencies that has done such a tremendous job. In our committee, it has been a bipartisan support, right from the get-go, with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research.

The last time this agency was authorized was in 1998 as part of a 3-year bill that expired at the end of fiscal year 2000. That is why I think it is so important that we move ahead with this legislation today, to make sure that the House has the kind of oversight of all agencies of government, as it is destined to do.

Let me just say that it is so clear from every evaluation and every economic analysis that the Federal investment in science and technology is about as good an investment as you can possibly make with the Americans' taxpayer money to make sure that we have the basic research for national security. Smart bombs and smart weapons and the technological ability of our economic security come from this kind of basic research.

It is also important for our economy, and we have been credited by Mr. Greenspan and many others that our economic strength is derived from the basic research that we have worked on over the last 50 years, and certainly not the least is the strength of the health in the United States.

I would like to give one quote that is very interesting, and that is from Harold Varmus, the former director of NIH. He said, "Congress is not addressing with significant vigor the compelling needs for adequately funding the National Science Foundation, which is the basis of a lot of the research and a lot of the tools they are using at NIH."

This bill is the product of 2 years of hearings and examinations of NSF activities by the Committee on Science and our Subcommittee on Research; and during this time the committee received input from prominent scientists, economists, government officials and from other experts with an interest in improving federally funded basic research.

In the end, we arrived at three principal conclusions. One, NSF is a model government agency with an exemplary record of supporting basic research within a peer-reviewed, competitive grant process that funds only the best cutting-edge research, and does so using under 5 percent of the total budget in overhead costs.

Second, as a relatively small Federal agency responsible for just 4 percent of the total Federal research development expenditures, NSF-funded research has led to a myriad of discoveries that have improved, as I mentioned, public health, strengthened our economy, and enhanced our lives and well-being in many ways we could not have imagined 30 years ago.

Three, a number of areas within NSF programs require additional funding to assure continued advancements in the Nation's scientific enterprise. Among them are funding new education initiatives, alleviating grant pressure within a system that cannot fund over 30 percent of highly rated research proposals.

Again, of all of these highly rated research proposals, we only end up being able to fund 30 percent of the excellent ideas that are coming in from all of the universities and research facilities. It is for these reasons that the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), I and every member of the Committee on Science called for significant increases in support for NSF in this legislation.

I say this as a true fiscal conservative that strongly supports the President's efforts to keep nondefense discretionary spending in check so we can fully focus our budget on the Federal Government's number one priority of defending our Nation, and basic research is part of that responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill today. Let me say this about research and what we do in the United States, and I think it needs to be said. Research is a very important part of what we do here in the United States, and it is a very important part of our economic growth.

About half of the economic growth in the United States today is as a result of research which has been funded in the past. We represent about 4 percent of the world's population, but we represent about 44 percent of the money that is spent on basic research. That is important, and there is a correlation.

I was fortunate to go and visit some of our national labs. They truly are national treasures. What they do through the National Science Foundation, not only through our labs but our universities around the country, makes a big, big difference.

A few years ago I was privileged to meet with a fellow by the name of Gene Fry. Now, Gene Fry is a researcher at a little company called 3M. Now, this probably was not original, but he said something very important that day. He said if we knew what we were doing, it would not be research.

There is a lot of truth to that. A lot of the projects that we fund at the beginning it is hard to defend. But ultimately the reason that we live in the world we live in today is because brave legislatures in the past and brave business people in the past have been willing to invest in projects that may not have made a lot of sense at the time.

I think we have to have the courage to stand up and say research is a very important responsibility to the Federal Government. We get a huge rate of re-

turn on the money that we invest in research, and we will determine today what kind of a world our children will live in. This is an important bill. I am happy to rise in support of it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research.

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 4664, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT); the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL); and the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH) for working with me and the rest of the committee in a bipartisan manner on this important piece of legislation that makes a strong statement about our commitment to invest in America's future.

H.R. 4664 places the National Science Foundation on the path to double its budget in 5 years, which was the goal of H.R. 1472, the NSF authorization bill that I introduced last April 2001. I introduced H.R. 1472 because I strongly believed that investing in basic research, math and engineering research is essential to the future economic prosperity and global competitiveness of our country. Even after September 11, what we are depending on most now will be the kinds of technology that the research from the National Science Foundation has brought to the forefront.

The National Science Foundation plays a leading role in educating our youth in math and sciences and training the scientists and engineers of tomorrow, and the agency is working to ensure that tomorrow's high-tech workers reflect a diversity of America. It is my sincere hope that my colleagues will recognize the importance of basic research to our Nation's future and will pass H.R. 4664.

The National Science Foundation expends only 3.8 percent of the Federal research and development funds, yet this relatively small amount belies the importance of the agency to our country. The National Science Foundation provides 23 percent of the basic research funding at academic institutions. For specific research areas, the National Science Foundation's role at universities is even larger. It funds 36 percent of research in the physical sciences, 49 percent of research in the environmental sciences, 50 percent of research in engineering, 72 percent of research in mathematics, and 78 percent of research in computer science. So, clearly, the National Science Foundation plays a disproportionately important role in funding some of the most basic research areas that have implications far beyond their own academic area.

□ 1430

To give an idea of the quality and importance of the NSF-funded research to our Nation, consider the fact that over 100 Nobel prizes have been awarded to scientists supported by the National Science Foundation research in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine and economics. In nearly every field of science and engineering are examples of outstanding research supported by the National Science Foundation. This research leads to critical advances in the understanding of our world and in technology that improves our lives.

For example, the National Science Foundation support at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications at the University of Illinois developed the first Internet browser that led to the explosive growth of the World Wide Web. The National Science Foundation-funded research in atmospheric chemistry identified the ozone depletion over the Antarctic, the ozone hole, as it has come to be known. NSF-funded research on mathematics and solid modeling led to the widespread use of computer-aided design and computer-aided manufacturing that has revolutionized industry and enhanced workplace productivity. These are but a few examples of the scientific breakthroughs that have been funded by the NSF in recent years, and this and other research supported by NSF ultimately strengthens our economy. The connection between research funding and the strength of the economy has been expounded by such diverse sources as former presidential science advisor Allen Bromley, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and the Hart-Rudman Commission for National Security. Yet despite the importance of basic research to the future economic health and well-being of our country, NSF now must decline more than \$1 billion worth of high quality research proposals each year. Why? Because NSF's budget is insufficient to meet the demands of our Nation's vibrant research sector.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that everyone must learn to live within their budget, and NSF has, it is a shame that top-notch proposals go unfunded for lack of resources. It is essential that our Nation's premier science research agency has the resources it needs to fund advances that could lead to the next World Wide Web or deciphering the genome of a critically important crop. Our generation has benefited enormously from the investment of our parents and grandparents made in basic research decades ago, and we owe it to our children to see that they enjoy the same pace of technological advancement that we have enjoyed. It is critical that we invest in basic research today that will lead to better life tomorrow.

These are but a few examples of the scientific breakthroughs that have been funded by NSF in recent years, and this and other re-

search supported by the NSF ultimately strengthens our economy. The connection between research funding and the strength of the economy has been expounded by such diverse sources as former presidential science advisor Allen Bromley, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, former speaker of the House Newt Gingrich, and the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security.

Yet despite the importance of basic research to the future economic health and well-being of our country, NSF now must decline more than 1 billion dollar's worth of high quality research proposals each year. Why? Because NSF's budget is insufficient to meet the demands of our Nation's vibrant research sector. Mr. Chairman, while it is true that everyone must learn to live within their budget, and NSF has, it is a shame that top-notch proposals go unfunded for lack of resources.

In addition to funding basic research at our Nation's laboratories, the National Science Foundation makes essential investments in training the scientists and engineers of tomorrow. NSF research awards and direct research fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, the future scientists and engineers essential to our high-tech economy. The bill before us today seeks to strengthen NSF's graduate research fellowships by funding more research grants and increasing the average grant size and duration.

NSF programs also help to improve science education for all students and to prepare them for citizenship in a world increasingly dominated by technology. Today we continue to have manpower shortages in many high technology fields, and many industries rely on the labor and brain power of foreign nationals. The ideal way to alleviate the shortages is by ensuring that our Nation's children of all races and both genders receive the basic grounding in science and mathematics that will prepare them to pursue careers as scientists, engineers and technologists. Now, more than ever, we need to ensure that an adequate number of Americans choose careers in the sciences and engineering. We cannot allow inadequate funding to cripple NSF's efforts in this area.

Mr. Chairman, over the past few months, there has been a great deal of debate about the appropriate level of funding for the National Science Foundation. Some have proposed essentially flat levels of funding, while others have proposed a small 8.8% increase for one fiscal year. These levels are simply not enough for an agency as highly regarded and as critical to the future well-being of our Nation as the National Science Foundation. I say that we must double the budget of NSF and invest in our Nation's future. H.R. 4664 was developed in a bipartisan fashion and enjoys the strong support of the Science Committee. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Science for its work in putting together this reauthorization for the National Science Foundation. This bill shows us the path we must take to ensure that our Nation con-

tinues to lead the world in technological innovation and in scientific capacity, by doubling Federal funding for the NSF over the next 5 years, just as we have done for the National Institutes of Health.

In a widely-circulated letter last year, Dr. Harold Varmus, the former director of the NIH, made it clear that we do health research no favors when we underfund basic research in the physical sciences. Physical science disciplines are often the key not only to providing the tools used in conducting health research, but in delivering the benefits of health research to the public.

Just take a walk through any hospital surgical unit or emergency room, where you will be surrounded by more pieces of medical technology than you can count, and you will quickly understand this point.

I also want to draw the attention of Members to the bill's reauthorization of the National Science Foundation's Advanced Technology Education program. The ATE program is the only NSF program targeted to community colleges.

Associate-degree-granting colleges educate the vast majority of the three to five technicians that support each engineer, scientist, and medical doctor across this Nation.

Meeting the demand for high-tech workers by both our modernizing manufacturing sector and our new-economy enterprises requires strengthening undergraduate education in science, mathematics, and technology at associate-degree-granting colleges, where nearly half of all undergraduate college students are enrolled. That is the purpose of the ATE program, which provides grants to 2-year institutions to develop new curricula and teaching methods and materials in advanced technology fields.

I have worked on our Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations to increase ATE funding, and we have enjoyed some successes. However, current funding is still under \$40 million a year, and cut of \$950,000 has been recommended by the administration for the next fiscal year. A more adequate authorization would offer considerable help.

Fortunately, the Committee on Science accepted an amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), to authorize the ATE program at \$50 million for fiscal year 2003, with a \$5 million increase for each of the next 2 fiscal years.

In fact, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and I have introduced legislation to more broadly expand and strengthen the ATE program.

In addition to increasing funding for the program, the Science Undergraduate Community College Education Enhancement Development Act, the SUCCESS Act, H.R. 4680, would give community colleges more flexibility to develop innovative core math

and science curricula, and would provide more opportunities for community college students to have research experiences at 4-year institutions.

Our bill would also establish an advisory committee, comprised of representatives from industry and academia, to evaluate the effectiveness of the ATE program and to make recommendations on how it can be improved. Also, it would promote the dissemination of ATE results to community college systems across the Nation.

While the increased authorization level for the ATE program is included in the bill before us now, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) was successful in adding the remaining provisions of H.R. 4680 to the Undergraduate Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology Improvement Act, which was also recently approved by the Committee on Science.

I again congratulate the Committee on Science and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the fine work they have done today in bringing H.R. 4664 to the House floor. I urge all of our colleagues to support it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

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

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentlewoman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this legislation. It is, I think, very important, and I think the committee, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON), has done an excellent job.

We heard that the National Science Foundation provides only a few percent of the total Federal research and development budget, but it provides a large fraction of the support for mathematics, biological sciences, earth sciences, social sciences, and engineering.

We have all heard about the many things that have come out of NSF research: the work in thin film technology, in genetics, in magnetic resonance imaging, CD players, printers, Taxol, and so forth.

It is also important to recognize the return on investment to this Federal investment. Economists will argue about whether the return on investment in research and development is 20 percent, 40 percent, or 60 percent. Whatever it is, it is extraordinarily high. This is one of the best things that we as a Congress can do who have been entrusted with the worthwhile expenditure of taxpayer money.

As one Member of Congress who himself has conducted NSF-funded research, and who every year that I have been in Congress has worked to see the NSF budget increased, I am very pleased to see the NSF on this faster growth path, because we can talk about funding the National Institutes

of Health and other health-related research here in the United States, but unless we invest in the research that leads to improved techniques and instrumentation and the training of scientists, that investment in health research will not yield the returns that we should be getting from it.

Just today I have been having some briefings with investigative and intelligence organizations. They have reminded me just today how much they are dependent on research that is coming out of the National Science Foundation for their work in dealing with anthrax and other pathogens.

Finally, I would say the most important work that the National Science Foundation is doing is the work in our schools, particularly in the pre-college setting. The members of the committee are to be commended for putting together such a good authorization bill.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I would like to commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Science and the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Research for their leadership on this issue.

Investment in research and development is one of the single largest contributing factors to the Nation's past, present, and future economic growth. The U.S. high technology industry spends more on R&D than on any other industry, but because corporations feel acute pressure to focus scarce research dollars on market-driven product development, the Federal Government must play an integral role in the longer-term basic research that leads to fundamental innovations.

Federal support for basic research has contributed to the development of the Internet, personal computers, the silicon chip, lasers, fiber optics, supercomputers, and magnetic resonance imaging. The first graphical web browser, high-speed networks, artificial intelligence, databases, and the graphical user interface all have their roots in government-sponsored research.

Over the past few years, funding for research in the physical sciences has declined as a fraction of overall R&D spending. Funding for the National Institutes of Health now makes up over half of all non-defense research, and the proposed research at NIH funding this year is as large as NSF's entire budget.

This funding imbalance threatens long-term research at a time when we are quickly approaching the physical limits to semiconductor performance. A new technological revolution is needed if we are going to continue improving computer performance like we have in the past few years. It is essential that we invest in basic research to provide the scientific basis for this technological revolution so that we can

maintain the gains in productivity that lead to economic growth.

A sustained public and private investment in R&D will also foster a skilled American work force, stimulate new technologies, and maintain U.S. dominance in vital industries, elements critical to retaining the United States' global economic leadership in the new millennium.

The 2001 report of the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security for the 21st Century determined that "the scale and nature of the ongoing revolution in science and technology . . . pose critical national security challenges to the United States."

To address the challenge, the commission recommended a doubling of all Federal funding for science and technology research and development by 2010. I believe we should strive to achieve this goal, and I recommend and urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4664.

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

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that it would be nice just to include myself in the good remarks made by both sides of the aisle on the importance of basic research.

One area that we have not talked about that I think is so important in NSF is it keeps young, quality minds at that university staying in research, so it encourages the talented young people in our university systems to stay on, to get their Master's degrees and their Doctor's degree.

Just in terms of sort of proving that point, if we are looking at all the Nobel Laureates in physics, in chemistry, and in economics, most every one of those individuals at one time in their career had an NSF grant. So part of the tremendous success of the program is keeping these talented young people in that research arena to do what is necessary to strengthen our economy, to improve our public health, and certainly to add to our ability to defend ourselves and our national security.

□ 1445

America's position as a world leader in science and education is a key element to our national security. Let me just mention in the report on national security in the 21st century, the Hart-Rudman Commission noted that and, I will quote, "The inadequacies of our systems of research and education pose a greater threat to U.S. national security over the next quarter century than any potential conventional war that we might imagine."

It is important that we move ahead, that we improve our education system, that we work more diligently than we ever have before, keeping more students in the math and sciences as they

move their careers through high school and into the college arena.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to summarize by saying that I believe we have put together a strong piece of legislation that will allow Congress to demonstrate its commitment to continuing the economic gains and technological advances of recent years through support of fundamental basic research. The increase in this legislation is a sound investment and is brought by bipartisan support, was passed through both the Subcommittee on Research and the full Committee on Science by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I would like to point out that NSF-funded research has also directly benefited America's effort in response to the events of 9/11—supporting emergency grants pioneering the use of genomics as a tool in forensic analysis of microbes after last October's anthrax attacks. Also, an NSF-funded robotics grant led to the development of software-guided robots that were used successfully to search the rubble and locate victims at the World Trade Center Disaster site.

NSF research has also led to faster computer Magnetic Resonance Imaging the Internet, Doppler radar, discoveries of new planets, new polymers materials that are used in products ranging from clothing to automobiles, and most recently, fundamental plant genomics research that will lead to improved crop varieties that increase yields while better protecting the environment. These are just a few examples, but the list goes on and on.

I want to reiterate that NSF has supported these achievements with an efficiency that is almost unheard of in the Federal Government. NSF has been recognized for its strong management—as the only cabinet agency to receive a “green light” rating in the President's budget. Mitch Daniels, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, has hailed NSF as “one of the true centers of excellence in government.”

Let me summarize by saying that I believe we have put together a strong piece of legislation that will allow Congress to demonstrate its commitment to continuing the economic gains and technological advancements of recent years through support of fundamental basic research. The increase in this legislation is a sound investment and has broad bipartisan support, was passed through both the Research Subcommittee and the full Science Committee by voice vote, and I urge all members to support the bill.

NSF has supported the research of more than half of the United States Nobel laureates in physics, chemistry, and economics. Since 1989, 80% of NSF-funded Nobel prize winners were funded by NSF before winning the prize.

Research supported by the National Science Foundation has led to a myriad of discoveries, technologies, and products that improve our daily lives, including: a greater understanding of bacteria, viruses, and the structure of DNA; medical diagnostic tools, such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI); the Internet, web browsers, and fiber optics, which have revolutionized global communication; automated DNA sequencing machines; polymer materials used in products ranging from clothing to automobiles; Doppler radar used

for accurate weather forecasting; artificial skin that can help recovering burn victims; economic research in game and decision theory which has led to a greater understanding of economic cycles; and discoveries of new planets, black holes, and insights into the nature of the universe.

More recently, NSF-funded research has benefited America's effort in response to the events of 9/11. An NSF-funded grant led to the development of software-guided robots that were used successfully to search the rubble and locate victims at the World Trade Center disaster site. Also, NSF supported emergency grants pioneering the use of genomics as a tool in forensic analysis of microbes after last October's anthrax attacks.

These advances have all come from an agency that receives only 4% of the total annual Federal spending for R&D.

NSF has also been the lead Federal agency in a number of national science initiatives, such as those in information technology, plant genomics, and nanotechnology.

The National Science Foundation's innovative education programs work to ensure that every American student receives a solid foundation in science and math through support for the training and education of teachers, the public, and students of all ages and backgrounds, and by supporting research into new teaching tools, curricula, and methodologies.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my concern over this legislation that will double the National Science Foundation's (NSF) budget in five years. I feel that while we have taken the effort to double the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and now NSF, this committee has neglected NASA. I am supportive of our commitment to NSF and have a history of such support. At this time, however, given the lack of attention this committee has given NASA, I cannot support this particular piece of legislation.

NASA's budget has been neglected for over a decade. When one considers inflation, the NASA budget is not keeping pace. This sends the wrong message. As a medical doctor and scientist, I very much appreciate the work that NIH and NSF do, but to keep NASA out in the cold I feel is the wrong approach. No other agency has such a daring, exciting and public mission. It is time we treated NASA as a valued Federal agency instead of letting it wither on the vine.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act. Past investment in fundamental scientific research has fueled growth of our economy, trained our technological workforce, and provided the research needed for national and homeland security. It is time to ensure our future prosperity and security by recognizing the important work performed by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the only agency devoted to supporting basic science research in science, math, and engineering across all fields and science and math education at all levels.

This legislation will double the NSF's budget over the next five years. Increasing funding for the NSF demonstrates the recognition of the lasting benefits that basic research provides to our economic and national security. The increase would also be used to expand core science programs to fund highly ranked grant proposals, pursue new initiatives like nanotechnology and biocomplexity, and fully

fund K–12 education programs that have been authorized by the House of Representatives. In addition, the bill provides greater transparency to the process through which major research and facilities construction projects are evaluated, prioritized, and selected for funding by requiring the Director to develop a list of proposed projects, ranking the relative priority of each for funding. This will allow Congress and NSF to expand its investments in cutting-edge research initiatives and to preserve its core research and education programs.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly believe that investing in basic science, math, and engineering research is essential to the future economic prosperity and global competitiveness of our country and an important investment for the future. For these reasons, I support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of H.R. 4664, I rise in support of this important bill that will put the National Science Foundation on a track to double its budget in five years.

I thank Chairman BOEHLERT and my colleagues in the Science Committee for their hard work on this bill.

I think we all recognize that investing in basic research is critical for a strong economy and national security. In the past 50 years, half of U.S. economic productivity can be attributed to technological innovation and the science that has supported it. Despite this fact, over the last two decades Federal investment in R&D has fallen by one-third as a share of the GDP.

This bill will help put us on the right track. Federal investment in science underpins our global competitiveness and our prosperity. NSF-funded research made possible the discovery of the “ozone hole,” developed the first Web browser, advanced the field of molecular genetics, and funded much of the early research leading to the development of speech activation and recognition technology. Less directly but no less importantly, NSF is often the major source of support for education and training of Ph.D. scientists and engineers, many of whom have gone on to make major private-sector contributions in the development of cell phones, fiber optics, and computer assisted design.

NSF provides fully 23% of total Federal support for university research—or nearly half excluding NIH sponsored biomedical research. From sources such as former science advisor to the first President Bush, Allen Bromley, and Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, to the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security, we hear that Federal funding for research is a necessary precondition for continued economic success and security in our high technology economy.

I think former Speaker Newt Gingrich said in best in a 1999 Washington Post op-ed. He wrote that “Out of our sense of patriotism and our own enlightened self-interest, we should . . . insist that Federal investment in scientific research be doubled over the next five years. . . . Anything less will weaken the future for all of us.”

Mr. Chairman, I agree, and I urge support of this important bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Members of the Science Committee, subcommittee, sponsor, and all the Members who worked so hard on

H.R. 4664, the Investing in America's Future Act of 2002.

I would like to take this opportunity today to voice my strong support for this legislation.

This legislation authorizes additional funding to a very important organization, the National Science Foundation.

The bills directs NASA to jointly establish an Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee to assess and provide recommendations regarding the coordination of astronomy and astrophysics programs at each agency.

This is one of the several provisions in this bill that would strengthen NASA. NASA plays a huge role in the 18th Congressional District, as many of my constituents are employed there.

The continued development of this nation's science program ought to be one of this nation's top priorities. By establishing a joint committee on astronomy to assess coordination of astronomy programs between the agencies and to assess the activities of the agencies relative to recommendations of the surveys conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, this bill would further make the science program accountable to Congress.

As a member of the Science Committee, I can attest to the fact that we have held numerous hearings investigating and asking relevant questions on how to best fund the NSF and how to best make it accessible and accountable to Congress.

By focusing directly on the research initiatives such as information technology, nanoscale science and engineering, and mathematical sciences, as well as the Major Research Instrumentation program, H.R. 4664 further enhances the research and education departments of the National Science Foundation.

Let me also voice my strong support for the funding of minority institutions in science education. This provision will open the door for many future scientists to carry the torch for many years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, which will reauthorize the National Science Foundation for the next three years. This bill is of the highest priority to me and to many colleges and universities in my district. I've already heard from students, professors and administrators from the University of Wisconsin who have told me that a lack of serious commitment to science funding and research would not only stunt the growth and education of many qualified students, but would also seriously cripple some of their most critical research efforts. This is why I'm delighted with the commitment in this legislation to increase NSF funding by 15 percent each year for the next three years. This commitment is similar to the highly successfully funding commitment that doubled the National Institutes of Health budget over the past five years.

The NSF funds 25% of the basic research conducted in universities across the nation, and a considerably higher percentage in selected fields. The NSF funds 425 grants for well over \$60 million at the University of Wisconsin-Madison alone, helping to make UW-Madison one of the top research universities in the country. NSF grants and fellowships also help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, many of whom go on to make

major contributions in academia and industry. University research funded by the NSF trains new generations of scientists and engineers, but without the type of funding increase outlined in this legislation, universities will be forced to limit the number of graduate students that they are able to admit to these programs.

One example of a thriving NSF project in my district is the IceCube Neutrino telescope, which is headed by UW-Madison. When completed, this groundbreaking new telescope will look deep into our universe in ways that traditional telescopes cannot. It is truly on the cutting edge of astronomical research and will allow us to view the universe in an entirely new and innovative manner. Furthermore, IceCube has been subjected to exhaustive peer review and is one of many shining examples of the sound science and basic research that the NSF successfully fosters.

It is my sincere hope that funding levels outlined in this legislation are met when it comes time to fund the NSF. Science funding for research should be and often is a result of bipartisanship. I am pleased that this is the case today. In that spirit, I urge a yes vote on this legislation and urge appropriators to fully fund the NSF at these new levels.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of a bill designed to improve the security, economy, and standard of living of all Americans, the Investing in America's Future Act, H.R. 4664. The bill accomplishes this by putting the nation's premier science agency, the National Science Foundation, on track to double its budget in five years.

Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that America has long recognized that its long-term strength and security, and its ability to recover and sustain high levels of economic growth, depends on maintaining its edge in scientific achievement and technological innovation. Biomedical advances have permitted us to live longer, healthier, and more productively. Advances in agriculture technology have permitted us to be able to feed more people at a cheaper cost. The information revolution can be seen today in the advanced instruments schools are using to instruct our children and in the vast information resources that are opened up as a result of the linkages created by a networked global society. Our children today can grow up to know, see, and read more, be more diverse, and have more options in their lives for learning and growing. Other emerging technologies—such as nanotechnology—have untold potential to make our lives more existing, secure, prosperous, and challenging.

Many companies also recognize this and they, therefore, focus their industrial, economic, and security policies on the nurturing and diffusion of technological advancement through all levels of society in a deliberate fashion. Countries that follow this path of nurturing innovation focus a lot of their efforts into recruiting and training the very best engineers and scientists, ensuring that a pipeline which pumps talented and imaginative minds and skills is connected to the needs of the country's socio-economic and security enterprise.

It always pays to be mindful of the fact—especially in the wake of the September 11 events—that there is a strong and tight linkage between our national security and the level of science and technology proficiency in America. Our strength and leadership in the world

is based on the might of our defense, strength of our economy, and the quality of our education system. Without any one of these three components the global preeminence of the nation suffers. These three components are, in turn, maintained on a foundation of strong leadership in the business of scientific and technological innovation, which keeps the engines of progress moving forward.

To remain a strong nation, we must ensure that the single most important element that keeps us dynamic, innovative, prosperous, and secure—and therefore strong—is there for us: our science and technology enterprise. In short, we need to support the NSF and we need to support this bill.

I am honored to be a sponsor of this important legislation in the United States House of Representatives and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 4664, the "Investing in America's Future Act." This bill reauthorizes the National Science Foundation (NSF) for three years, increasing its funding by 15% each year. Today we are taking an important step forward by enhancing our commitment to our nation's science enterprise and setting a long-term goal of doubling the budget of NSF.

The National Science Foundation is the only Federal agency devoted to supporting basic research in science, math, and engineering across all fields and science and math education at all levels. In fact, NSF funds 25% of the basic research conducted in U.S. universities, and a considerably higher percentage in selected fields. NSF grants and fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year, many of whom go on to make major contributions in academia and industry.

My district is home to one of our nation's premier scientific research institutions, the California Institute of Technology (Caltech), and one of the most prominent beneficiaries of NSF grant funding. In fiscal year 2001, Caltech received 31% of its total federal agency research support from NSF, totaling near \$44 million. And Caltech is not alone. In fiscal year 1999, NSF provided 16% of the total federal research and development funds provided to ALL California universities, an impressive sum of \$367 million.

By increasing NSF funding, we will enable this fine institution to expand core science programs, fund highly ranked grant proposals that would otherwise go unfunded, and pursue new initiatives such as nanotechnology and bio-complexity. We must continue to support the backbone of our new economy—fundamental scientific research and education—by supporting the National Science Foundation and its many groundbreaking endeavors.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4664 and to remain steadfast in our commitment to our nation's science enterprise.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed

in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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 "Investing in America's Future Act of 2002".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to section 1?

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2 DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BOARD.**—The term "Board" means the National Science Board established under section 2 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1861).

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term "Director" means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(3) **FOUNDATION.**—The term "Foundation" means the National Science Foundation.

(4) **INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)).

(5) **NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITY.**—The term "national research facility" means a research facility funded by the Foundation which is available, subject to appropriate policies allocating access, for use by all scientists and engineers affiliated with research institutions located in the United States.

(6) **UNITED STATES.**—The term "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2003.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$5,515,260,000 for fiscal year 2003.

(2) **SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.**—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$4,138,440,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities, of which—

(i) \$704,000,000 shall be for networking and information technology research;

(ii) \$238,450,000 shall be for the Nanoscale Science and Engineering Priority Area;

(iii) \$60,090,000 shall be for the Mathematical Sciences Priority Area; and

(iv) \$75,900,000 shall be for Major Research Instrumentation;

(B) \$1,006,250,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources, of which—

(i) \$50,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education Program established under section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i); and

(ii) \$30,000,000 shall be for the Minority Serving Institutions Undergraduate Program;

(C) \$152,350,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) \$210,160,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) \$8,060,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(b) **FISCAL YEAR 2004.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$6,342,550,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(2) **SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.**—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$4,735,600,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities, of which—

(i) \$774,000,000 shall be for networking and information technology research;

(ii) \$286,140,000 shall be for the Nanoscale Science and Engineering Priority Area;

(iii) \$90,090,000 shall be for the Mathematical Sciences Priority Area; and

(iv) \$85,000,000 shall be for Major Research Instrumentation;

(B) \$1,157,190,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources, of which \$55,000,000 shall be for the Advanced Technological Education Program established under section 3 of the Scientific and Advanced-Technology Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 1862i);

(C) \$225,000,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) \$216,460,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) \$8,300,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

(c) **FISCAL YEAR 2005.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation \$7,293,930,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(2) **SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS.**—Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)—

(A) \$5,445,940,000 shall be made available to carry out Research and Related Activities;

(B) \$1,330,770,000 shall be made available for Education and Human Resources;

(C) \$285,710,000 shall be made available for Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction;

(D) \$222,960,000 shall be made available for Salaries and Expenses; and

(E) \$8,550,000 shall be made available for the Office of Inspector General.

SEC. 4. OBLIGATION OF MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT FUNDS.

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2003.**—None of the funds authorized under section 3(a)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the first report required under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

(b) **FISCAL YEAR 2004.**—None of the funds authorized under section 3(b)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the report required by June 15, 2003, under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

(c) **FISCAL YEAR 2005.**—None of the funds authorized under section 3(c)(2)(C) may be obligated until 30 days after the report required by June 15, 2004, under section 7(a)(2) is transmitted to the Congress.

SEC. 5. ANNUAL PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF FUNDING.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of legislation providing for the annual appropriation of funds for the Foundation, the Director shall submit to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, a plan for the allocation of funds authorized by this Act for the corresponding fiscal year. The portion of the plan pertaining to Research and Related Activities shall include a description of how the allocation of funding—

(1) will affect the average size and duration of research grants supported by the Foundation by field of science, mathematics, and engineering;

(2) will affect trends in research support for major fields and subfields of science, mathe-

tics, and engineering, including for emerging multidisciplinary research areas; and

(3) is designed to achieve an appropriate balance among major fields and subfields of science, mathematics, and engineering.

SEC. 6. PROPORTIONAL REDUCTION.

(a) **OVERALL AMOUNTS.**—If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(1), (b)(1), or (c)(1) is less than the amount authorized under that paragraph, the amount available under each subparagraph of paragraph (2) of that subsection shall be reduced by the same proportion.

(b) **RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES AMOUNTS.**—If the amount appropriated pursuant to section 3(a)(2)(A) or (b)(2)(A) is less than the amount authorized under that subparagraph, the amount available under each clause of that subparagraph shall be reduced by the same proportion.

SEC. 7. NATIONAL RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) **PRIORITIZATION OF PROPOSED MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **DEVELOPMENT OF PRIORITIES.**—

(A) **LIST.**—The Director shall develop a list indicating by number the relative priority for funding under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account that the Director assigns to each project the Board has approved for inclusion in a future budget request. The Director shall submit the list to the Board for approval.

(B) **UPDATES.**—The Director shall update the list prepared under paragraph (1) each time the Board approves a new project that would receive funding under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account and as necessary to prepare reports under paragraph (2). The Director shall submit any updated list to the Board for approval.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than each June 15th thereafter, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report containing—

(A) the most recent Board-approved priority list developed under paragraph (1);

(B) a description of the criteria used to develop such list; and

(C) a description of the major factors for each project that determined its ranking on the list, based on the application of the criteria described pursuant to subparagraph (B).

(3) **CRITERIA.**—The criteria described pursuant to paragraph (2)(B) shall include, at a minimum—

(A) scientific merit;

(B) broad societal need and probable impact;

(C) consideration of the results of formal prioritization efforts by the scientific community;

(D) readiness of plans for construction and operation;

(E) international and interagency commitments; and

(F) the order in which projects were approved by the Board for inclusion in a future budget request.

(b) **FACILITIES PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 201(a)(1) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director shall prepare, and include as part of the Foundation's annual budget request to Congress, a plan for the proposed construction of, and repair and upgrades to, national research facilities, including full life-cycle cost information."

(2) **CONTENTS OF PLAN.**—Section 201(a)(2) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "including costs for instrumentation development" after "described in paragraph (1)";

(B) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(C) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(D) for each project funded under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account—

“(i) estimates of the total project cost (from planning to commissioning); and

“(ii) the source of funds, including Federal funding identified by appropriations category and non-Federal funding;

“(E) estimates of the full life-cycle cost of each national research facility;

“(F) information on any plans to retire national research facilities; and

“(G) estimates of funding levels for grants supporting research that will make use of each national research facility.”.

(3) DEFINITION.—Section 2 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 1862k note) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) FULL LIFE-CYCLE COST.—The term ‘full life-cycle cost’ means all costs of development, procurement, construction, operations and support, and shut down costs, without regard to funding source and without regard to what entity manages the project.”.

(c) PROJECT MANAGEMENT.—No national research facility project funded under the Major Research Equipment and Facilities Construction account shall be managed by an individual whose appointment to the Foundation is temporary.

SEC. 8. MAJOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENTATION.

The Foundation shall conduct a review and assessment of the Major Research Instrumentation Program and provide a report to Congress on its findings and recommendations within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report shall include—

(1) estimates of the needs, by major field of science and engineering, of institutions of higher education for the types of research instrumentation that are eligible for funding under the guidelines of the Major Research Instrumentation Program;

(2) the distribution of awards and funding levels by year and by major field of science and engineering for the Major Research Instrumentation Program, since the inception of the Program; and

(3) an analysis of the impact of the Major Research Instrumentation Program on the research instrumentation needs that were documented in the Foundation’s 1994 survey of academic research instrumentation needs.

SEC. 9. ASTRONOMY AND ASTROPHYSICS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall jointly establish an Astronomy and Astrophysics Advisory Committee (in this section referred to as the “Advisory Committee”).

(b) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall—

(1) assess, and make recommendations regarding, the coordination of astronomy and astrophysics programs of the Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

(2) assess, and make recommendations regarding, the status of the activities of the Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as they relate to the recommendations contained in the National Research Council’s 2001 report entitled “Astronomy and Astrophysics in the New Millennium”, and the recommendations contained in subsequent National Research Council reports of a similar nature; and

(3) not later than March 15 of each year, transmit a report to the Director, the Adminis-

trator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Congress on the Advisory Committee’s findings and recommendations under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall consist of 13 members, none of whom shall be a Federal employee, including—

(1) 5 members selected by the Foundation;

(2) 5 members selected by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

(3) 3 members selected by the members selected under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(d) SELECTION PROCESS.—Initial selections under subsection (c)(1) and (2) shall be made within 3 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Initial selections under subsection (c)(3) shall be made within 5 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Vacancies shall be filled in the same manner as provided in subsection (c).

(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Advisory Committee shall select a chairperson from among its members.

(f) COORDINATION.—The Advisory Committee shall coordinate with the advisory bodies of other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Energy, which may engage in related research activities.

(g) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) MEETINGS.—The Advisory Committee shall convene, in person or by electronic means, at least 4 times a year.

(i) QUORUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a majority of the members serving on the Advisory Committee shall constitute a quorum for purposes of conducting the business of the Advisory Committee.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The selection of a member under subsection (c)(3) shall require a vote of $\frac{3}{4}$ of the members appointed under subsection (c)(1) and (2).

(j) DURATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.

SEC. 10. BOARD MEETINGS.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that the Board complies with the requirements of section 552b of title 5, United States Code, that all meetings, with the exception of specific narrow statutory exemptions, be open to the public.

(b) COMPLIANCE AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the National Science Foundation shall conduct an annual audit of the compliance by the Board with the requirements described in subsection (a). The audit shall examine the extent to which the proposed and actual content of closed meetings is consistent with those requirements.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than February 15 of each year, the Inspector General of the National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Congress the audit required under subsection (b) along with recommendations for corrective actions that need to be taken to achieve fuller compliance with the requirements described in subsection (a), and recommendations on how to ensure public access to the Board’s deliberations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. RIVERS

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. RIVERS:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBILITY.

The Director shall not exclude part-time students from eligibility for scholarships under the Computer Science, Engineering,

and Mathematics Scholarship (CSEMS) program.

Ms. RIVERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment that will offer relief in some very complicated lives. The NSF currently administers the Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics Scholarships program, which was established by the American Competitiveness and Workforce Improvement Act of 1998.

This program assists students training to enter the high-tech workforce in computer science, computer technology, engineering, engineering technology or mathematics. Unfortunately, NSF requires that students be enrolled full time as students, precluding working students, especially older students who have full time jobs and families, from qualifying for these scholarships. As someone who attended college and law school while juggling work and family obligations, I know firsthand how much good a change like this would do for folks who are working so hard.

The data clearly shows that traditional full-time students are no longer the overwhelming majority of those attending undergraduate institutions. The U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics found in 1999, the most recent data available, that of the 15 million students here in the United States, nearly 6 million, or 41 percent, were attending on a part-time basis. According to the current population survey conducted by the Census Bureau, the greatest percentage rise in college attendance was by women 30 and over, 2.3 million new students. Approximately 23 percent of all male college and graduate students were age 30 or older.

The National Center for Education Statistics has estimated that in 2000, students 25 or older outnumbered those younger than 25. And according to the American Association of Community Colleges, community colleges in this country enroll over 10 million students, that is 44 percent of all United States undergrads, and 63 percent of those attending community college are part-time students.

The average age of a student at a community college is now 29 years old. Furthermore, more than 80 percent of community college students balance studies with full-time or part-time work.

My amendment simply states that NSF’s CSEMS program would be open to students enrolled in appropriate programs less than full time. The expansion of the CSEMS program will open the doors of opportunity to those who want to acquire or finish degrees in the very fields we need the most workers,

high technology. Add flexibility to the program and allow university administrators the discretion to help those who need the help most, regardless of whether they are an 8-, 10-, 12-, or 16-credit student per quarter. It would also enable NSF to administer all of the scholarship funds it currently has available under this program.

I understand that much of this money sits unused due to lack of advertising, which is compounded due to the exclusion of part-time students. This amendment would fix the problem.

In my home State of Michigan, several schools have received CSEMS program grants, including the University of Michigan that I represent, Grand Valley State University, Western State University, Central Michigan University, Kettering University, Lake Superior State University, and the University of Detroit. All of these institutions enroll part-time students, but none of those students are eligible for this program.

We should extend the same assistance to them as their full-time colleagues receive. Having access to the CSEMS scholarship can make a significant difference when it comes to making a choice about pursuing a degree or not. The availability of Federal help in financing my education allowed me to go from being a teen mom working in low-wage jobs to being a Member of this august body. Education made the difference.

Let us open the door to success just a little bit wider so more Americans can walk through it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. More and more of our students are adult and are part-time. It is a good amendment, and we accept the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague from Michigan's amendment. This amendment seeks to expand educational opportunities for working Americans in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering.

NSF's Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics Scholarship (CSEMS) Program was established to support financially needy post-secondary students pursuing careers in the high-tech sector. The acute shortage of trained scientists and engineers in our country is well documented, and critical sectors of our economy find it necessary to import high-tech labor from other countries under the H-1 B visa program.

NSF is doing a great deal to address the shortage of home-grown scientists and engineers, but currently, the CSEMS program is only eligible to full-time students. The expansion of the eligibility of the CSEMS program to include part-time students will have two important results. The first is that it addresses our nation's need for more scientists and engineers in key sectors of our economy. The second is that it provides talented, motivated, and economically needy students with the resources they need to improve their quality of life and fulfill their dreams.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. RIVERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WOOLSEY

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WOOLSEY:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(d) BIOSAFETY RESEARCH.—Of the amount authorized under subsection (a)(2)(A), \$15,000,000, and of the amount authorized under subsection (b)(2)(A), \$20,000,000, shall be available for support of fundamental research in areas related to assessing biosafety. For purposes of this subsection, the term "biosafety" means safety with respect to the effects of biological research on organisms and the environment.

Ms. WOOLSEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would create a research program within the National Science Foundation to address a significant gap of knowledge on biosafety, a gap of knowledge that must be filled. The amendment establishes the Biosafety Research Program, so we can understand in scientific terms the effects of altering biological systems. It funds the basic science needed to understand the effects of introducing new plant and animal varieties through both traditional breeding techniques and through new methods of biotechnology in our agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture systems.

For thousands of years we have experimented with plants, animals, microbes, and ecological systems in an effort to survive and prosper through the development of food and fiber sources, medicines and other materials essential to our well-being.

Essentially, we have been moving our biological system around, sometimes intentionally, sometimes not intentionally.

Here I use the term "biological systems" in the broadest sense. A biological system could be a set of genes, a whole organism, an ecosystem, or a group of ecosystems that co-exist in the landscape. It is no secret, Mr. Chairman, that a contentious debate has surrounded the introduction of biotechnology products. The debate has been characterized more by statements of hope by the advocates and fear from opponents than by science-based information. It is time we replace the rhetoric, the rhetoric on both sides, with a firm understanding of how these varieties are likely to operate in the real world.

With the adoption of my amendment, the Biosafety Research Program will provide an identifiable pool of research funds for scientists to ask the basic re-

search questions that could prevent unintended scenarios. I want my colleagues to know that this program will not fund risk assessment. It will not fund monitoring or the development or evaluation of risk-management strategies. Those activities in the area of applied research are not within the NSF mission. They are and should be supported by programs at USDA, EPA, and FDA, the entities charged with reviewing and regulating products being introduced into the market.

The program my amendment creates in NSF is not a substitute for increased funding in these other agencies; however, I do believe that the applied research programs of these agencies need to be increased also to address the questions the public is asking about these new products.

Before I close, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to several recent reports from the National Academy of Sciences on invasive species and agriculture biotechnology that have called for more research in these areas, including one released earlier this year. My amendment closely follows the recommendations contained in these academy reports. I also have a series of excerpts from these recent reports that I will insert into the RECORD at this time.

QUOTATIONS FROM NAS REPORTS

"The committee realizes that there remain some uncertainties regarding the use of pest-protected plants, including transgenic pest-protected plants. These uncertainties can lead to ambiguities in regulation and often force agencies to base their decisions on minimal data sets. Additional research should continue to refine and improve risk assessment methods and procedures and continue to develop additional data on both conventional and transgenic pest-protected plant products." (p. 139, NAS 2000)

"Research to increase our understanding of the population biology, genetics, and community ecology of the target pests should be conducted, so that more ecologically and evolutionary sustainable approaches to pest management with pest-protected plants can be developed. Knowledge of pests' roles in the larger biological community (for example, their role as food sources for non-target organisms or their roles as predators of other agriculturally relevant pests) will allow us to anticipate better the indirect effects of declines in the pests due to both conventional and transgenic pest-protected plants. Knowledge of the pest population biology will enable prediction of the types of pest-protection mechanisms that would most efficiently reduce a target organism's pest status and would help us to design more accurate resistance management plans.

Research to assess gene flow and its potential consequences should be conducted . . . more ecological and agricultural research is needed on the following: weed distribution and abundance (past and present), key factors that regulate weed population dynamics in managed and unmanaged areas, the likely impact of specific, novel resistance traits on weed abundance in managed and unmanaged areas, and rates at which resistance genes from the crop would be likely to spread among weed populations." (p. 140-141 NAS 2000)

RECOMMENDATIONS

"In cases when crucial scientific data are lacking about the potential impacts of gene

flow on wild or weedy relatives, the committee recommends delaying approval of de-regulation pending sufficient data, establishing a scientifically rigorous monitoring program in key areas to check for undesirable effects of resistance transgenes after the transgenic pest-protected plant is commercialized, or restricting the initial areas where the plants can be grown." (p. 141-142 NAS 2000)

"APHIS jurisdiction has been restricted to the U.S. borders. However, in an era of globalization, environmental effects of transgenic crops on the ecosystems of developing countries will be an important component of risk analysis. As exemplified by the effects of the Green Revolution varieties of wheat and rice, novel crop genes often have indirect effects on the environment. These indirect effects can occur because the new crop traits enable changes in other agricultural practices and technologies that impact the environment. They also can indirectly affect vertical integration of agriculture and equality of access to food. Society cannot ignore the fact that people who lack food security often cause major effects on both agricultural and nonagricultural environments, so in a broad context the positive or negative effects of transgenes on human well-being can be seen as an environmental effect.

Environmental concerns raised by some of the first transgenic crops (e.g. gene flow, disruption of the genome, non-target effects) could be ameliorated by expanding our knowledge base in specific areas of molecular biology, ecology, and socioeconomic. Furthermore, such an expanded knowledge base could lead to the production of transgenic plants that would improve the environment. To increase knowledge in relevant areas the committee recommends substantial increases in public-sector investment in the following research areas: (1) improvement in precommercialization testing methods; (2) improvement in transgenic methods that will minimize risks; (3) research to identify transgenic plants traits that would provide environmental benefits; (4) research to develop transgenic plants with such traits; (5) research to improve the environmental risk characterization processes; and (6) research on the social, economic, and value-based issues affecting environmental impacts of transgenic crops." (p. 16 NAS 2002)

"The committee cannot presently judge whether extensive commercialization of transgenic—and other crops bearing novel traits—will significantly perturb agroecosystems or neighboring ecosystems because of major gaps in our knowledge of these systems." (p. 23 NAS 2002)

"The committee finds, . . . that specific types of transgenic and conventional crops can pose unique environmental hazards. Also, the committee finds that there are good arguments for regulating all transgenic crops. To be effective such a regulatory system must have an efficient and accurate method for rapidly evaluating all transgenic plants to separate those that require additional regulatory oversight from those that do not." (p. 52 NAS 2002)

"Perhaps more than anything else, the experience with commercialization of transgenic crops has revealed gaps in the knowledge base for understanding and measuring the environmental risks of crop production, irrespective of whether recombinant DNA technologies have been applied." p. 254 NAS 2002

"Formal research support in the United States for the study of environmental impacts of transgenic plants has been sparse." p. 255 NAS 2002

In reference to USDA's Biotechnology Risk Assessment Research Grants program:

" . . . The program has allocated no more than a few million dollars for research each year. Recently, the USDA's Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (IFAFS) program has included a competition for funding research, education, and extension on the management of environmental risks of agricultural biotechnology. Both funding programs have substantial limitations—BRARGP because its focus is only on assessment and because the total amount of funding is so low; IFAFS because the focus is only for risk management and the funding program itself is anticipated to have a short life. Neither program funds monitoring or research related to monitoring.

Research on the environmental impacts of transgenic plants can be accomplished through other funding sources if the research questions asked have general significance. For example, issues directly associated with the impacts of transgenic plants may often be associated with critical, but largely unanswered, questions in other fields. For example, whether or not the introgression of pest resistance transgenes into wild populations will result in the evolution of weediness or invasiveness is directly associated with important questions in population biology regarding the genetic and ecological causes and correlates of invasiveness (Traynor and Westwood 1999)." (p. 255 NAS 2002)

"Recommendation 7.3: Significant public-sector investment is called for in the following research areas: improvement in risk analysis methodologies and protocols; improvement in transgenic methods that will reduce risks and improve benefits to the environment; research to develop and improve monitoring for effects in the environment; and research on the social, economic, and value-based issues affecting environmental impacts of transgenic crops." (p. 259 NAS 2002)

National Research Council. 2002. "Environmental Effects of Transgenic Plants: The Scope and Adequacy of Regulation" National Academy Press, Washington, DC.

National Research Council 2000. "Genetically Modified Pest-Protected Plants: Science and Regulation. Washington, DC National Academy Press.

Mr. Chairman, we all live in a world in which we move things around with increasing frequency and speed. So we must make at least a modest investment in understanding how those movements are likely to affect our world. That is why I am asking my chairman and my colleagues to support this amendment, because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we must reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment from my very good friend from California. I certainly agree with the gentlewoman that the National Science Foundation should conduct basic research that will enable us to understand better the impacts of biotechnology and other biological research on organisms and on the environment. In fact, NSF already conducts such research. Indeed, this House passed a bill just a few weeks ago that charged NSF, again, with conducting such research. That bill introduced by myself and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), had been approved by the Committee on Science. So I wholeheartedly endorse the idea that NSF should fund this kind of research and they will.

My problems with the amendment are narrower, but still significant. First the numbers in the amendment are entirely arbitrary. They may be too large; they may be too small. We have no idea. We have never looked into it. In an area this important, I do not think we should be pulling numbers out of thin air.

Second, NSF funds a lot of different scientific disciplines and subdisciplines. We choose not to pick out many of these specific areas in this bill for congressionally or politically targeted spending levels because once we go down that road, there is no end to it. We want to give the foundation, the scientific community the maximum flexibility that has served us so well.

So generally we have limited ourselves to initiatives proposed by the President in areas on which the House has previously acted. The kind of research that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is highlighting is important, but not necessarily more important than areas of research we are not citing by name in this bill. We need to limit the number of areas of science that we single out for set-asides in this bill.

Let me say in conclusion, and maybe thirdly, I have a process problem with this amendment.

□ 1500

We have worked on this bill in a bipartisan manner for almost 2 years. The bill passed unanimously in committee because of lengthy bipartisan discussions. I am not eager to add new issues on the House floor. We are poised now to pass a bill that can move swiftly through both the House and the other body, and I think many of us do not want to add anything that has even the potential to slow our progress.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. It is unnecessary and could slow passage of an important measure, and I will work with the gentlewoman to ensure that the area of science she is seeking to protect continues to receive its due from the National Science Foundation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, two things. First, this would have been part of the debate in the committee had I not been asked not to bring it up in committee but to bring it as an amendment to the floor, and I was asked by the majority party to do that. So please be clear, this is not something I did not want to bring to the committee.

Second of all, when my colleague talks about the funding being arbitrary, our decision on this funding came from the same place that our whole committee's decision to double the funding for NSF came from. We do not know how much money we need. We know we need more, and I know with my amendment we need something. So I want to get started and the

public wants to get started so that we can scientifically decide what is good and what is not good.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, to make it clear, it is somewhat of a different amendment than the gentlewoman submitted in the Committee on Science, but even more and above that, it seems to me like we should agree that if we can leave NSF and the scientific community and the peer review process to do and decide on these initiatives and how much is reasonable, the legislation that we passed recently by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and myself does not say we are going in one area or the other. It says do more research. Let us leave that up to the scientific community in deciding how much money should be spent in any particular area of this biological research.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of this particular amendment, but I would like to ask a specific question relative to an area of research that might be related to this program, and so I offer to the sponsor this question. Is it the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) anticipation that this particular biosafety research program would provide research that would better understand why plants and animals become invasive pests when they are introduced in new habitats?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. RIVERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly my intention.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her response.

I note that the National Academy of Sciences recently released a report called Predicting Invasions of Non-indigenous Plants and Plant Pests. In that document they state, "In spite of a long history of interest in biological invasion, scientific inquiry in invasion is still nascent. Progress in understanding and predicting invasions will depend on how well the insights of investigators with diverse training can be coalesced and directed to decipher the myriad combinations of immigrant species, new ranges, and novel circumstances that can produce a biological invasion. The last 10 years has seen the emergence of a broad consensus that the prediction of biological invasion is a field presenting national need. It will take some time, however, to generate the predictive principles on which policy-makers, regulators, the scientific community, and the public can have confidence."

They go on to say that, "The challenge of constructing a scientific basis for predicting the risk associated with nonindigenous species needs to be met by a significant national effort, including other agencies within the USDA, other branches of the Federal Govern-

ment responsible for research and land management, agricultural and natural resource agencies of State governments and the scientific community at large."

I am very pleased to support this bill, with emphasis on invasive species, because in Michigan we have a terrible problem. When the zebra mussels hitched a ride in ship ballast water and were introduced to the Great Lakes and other bodies of water, their populations exploded. These animals are continuing to cause serious ecological and economic damage in my region, and I believe we need much more research to understand the basic biology and ecology of this organism if we are ever to hope to control it.

I also believe that we need much more information to help us identify potentially invasive species before they are introduced to new ecosystems. We could avoid a great deal of harm and expense if we were able to devise means to evaluate the potential invasiveness of new plants and animals.

I believe that the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) proposal is a sound one that will bring us forward in the debate around invasive species and understanding our ecology in general. I urge Members to support this amendment.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) might also be relating to this, but in the bioterrorism bill that we passed a couple of weeks ago, we did include over \$190 million to USDA, additional funding to the Department of Energy, specifically for this purpose. So that bioterrorism bill included a lot of the goals that I hear some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle suggest we need.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I know that the author and the supporters of this amendment are very sincere. They feel very strongly about the issues, but I want to clarify something here for the rest of the Members.

We are really not talking about zebra mussels in this amendment, and we are not talking about purple loosestrife. What we are really talking about is whether or not we are going to take actions on the floor of the House of Representatives to limit the amount of research that can be done on biology and new plant species and things that are happening in biotechnology.

What that says is we are not spending enough on that area now, and the truth of the matter is there is nothing in this authorization today that would limit the amount that the National Science Foundation could spend on these kinds of programs, but it is, in fact, a way of tinkering. So this is redundant. It is unneeded and, worse

than that, it is politicizing what I think has been a very nonpolitical markup and as we have worked through this process.

Historically, we in Congress, I think, have done a very good job of not trying to politicize or get our fingers into these kinds of decisions. We have had an awful lot of research about biology and new biotechnology, and all of it has come to this same conclusion, and that is, that the work that is being done in both the government-funded labs, as well as in private labs, is both safe and has no detrimental impact on the environment.

We have had all kinds of scares. What the authors are trying to do really is they are once again introducing the idea that we can somehow disprove the negative. They know that that cannot happen, and this is a toe in the door for some of these researchers to say, well, the answer, of course, is we have to have more money, but understand that when those particular researchers, attempting to disprove a negative which cannot be disproved, when they take more money, it comes at the expense of other important research.

I believe this research has to go forward. I think the USDA, the National Science Foundation, other groups that are doing this kind of research, they are doing it with very good scientists who understand that there are consequences, but more importantly, if we try to limit the work that is done in biotechnology, what we are working on today is developing plant species that can actually cure diseases.

That is amazing. It is wonderful. We should not try to stymie that kind of research. We are developing new plant species which are much more resistant to pests and other problems they might encounter so we can use less in terms of pesticides on those plants. That again is a wonderful discovery.

And also understand, most of the food that we eat today is a result of biotechnology. The Native Americans did a wonderful job in creating what we now know is corn. They actually developed that from what was formerly known as maize. The potato was something that was actually crossbred and developed by the American Indian. All that we enjoy, much of what we enjoy today in terms of things that we take for granted, were developed with biotechnology.

This is a thinly veiled attempt to politicize what has been a very nonpolitical markup, and the way that the Congress has dealt with it, I think it is a bad idea. It sets a very bad precedent because if this amendment is adopted, I promise my colleagues we will see more and more amendments by Members attempting to advance a political cause they believe in. I think it is a very big mistake, and I hope the Members will join me in opposing this amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding to me. I have two responses to the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. SMITH) objections to my amendment.

First, in talking about the changes that differed from what my amendment was in committee and to what we have brought to the floor, my changes were based on the committee's objections. So I came here prepared to improve upon what we had talked about earlier.

In the amendment in committee, we had the funding come from a small account in the plant genome program, and now my amendment would allow the NSF director to decide where within an \$11 billion research account my \$35 million program could be funded. That is not a lot of money within a large account, and so I wanted to make sure my colleague knew why that had changed.

It is \$15 million in the first year of the bill, \$20 million in the second year of the bill, and nothing specified in the third year because we have required a report from the NSF with their recommended levels for future years. So we are not assuming beyond the first 2 years.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has said that his bill already covers this, his bill that I voted for, H.R. 2051, to establish plant genome research centers which also authorizes research on basic research and dissemination of information on the ecological and other consequences of genetically engineered plants. His does that. My amendment expands upon the gentleman's bill, and my program covers plants and animals that would not be restricted to research on genetically engineered plants and animals. So it expands his good ideas but makes it larger.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a couple of reactions, one supporting this concept. I am informed that the language of the gentlewoman's amendment limits the amount that can be spent on this effort, and who is to say it should be more, and I just suggest rather than let politicians deciding, let us let the scientific community make that decision, not limit it or pre-guess what is the right amount.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond that I think I am sitting on the wrong side of the aisle when it is this side of the aisle who would limit a budget, and it is the gentleman's side of the aisle challenging that.

So this is the beginning of something that the public wants us to do, and I think we are making a great mistake if

we do not vote for this because it is the right thing to do, and it is the environmentally friendly thing to do, and it would help our public know what is safe and what is not safe by having scientific studies, not emotional rhetoric, about what is going on with these programs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to enthusiastically support the distinguished gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) amendment, and let me say to the proponents, this is a good bill, and I appreciate the leadership of the Committee on Science for the collaborative way in which this bill, the authorization of the National Science Foundation, has been done.

Let me comment that the importance of science in America could not be more important now. When we begin to talk about homeland security and the new challenges that we will face in the 21st century to ensure safety in our community, science is important. Training of girls and boys and the training of minorities in science, preparing them for the 21st century, funding those kinds of institutions, providing such programs is important.

That is why I connect the value of the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. WOOLSEY) amendment because it is a simple, common sense amendment. If we could sort of move away from issues of politicizing and depoliticizing, let me say what this amendment does.

It simply provides a steady stream of funding to study the impact of biotechnology on plants and ecosystems where there is not.

□ 1515

I would say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that we all supported his legislation that was recently passed: 2051. In that legislation, the gentleman did in fact earmark, and that is simply what is going on here. What we are responding to, however, is our instructor, our instructor is the National Academy of Sciences, which has called for implicit and significant increased funding for the particular aspect of the Woolsey amendment.

So, in fact, what is occurring is that the Woolsey amendment supports the National Academy of Sciences to provide monies for this kind of research. In fact, it has recommended this kind of research to study the ecological impact of plants bred conventionally and through biotechnology.

I would also simply say to my good friend from Minnesota that depoliticizing the issue is what we are doing. We are not politicizing it. What we are simply trying to do is to give the funding stream to get good science in order to be able to regulate properly. And that means if we get the research, the basic research, we know how to do the job.

I believe the American public is more than prepared now to understand that this is not a question of limiting the

funds. The Woolsey amendment does not limit it; it gives it a funding stream. If we need more monies, I am sure that with an intelligent response by the Congress we can add more money. So this is not a limit. This is providing a continuous funding stream in order to be able to do the kind of research.

Might I just restate the utilization of H.R. 2051, the bill of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), was to establish plant genome research centers and which authorize research on basic research and dissemination of information on the ecological and other consequences of genetically engineered plants. This program would cover plants and animals and would not be restricted to research on genetically engineered plants and animals. This, however, has to be expanded; and the Woolsey amendment, I am very glad to say, goes a step further and begins to do the research that is necessary, the impact of biotechnology on plants and the ecosystems.

I close this by simply saying this, Mr. Chairman. It is interesting how as we mature and learn we find out that what we used to ridicule we find is truth. It is interesting that the present administration and others who support their policies ridiculed global warming, but just the other day those representatives of this administration put forward a report that said, you know what, global warming exists. Good science tells us that global warming exists and we have a problem. Interestingly enough, the present administration had to concede. And, of course, we understand that it was refuted and that individuals who put forward the report were called a bunch of bureaucrats. But truth will find a way.

This is what the Woolsey amendment offers to do, gives us the truth and the information that allows us to go forward and make an effective determination on how we can regulate this particular issue. And I would believe that our instructor, the National Academy of Sciences, could not be wrong in insisting that we need a significant increase in funding. I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. I do not even rise reluctantly to oppose it, because I think it is ill advised.

It is ill advised for several reasons. The type of research that is being outlined here is already being conducted, not just in the NSF but in various other agencies that are interested in it, the Department of Agriculture, the EPA; and I am sure NIH is looking at some aspects of it as well.

But my main reason for objection has to do with the history of the National Science Foundation. The National

Science Foundation arose out of a report written by Vannevar Bush at the request of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1945. That report set out the basic structure of the National Science Foundation, and the basic idea of that report was that this would be an agency that would do scientific research, the priorities would be set by the scientists based on the scientific evidence, and that the research to be conducted would be peer reviewed by other scientists so that we would have good science done in this country.

It has an outstanding record. We have heard already that we have had over 100 Nobel prizes awarded to people who have received National Science Foundation grants. The basic idea is that the Congress would keep its hands off of specific appropriations for specific projects. It is very disappointing that this bill, which received unanimous support in committee and appears to have received unanimous support in debate on the floor, has this introduced where we are trying to earmark money for a specific pet project.

I can tell my colleagues that I can quickly list 20 pet projects that I think the NSF should be conducting research on and that they should be spending more money on. But the idea behind the NSF is that we do not allocate that money here, particularly in authorization bills; that, in fact, the work done there is based on the scientific judgments collectively gathered from the scientific community in this Nation.

It is entirely inappropriate for us to sit here on the House floor in an authorizing bill and try to designate funding for a particular project which a few Members of this body believe are important above and beyond all the other scientific research that we are considering in this Nation.

I object to this amendment. I hope that it is defeated, and I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would like to point out, in responding to the statement that we are doing this already, that I have a quote on page 255 of the National Academy of Sciences Report of 2002, and I quote "Formal research support in the United States for the study of environmental impacts on transgenic plants has been sparse." In other words, we are not doing enough.

And in responding to the statement of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), that we do not identify how we spend NSF funds, we just give them a big pot of money, we do have other programs that are identified. We spend money on advanced technological education, on Noyce scholarships, math and science scholar-

ship programs, minority-serving institutions and undergraduate programs, and the Presidential Science Teacher awards, for example. That is just a list of the few things that we do.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, the items the gentlewoman has mentioned are all, if I heard them correctly, are all in the educational area, and are not directing research within the agency.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. CARDIN. I yield once again to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I would respond that they are still in NSF, and that is what we are saying. The gentleman is saying we do not identify programs that we invest money in other than just general funds. We do decide what is important under NSF when we choose to.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment, and let me just say that I have a great deal of fear that the money that is going into science is quite often politicized, and there is evidence of that around. I think the amendment that the gentlewoman is suggesting would lead in that direction and we should be very wary of these types of earmarks.

What I think the gentlewoman would actually do is create a situation where money was earmarked for this particular biotechnology type of research and the word would go out that if anyone wants to create scares about biotechnology they should come and get their grant because this is what this money is for.

We have seen the same sort of thing happen before. We saw it happen with global warming. My fellow colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), suggested there has been a "change" in administration policy on global warming. Well, I am not sure what that change in policy is, but it is very clear that that issue has been so politicized by the introduction of tax dollars through the various National Science Foundation, NASA, et cetera, that the public has not been getting pure science, but it has been getting politicized science.

In the early 1980s, there was a consensus, and in fact there were hearings in this Congress, in our committee, reaffirming the great threat that the global climate change posed to humankind. In fact, we had hearings in which the Democratic leaders of the committees at that time, because the Democrats controlled the House, they controlled the committees, made statements about the horrible threat of this global climate change. The only trouble was the climate change they were talking about and the scientists they brought in to verify it were warning us of global cooling.

Some of those scientists, I might add, are now on the payroll advocating that we have to fear global warming. Now, all of that in a 20-year time period. They reversed themselves on this important issue in a 20-year period. Now, supposedly the global warming trend and the global cooling trend, whatever it is, has been going on for thousands and thousands of years, yet they reversed themselves in a 20-year period as to what the government had to emphasize in order to save humankind.

If we had taken their prescriptions, obviously we would have been going in exactly the wrong direction. And I would predict in about 5 years from now there will be some other major revelation to the scientific community, as government grants are given in this way or that way; and we might find that it is neither global warming nor global cooling, but something to do with the Earth on its axis or something going towards the Moon or the sun, or something else we deserve to spend billions of dollars and direct it towards the scientists who will be able to warn us about it.

Let me just note that we have seen the glaciers in our country and other countries receding for about 100,000 years now. There has been climate change in the world, and it has been getting warmer for hundreds of thousands of years. Yet in order to prove that humankind in the last 5,000, or actually the last 500 years is causing this global climate change, we are spending billions and billions of science dollars.

We have got to quit politicizing science. This amendment, I believe, goes in exactly the wrong direction. But let me note this. Politicized science is probably the worst threat that we have right now to understanding the actual perils that might face us in the future.

I still remember the "Global 2000 Report," and I would recommend that my colleagues read the "Global 2000 Report" that was put out in 1980, financed of course by tax dollars. The "Global 2000 Report," I believe, warned us against global cooling, but my colleagues can check into that. I do not remember that precisely, but I do remember they said we would be totally out of oil by the year 2000 and that gasoline would cost about \$150 a gallon, or something like that, and all of our natural resources would be depleted. In other words, there was this great threat, this great scare that was put out in the "Global 2000 Report," and every one of their conclusions were wrong, now that we have passed the year 2000. Do my colleagues know why it was wrong? It is because it was politicized science.

I think that we have to, and we are dealing with this committee and we are dealing with our expenditures, we have to go out of our way, bend over backwards to ensure that we are not politicizing science; that we are not taking up a trendy issue and asking the scientific community to verify it in order

to get government grants. That is why I would oppose the Woolsey amendment.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I would like to respond to the gentleman from California when he talks about biotechnology research and global climate reports that our President and his administration put forth a report this weekend to the U.N. acknowledging global climate change, and telling the world to adapt, just get used to it.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, what are we going to tell the monarch butterflies when they are having to adapt to genetically modified corn? They cannot adapt. They are dying. We have to look into what we can do about that, and that is what this amendment is about. It is about good science, not about emotions.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I generally agree with the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), but I do have to correct one thing the gentleman said, the President and the administration put out a report. Actually, the administration put out a report. The President seemed to be quite surprised by it, not to the point of actually reading it, because I think it would take more than that to get him to read it; but I was struck by the President's bemusement by the report.

So just because the EPA and a group of scientists have said something does not mean that the President chooses to associate himself with it. That does not detract from the validity of the report, but it did seem to me to be a rather interesting precedent being set of a President expressing his surprise that a report issued in his administration's name ought to be noted.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair will count for a quorum.

Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, parliamentary inquiry. Is an insufficient number standing, in your opinion, for a recorded vote?

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman withdraws her point of order.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, noes 259, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 211]

AYES—165

Abercrombie	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Ackerman	Hinchey	Napolitano
Allen	Hinojosa	Neal
Andrews	Hoeffel	Olver
Baird	Holt	Ortiz
Baldacci	Honda	Owens
Becerra	Hooley	Pallone
Bentsen	Houghton	Pascrell
Berkley	Hoyer	Pastor
Berman	Inslee	Payne
Bishop	Israel	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pomeroy
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Price (NC)
Borski	(TX)	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Rivers
Capps	Kaptur	Rodriguez
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Roemer
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Rothman
Carson (OK)	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Klecza	Rush
Clayton	Kucinich	Sabo
Clement	Lampson	Sanchez
Clyburn	Langevin	Sanders
Conyers	Lantos	Sandlin
Costello	Larsen (WA)	Sawyer
Coyne	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lee	Schiff
Cummings	Levin	Scott
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Davis (FL)	Loftgren	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lowe	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Luther	Solis
DeGette	Lynch	Spratt
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Stark
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Strickland
Dicks	Markey	Stupak
Dingell	Mascara	Tauscher
Doggett	Matheson	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	Matsui	Thompson (MS)
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Eshoo	McCarthy (NY)	Towns
Etheridge	McCollum	Udall (CO)
Evans	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Farr	McGovern	Velazquez
Fattah	McKinney	Visclosky
Filner	McNulty	Waters
Frank	Meehan	Watson (CA)
Frost	Meek (FL)	Watt (NC)
Gonzalez	Millender-	Waxman
Gordon	McDonald	Weiner
Green (TX)	Miller, George	Wexler
Gutierrez	Mink	Woolsey
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Wu
Harman	Moran (VA)	

NOES—259

Aderholt	Boucher	Crane
Akin	Boyd	Crenshaw
Armey	Brady (TX)	Cubin
Baca	Brown (SC)	Culberson
Bachus	Bryant	Cunningham
Baker	Burr	Davis, Jo Ann
Baldwin	Burton	Davis, Tom
Ballenger	Buyer	Deal
Barcia	Callahan	DeLauro
Barr	Calvert	DeLay
Barrett	Camp	DeMint
Bartlett	Cannon	Diaz-Balart
Barton	Cantor	Dooley
Bass	Capito	Doolittle
Bereuter	Capuano	Dreier
Berry	Castle	Duncan
Biggert	Chabot	Dunn
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Edwards
Blunt	Coble	Ehlers
Boehlert	Collins	Ehrlich
Boehner	Combest	Emerson
Bonilla	Condit	English
Bono	Cooksey	Everett
Boozman	Cox	Ferguson
Boswell	Cramer	Flake

Fletcher	Latham	Ryan (KS)
Foley	LaTourette	Saxton
Forbes	Leach	Schaffer
Ford	Lewis (CA)	Schrock
Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Sessions
Gallely	Lipinski	Shadegg
Ganske	LoBiondo	Shaw
Gekas	Lucas (KY)	Shays
Gephardt	Lucas (OK)	Sherwood
Gibbons	Manzullo	Shimkus
Gillmor	McCrery	Shows
Gilman	McHugh	Shuster
Goode	McInnis	Simmons
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Simpson
Goss	McKeon	Skeen
Graham	Menendez	Skelton
Granger	Mica	Smith (MI)
Graves	Miller, Dan	Smith (NJ)
Green (WI)	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Greenwood	Miller, Jeff	Snyder
Grucci	Moore	Souder
Gutknecht	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hall (OH)	Murtha	Stenholm
Hansen	Myrick	Stump
Hart	Pastor	Sullivan
Hastings (WA)	Nethercutt	Sununu
Hayes	Ney	Sweeney
Hayworth	Northup	Tancredo
Hefley	Norwood	Tanner
Herger	Nussle	Tauzin
Hill	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Hilleary	Obey	Taylor (NC)
Hobson	Osborne	Terry
Hoekstra	Ose	Thomas
Holden	Otter	Thornberry
Horn	Oxley	Thune
Hostettler	Paul	Thurman
Hulshof	Pence	Tiahrt
Hunter	Peterson (MN)	Tiberi
Hyde	Petri	Toomey
Isakson	Phelps	Turner
Issa	Pickering	Upton
Istook	Pitts	Vitter
Jefferson	Platts	Walden
Jenkins	Pombo	Walsh
John	Portman	Wamp
Johnson (CT)	Pryce (OH)	Wattkins (OK)
Johnson (IL)	Putnam	Watts (OK)
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Weldon (FL)
Jones (NC)	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)
Keller	Ramstad	Weller
Kelly	Regula	Whitfield
Kennedy (MN)	Rehberg	Wicker
Kerns	Reynolds	Wilson (NM)
Kind (WI)	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
King (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Wolf
Kingston	Rohrabacher	Wynn
Kirk	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)
Knollenberg	Ross	Young (FL)
Kolbe	Roukema	
LaHood	Royce	
	Ryan (WI)	

NOT VOTING—10

Blagojevich	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Gilchrest	Morella	Traficant
Hilliard	Petersen (PA)	
LaFalce	Riley	

□ 1557

Messrs. SAXTON, HALL of Ohio, SIMMONS, SHOWS, CRAMER, Mrs. THURMAN and Messrs. RYAN of Kansas, CRENSHAW and COX changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair,

Mr. BONILLA, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4664) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2003, 2004, and 2005 for the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on the amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

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

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 397, noes 25, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 212]

AYES—397

Abercrombie	Brady (TX)	Davis (FL)
Ackerman	Brown (FL)	Davis (IL)
Aderholt	Brown (OH)	Davis, Jo Ann
Akin	Brown (SC)	Davis, Tom
Allen	Bryant	DeFazio
Andrews	Burr	DeGette
Armey	Burton	Delahunt
Baca	Buyer	DeLauro
Bachus	Calvert	DeLay
Baird	Camp	DeMint
Baker	Cannon	Deutsch
Baldacci	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Baldwin	Capito	Dicks
Ballenger	Capps	Dingell
Barcia	Capuano	Doggett
Barr	Cardin	Dooley
Barrett	Carson (IN)	Doolittle
Bartlett	Carson (OK)	Doyle
Barton	Castle	Dreier
Bass	Chabot	Duncan
Becerra	Chambliss	Dunn
Bentsen	Clay	Edwards
Bereuter	Clayton	Ehlers
Berkley	Clement	Ehrlich
Berman	Clyburn	Emerson
Berry	Coble	Engel
Biggert	Combest	English
Bilirakis	Condit	Eshoo
Bishop	Conyers	Etheridge
Blumenauer	Cooksey	Evans
Blunt	Costello	Everett
Boehlert	Cox	Farr
Boehner	Coyne	Fattah
Bonilla	Cramer	Ferguson
Bonior	Crane	Finer
Bono	Crenshaw	Fletcher
Boozman	Crowley	Foley
Borski	Cubin	Forbes
Boswell	Culberson	Ford
Boucher	Cummings	Fossella
Boyd	Cunningham	Frank
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Frelinghuysen

Frost	Lewis (GA)	Ross
Galleghy	Lewis (KY)	Rothman
Ganske	Linder	Roukema
Gekas	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Gephardt	LoBiondo	Rush
Gibbons	LoFgren	Ryan (WI)
Gillmor	Lowey	Ryun (KS)
Gilman	Lucas (KY)	Sabo
Gonzalez	Lucas (OK)	Sanchez
Goode	Luther	Sanders
Goodlatte	Lynch	Sandlin
Gordon	Maloney (CT)	Sawyer
Goss	Maloney (NY)	Saxton
Graham	Manzullo	Schaffer
Granger	Markey	Schakowsky
Graves	Mascara	Schiff
Green (TX)	Matheson	Schrock
Green (WI)	Matsui	Scott
Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano
Grucci	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions
Gutierrez	McCollum	Shaw
Gutknecht	McCrery	Shaays
Hall (OH)	McDermott	Sherman
Hall (TX)	McGovern	Sherwood
Hansen	McHugh	Shimkus
Harman	McInnis	Shows
Hart	McIntyre	Shuster
Hastings (FL)	McKeon	Simmons
Hastings (WA)	McKinney	Simpson
Hayes	McNulty	Skeen
Hayworth	Meehan	Skelton
Hefley	Meek (FL)	Smith (MI)
Hill	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Hilleary	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hinchey	Millender-	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	McDonald	Snyder
Hobson	Miller, Dan	Solis
Hoeffel	Miller, George	Souder
Hoekstra	Miller, Jeff	Spratt
Holden	Mink	Stark
Holt	Moore	Stenholm
Honda	Moran (KS)	Strickland
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Stupak
Horn	Murtha	Sullivan
Houghton	Myrick	Sununu
Hoyer	Nadler	Sweeney
Hulshof	Napolitano	Tanner
Hunter	Neal	Tauscher
Inslee	Nethercutt	Tauzin
Isakson	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Israel	Northup	Thomas
Issa	Nussle	Thompson (CA)
Istook	Oberstar	Thompson (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Thornberry
Jackson-Lee	Oliver	Thune
(TX)	Osborne	Thurman
Jefferson	Ose	Tiahrt
Jenkins	Otter	Tiberi
John	Owens	Tierney
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Toomey
Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Towns
Johnson, E. B.	Pascrell	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Jones (OH)	Payne	Udall (NM)
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Upton
Kaptur	Pence	Velazquez
Keller	Phelps	Visclosky
Kelly	Pickering	Vitter
Kennedy (MN)	Pitts	Walden
Kennedy (RI)	Platts	Walsh
Kildee	Pombo	Wamp
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Waters
Kind (WI)	Portman	Watkins (OK)
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Watson (CA)
Kirk	Pryce (OH)	Watt (NC)
Kleczka	Putnam	Watts (OK)
Knollenberg	Quinn	Waxman
Kolbe	Radanovich	Weiner
Kucinich	Rahall	Weldon (PA)
LaHood	Ramstad	Weller
Lampson	Rangel	Wexler
Langevin	Regula	Whitfield
Lantos	Rehberg	Wicker
Larsen (WA)	Reyes	Wilson (NM)
Larson (CT)	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)
Latham	Rivers	Wolf
LaTourette	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Leach	Roemer	Wu
Lee	Rogers (KY)	Wynn
Levin	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)
Lewis (CA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (FL)

NOES—25

Collins	Jones (NC)	Paul
Deal	Kerns	Peterson (MN)
Flake	Kingston	Petri
Herger	Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher
Hostettler	Mollohan	Royce
Hyde	Norwood	Sensenbrenner

Shadegg	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)
Stearns	Taylor (MS)	
Stump	Terry	

NOT VOTING—12

Blagojevich	LaFalce	Peterson (PA)
Callahan	Meeks (NY)	Riley
Gilchrest	Morella	Slaughter
Hilliard	Ortiz	Traficant

□ 1615

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. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on final passage of H.R. 4664, Investing in America's Future Act, I was on the House Floor and cast an "aye" vote for H.R. 4664.

I later learned my vote was not recorded. I wanted to advise the House that had my vote been recorded, I would have voted "aye" on final passage for H.R. 4664.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 209, 210, 211, and 212. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each of them. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the permanent RECORD immediately following this vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4664, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2143, PERMANENT DEATH TAX REPEAL ACT OF 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-494) on the resolution (H. Res. 435) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX of the rules of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas the President's constitutional duty is to faithfully execute the laws of the United States, and

Whereas, under the Constitution, treaties have the status of "supreme law of the land," equally with other laws, and

Whereas, the President does not have the authority to repeal laws, and

Whereas, the President is not authorized to withdraw unilaterally from treaties in general, and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in particular, without the consent of Congress, and

Whereas, the President unilaterally withdrew the United States of America from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 without seeking or obtaining the consent of either house of Congress;

Therefore be it resolved,

That the President should respect the Constitutional role of Congress and seek the approval of Congress for the withdrawal of the United States of America from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution that is offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within two legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Ohio will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair does not at this point determine whether or not the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2002, FOR PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING THE HONORABLE JOHN HOWARD, PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the Honorable John Howard, Prime Minister of Australia.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

RECOGNIZING WOMEN WHO HAVE SERVED IN THE ARMED FORCES THROUGHOUT AMERICA'S HISTORY

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, recently, back in my district in central Pennsyl-

vania, I had occasion in connection with the armed services holidays and celebrations to appear with a group of women right in the center of the action of Harrisburg, at the capital area, who were celebrating long service on the part of women in the Armed Forces of the United States.

What was brought to bear at that function was the memory of Oveta Culp Hobby, who was from Texas and who was the first Women's Army Corps general; she did not make general, but she was commander of the Women's Army Corps. That is one of the first visions we have had of actual women serving in the service in the modern era.

But women have served in the Armed Forces ever since the Revolution. Many of them served, of course, as nurses throughout all the conflicts, and they were Army and Navy and Air Force nurses, actually, so they were part of the Armed Forces. But we have had many, many different examples in the Revolutionary War, in the Mexican War, in the Civil War, and all the modern wars, so to speak, of women posing as men for the sole privilege on their part of wielding a weapon and engaging in fierce combat. Hundreds and maybe thousands of such cases can be found in the history of armed conflict in the United States.

The remainder of the function in which we participated was to give recognition to modern day women participants in the current ranks of the Armed Forces, so it was a splendid day.

One thing that was evident throughout all of this was that the women exhibited extreme pride in their current status as members of the Armed Forces and in the reverence with which they spoke about their predecessors, and the same women about whom I have made reference in the history of armed conflict in the history of our country.

So we ought to know that when we celebrate the national holidays, like the one now coming up, Independence Day on July 4, that we include in our celebration the thought and memory of the gallant women, as well as our men; the women who, from the Declaration of Independence until the current season of the war on terrorism, when women are flying combat missions, women are participating in practically every form of armed conflict or preparation therefor; and that we should not anymore, throughout the remainder of the history of the Nation, conduct the holiday and celebrate our history without due concern and mention and recollection of the deeds of the women of our society who plunged themselves into armed conflict along with the men that we have honored for so many years.

INNOVATIVE SOLUTION TO PROBLEM OF SCARCITY OF NATIONAL BURIAL SPACE FOR VETERANS

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a few minutes to a problem that I know faces congressmen all over this Nation. That is the lack of national burial space for our veterans of our Armed Forces.

I live in San Diego County, where we have almost 300,000 veterans. The national cemetery at Fort Rosecrans is out of space. There is no place for an honorable burial of a veteran in his or her hometown. We have to drive 100 miles or so to Riverside County, and that is just not what most families want to do with their loved ones.

We have figured out an innovative solution in San Diego County that I want to share with my colleagues and hope that they help us pass a resolution from this Congress which would instruct the Department of Veterans Affairs to help us with this innovative solution.

I have introduced H.R. 4806, the Honorable Burial for Veterans Act, along with my colleagues and the San Diego County delegation, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Each and every veteran in our county is concerned that upon his or her demise, interment may become a source of frustration for family and close friends. Many families are left with an impossible dilemma: cremation, where only a few spaces actually exist in the columbarium, or a ground burial at a cemetery a 2-hour drive away.

We should not force this decision on the families of our Nation's veterans. When we called on them to serve, they did not hesitate. Now, in their last hour, a grateful Nation should not hesitate to assist their families.

My colleagues and I want to build a second National Cemetery in San Diego, and we are on the list to do that. In fact, it may take a decade or more before we get around to doing that cemetery on the VA list. In the meantime, we should not abandon our veterans' families in their time of grief.

My bill would provide San Diego with an interim solution. A local effort among the private sector and local authorities and veterans' organizations has produced what I would consider to be an excellent pilot program. Two parcels of land, about 20 acres each, have been identified in the northern and southern parts of our county in what are now private cemeteries. They have offered this land to the Veterans Administration free of charge to become what we will call satellite cemeteries to the National Cemetery in our county.

We have a generous offer of land from the Service Corporation International which would be donated to a 501(c)(3) organization, the Veterans Memorial Center and Museum in San Diego, who will then turn that over to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I thank all the folks who have tried to come up with this solution back in

San Diego: the general manager of the Glen Abbey Memorial Park; the regional president, western regional president of Service Corporation International, Richard Sells; and to Colonel Jesse Ugade, Brigadier General Robert Cardenas, Captain Tom Splitgerber, and David Brown, co-publisher and editor of the Veterans Journal of San Diego County, because they have devoted enormous hours in an attempt to find a solution for San Diego's veterans.

My bill would authorize the establishment of this satellite cemetery pilot project. It is not the ideal solution, but we have to wait for two decades to get that ideal solution for families who have served our Nation. With our limited Federal budget, families can in fact be helped by an innovative and creative effort to meet our national needs.

The Veterans Administration had a negative reaction when this first was broached to them. Any bureaucracy, it seems, does not look at innovative ideas with a very encouraging light.

□ 1630

So I hope to get a bill passed by Congress which would direct the VA to do this. Certainly providing a final resting place for our brave veterans must be one of our top priorities. I hope my colleagues will support this bill to see how it works in San Diego because it might be useful in their own communities also.

BEWARE DOLLAR WEAKNESS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have for several years come to the House floor to express my concern for the value of the dollar. It has been, and is, my concern that we in the Congress have not met our responsibility in this regard. The constitutional mandate for Congress should only permit silver and gold to be used as legal tender and has been ignored for decades and has caused much economic pain for many innocent Americans. Instead of maintaining a sound dollar, Congress has by both default and deliberate action promoted a policy that systematically depreciates the dollar. The financial markets are keenly aware of the minute-by-minute fluctuations of all the fiat currencies and look to these swings in value for an investment advantage. This type of anticipation and speculation does not exist in a sound monetary system. But Congress should be interested in the dollar fluctuation not as an investment but because of our responsibility for maintaining a sound and stable currency, a requirement for sustained economic growth.

The consensus now is that the dollar is weakening and the hope is that the drop in its value will be neither too much nor occur too quickly; but no

matter what the spin is, a depreciating currency, one that is losing its value against goods, services, other currencies and gold, cannot be beneficial and may well be dangerous. A sharply dropping dollar, especially since it is the reserve currency of the world, can play havoc with the entire world economy.

Gold is history's oldest and most stable currency. Central bankers and politicians hate gold because it restrains spending and denies them the power to create money and credit out of thin air. Those who promote big government, whether to wage war and promote foreign expansionism or to finance the welfare state here at home, cherish this power.

History and economic law are on the side of the gold. Paper money always fails. Unfortunately, though, this occurs only after many innocent people have suffered the consequences of the fraud that paper money represents. Monetary inflation is a hidden tax levied more on the poor and those on fixed incomes than the wealthy, the bankers, or the corporations.

In the past 2 years, gold has been the strongest currency throughout the world in spite of persistent central banks selling designed to suppress the gold price in hopes of hiding the evil caused by the inflationary policies that all central bankers follow. This type of depreciation only works for short periods; economic law always rules over the astounding power and influence of central bankers.

That is what is starting to happen, and trust in the dollar is being lost. The value of the dollar this year is down 18 percent compared to gold. This drop in value should not be ignored by Congress. We should never have permitted this policy that was deliberately designed to undermine the value of the currency.

There are a lot of reasons the market is pushing down the value of the dollar at this time. But only one is foremost. Current world economic and political conditions lead to less trust in the dollar's value. Economic strength here at home is questionable and causes concerns. Our huge foreign debt is more than \$2 trillion, and our current account deficit is now 4 percent of GDP and growing. Financing this debt requires borrowing \$1.3 billion per day from overseas. But these problems are ancillary to the real reason that the dollar must go down in value. For nearly 7 years the U.S. has had the privilege of creating unlimited amounts of dollars with foreigners only too eager to accept them to satisfy our ravenous appetite for consumer items. The markets have yet to discount most of this monetary inflation. But they are doing so now; and for us to ignore what is happening, we do so at the Nation's peril. Price inflation and much higher interest rates are around the corner.

Misplaced confidence in a currency can lead money managers and investors astray, but eventually the piper

must be paid. Last year's record interest rate drop by the Federal Reserve was like pouring gasoline on a fire. Now the policy of the past decade is being recognized as being weak for the dollar; and trust and confidence in it is justifiably being questioned.

Trust in paper is difficult to measure and anticipate, but long-term value in gold is dependable and more reliably assessed. Printing money and creating artificial credit may temporarily lower interest rates, but it also causes the distortions of malinvestment, overcapacity, excessive debt and speculation. These conditions cause instability, and market forces eventually overrule the intentions of the central bankers. That is when the apparent benefits of the easy money disappear, such as we dramatically have seen with the crash of the dot-coms and the Enrons and many other stocks.

It is back to reality. This is serious business, and the correction that must come to adjust for the Federal Reserve's mischief of the past 30 years has only begun. Congress must soon consider significant changes in our monetary system.

Congress must soon consider significant changes in our monetary system if we hope to preserve a system of sound growth and wealth preservation. Paper money managed by the Federal Reserve System cannot accomplish this. In fact, it does the opposite.

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

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

AMERICA SHOULD NOT INSTIGATE WAR AGAINST IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Gulf War ended in 1991, the U.S. has been spending about \$4 million a day enforcing a no-flight zone in Iraq, \$4 million a day. This has been a tremendous waste of money and manpower.

I believe almost all Americans would have preferred that this 12 or \$13 billion that has been spent over these years would have been spent in almost any other good way. Most Americans have not even noticed that we have been dropping bombs and still shooting at missile sites all these years in Iraq. I remember reading a front page lengthy story about a group of Iraqi boys we accidentally killed there.

Now there are some people here in Washington who seem to be clamoring for us to go to war against Iraq. I represent a very patriotic pro-military district in Tennessee. My people will strongly support our troops if we go to

war. But I can assure you that as I go around my district I hear no clamor or even a weak desire to go to war against Iraq.

Saudi Arabia had much more to do with the September 11 tragedies than Iraq did. I heard yesterday that one of the main financial backers of the terrorists is from Kuwait. Yet we are not talking about going to war against Saudi Arabia or Kuwait, nor should we. We have been too quick to get involved in ethnic or religious disputes around the world. We have been too quick to drop bombs on people who want to be our friends. We turned NATO from a defensive organization into an offensive one in Bosnia.

Chris Matthews on "Hard Ball" the other night said, "In the past we always had the world on our side because we did not go to war unless we were attacked."

He strongly questioned this eagerness to go to war against Iraq. He said in a recent column that the American people are being "herded into war." A war that he says will just lead to more hatred of the U.S.

David Ignatius, the nationally syndicated columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and The Washington Post wrote on March 15: "How can the United States sell a war against Iraq to skeptical Arabs and Europeans? A good start would be to level with them and admit there is no solid evidence linking Baghdad to Osama bin Laden's terrorists attacks against America."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have questioned this eagerness to go to war against Iraq. Yesterday, William Raspberry, the very highly respected columnist for The Washington Post, in a nationally syndicated column repeated words he had written a dozen years ago. He wrote: "The prospect of a bloody war with no price worth the tens of thousands of American lives it would cost can make you a little nervous. I am getting a little nervous. It is not that I doubt the ability of America's fighting forces to take out a third-rate power like Saddam Hussein's Iraq. My doubts concern the purpose for doing so. Saddam is being described as a ruthless and power-mad tyrant bent on achieving political control of the Arab world. I do not question the description, but it does seem to me that most of the current saber rattling is coming from Washington, not Baghdad." And Mr. Raspberry continued: "I wrote those words a dozen years back when the first President Bush was contemplating the invasion of Iraq. Why are we rattling sabers now? The reason I recall my earlier doubts is that they are so much a carbon copy of my present ones." Mr. Raspberry says: "Maybe it was a mistake not to wipe out the last scrap of Iraq's military power back then, not to mow down the surrendering republican guard like shooting fish in a barrel. But surely the failure to do so then cannot justify a unilateral attack now."

Mr. Raspberry said: "We should not become the playground bully of the

word." In 1990, Saddam Hussein, who I am not praising or defending in any way, had invaded Kuwait and was threatening to go further.

We had to act and I voted for the original Gulf War. However, we later found out the Iraqi military strength had been greatly exaggerated. The so-called "elite" Praetorian Guards were surrendering to CNN camera crews or anybody who would take them. Hussein has been greatly weakened since then in almost every way. Let us not exaggerate his strength this time. If he starts to attack us, I will be the first to support a war effort, but please let us not provoke war. Let us not change the name of the Department of Defense into the War Department once again. We should not try to be the policemen of the world. We should try as hard as we can to reestablish our reputation as the most peace-loving Nation on the face of the Earth.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

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

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, Medicare does not cover the cost of prescription drugs, and as a result, approximately 10 million medical recipients nationwide lack any prescription drug coverage. It is estimated by the Kaiser Foundation that seniors spend on average \$1,756 per year for prescription drugs.

Due to the extraordinary cost of prescription drugs, millions of seniors will, A, have to choose between proper medication and rent; B, have to choose between proper medication and groceries; or, C, have to suffer because of improper doses of unaffordable medicines.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge this Congress. How dare we. How dare we affect the quality of life for our seniors by withholding funding for prescription drugs. How dare we dismiss our seniors with a poorly funded mandate that will not cover their needs. How dare we allow our Medicare seniors to be squeezed by an industry lobby when life and death is on the line.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to honor our seniors, respect their age and wisdom and their contributions to America. Fully fund medical prescription drug coverage.

PERMANENT ESTATE TAX REPEAL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House of Representatives will consider a proposal by the Republican majority to permanently repeal the estate tax.

Now, we had a vigorous debate over the estate tax last year; and I along with many others supported a reform

of the estate tax that would lead to the exemption of 99½ percent of the estates in the United States of America. But to take and permanently repeal the tax as will be proposed tomorrow for the largest estates will be an extraordinarily expensive measure and add dramatically to the deficit of the United States and ultimately undermine the Social Security trust fund of the United States.

Permanent repeal would cost \$740 billion, B, billion dollars, over the next decade after 2012. But if we were to instead say, well, let us exempt the first \$5 million of everybody's estate, now that seems like a pretty reasonable step. We do not want people, for instance, in my district or in Oregon who own forestry, tree farms, to go out and prematurely harvest the trees so they have to pay their estates taxes. We do not want people to have to break up their small businesses so they can pay their estates taxes. Those things are well and good. We could do that. We could easily do that.

The current law will exempt by the year 2009 the first \$3.5 million of each estate. So let us just round that up to \$5 million. So if we did that, that would reserve \$400 billion in taxes or \$400 billion of money that would not be drained from the Social Security trust fund to help pay for the retirement of the baby boom.

Now, it is true that there would be some 4 or 500 estates a year worth more than \$5 million who would have to pay taxes to support the 53 million people on Social Security.

□ 1645

I believe that they can afford that burden. Some say, well, we know they should not pay taxes twice. Well, guess what, most of them will not pay taxes twice. In fact, the way the current laws are set up, many of these estates have unrealized capital gains, and if those estates are exempt from taxation, not even the lower rate of capital gains will be paid.

The American working people have to pay day in, day out a substantial portion of their income to Social Security, day in, day out a substantial portion of their income in income taxes, but these people with the estates worth more than \$5 million would never, ever pay a penny in taxes. The unrealized capital gains would be rolled over into the estates, the estates would be tax-exempt, all at a cost of \$400 billion to the rest of the United States of America, the rest of the taxpayers in this country.

This is not fair. It is not fiscally prudent, and the Republican majority should be ashamed of pushing this through at this time of financial crisis. We are looking at a \$300 billion deficit this year. The Social Security lock box that they had us vote on seven times, which I voted for seven times, has been busted open and depleted. There is nothing, nothing going into it over the next 10 years, and for the next 10 years

after that; if they permanently repeal the estate tax for estates worth more than \$5 million, in fact, the Social Security trust fund will continue to be drained.

So we will threaten the benefit of 53 million Americans' Social Security benefits to benefit a handful of extraordinarily wealthy families. This is not the America that I know and I love.

The estate tax was put in place nearly a century ago by a Republican president because the accumulation of wealth generation to generation was creating extraordinary disparities in our society, and the idea was, well, those people should help carry a little bit more of the burden, but if this becomes law, if they are successful tomorrow, as I suspect they might be, then many of these estates, many of these families will never, ever contribute to the collective burdens of citizenship in the United States, much as many corporations are now setting up phony overseas offices in Bermuda and Luxembourg to avoid paying taxes on overseas or U.S. earnings.

We will ultimately, if they are successful, be a country where only wage-earning Americans pay taxes and those that live off the accumulated wealth of their predecessors and the largest corporations will not contribute a penny. This is not right, and my colleagues should vote against this legislation tomorrow for fiscal prudence and for fairness.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about outrageously high drug prices and what we pay for drugs in the United States compared to what the rest of the world is paying.

There is a group down in Florida, and they have been doing this research for a number of years, called the Life Extension Foundation or the Life Extension Network, and they have been doing research in terms of what Americans pay for prescription drugs and what the average European price for those same drugs, made in the same FDA-approved facilities, under the same FDA-approved methodology. These are the exact same drugs, and let us look at some of these.

One that we became very familiar with in the last several months is a drug that is made in Germany. It is called Cipro. We bought an awful lot of Cipro when we started having anthrax mailed to places in Washington and New York. Cipro is a very effective antibiotic. The average United States price for a 30-day supply is \$87.99. That same drug in Germany sells for \$40.75.

The story gets worse when we look at some of the more expensive drugs. Let us take the drug Claritin, for example, which is going off patent here in the

United States, but it still sells for about an average of \$89 for a 30-day supply in the United States. That exact same drug sells for \$18.75 over in Europe.

A drug that is technically off patent in the United States, the FDA has approved what they call a special extension of the patent, Glucophage, one of the most commonly prescribed drugs for diabetes sufferers, which is one of the most common diseases in the United States, but Glucophage, a 30-day supply in the United States sells for \$124.65. That same drug in Geneva, Switzerland, sells for \$22.

Mr. Speaker, as we look down this list, it becomes almost embarrassing that we allow this situation to exist, and the real culprit is not so much the pharmaceutical industry. They are doing what any industry would do, and that is, taking advantage of market opportunities. No, the real problem is that our own FDA stands between Americans and lower drug prices. It is not so much shame on them. It is shame on us.

Now we passed a very important amendment last year on a vote of 324 to 101 saying that as long as it is an FDA-approved drug made in an FDA-approved facility, that those drugs can be imported and reimported by both consumers and wholesalers and a local pharmacist.

Let me show my colleagues one other drug that is fairly near and dear to my heart. It is a drug that my 85-year-old father takes. It is called Coumadin. When I first started putting these charts up a few years ago, the average price for a 30-day supply of Coumadin was about \$38. In just a little over 2 years, that price is now over \$64.

Now, we asked the drug companies what has changed. I mean, do we have new doctoring regulations or new lawsuits that they have to settle? Have they had to spend more money getting approval? The answer is no, nothing has changed, except the price. It has gone from about \$38 to about \$64, almost \$65 in the United States, but here is what really frosts me. The price over in Europe averages only \$15.80 for the same drug.

We are going to have some pitched debates over the next several weeks about prescription drugs, whether or not we should extend coverage, and I believe that we need to do something to help people who are currently falling through the cracks, but if we fail to deal with the critical issue of price, then it is shame on us.

Let me explain how this gets important. Let me first of all show this chart. This is according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the National Institutes of Health Care Management, the last year we have full numbers for. The average Social Security recipient in the United States got a 3½ percent increase in their COLA on their Social Security. At the same time, prescription drug prices in the United States went up by 19 percent. Nineteen per-

cent. That is unsustainable, and ultimately, we in Congress need to do something about it.

My answer is let us open markets, let us allow some competition to exist, and we will see a real change.

I think it is important that we do address the issue of prescription drugs, but according to the Congressional Budget Office, and they are our official scorekeepers, they are the ones who are bean counters, prognosticators, they tell us over the next 10 years their best estimate is that seniors, people over the age of 65, and look at all these numbers, this is how much they estimate seniors will pay for prescription drugs over the next 10 years. That is \$1.8 trillion. There is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to come up with that and continue to fund the other legitimate needs of people here in the United States of America.

The reason I put 35 percent under that, to give a point to why it is important that we do something on reimportation this year, is that I estimate we can save at least 35 percent. Here in Washington a billion dollars gets lost once in a while. In fact, the old expression, a billion here, billion there, pretty soon you are talking about real money, but if we multiply the 35 percent minimum savings that I think we can get with reimportation times \$1.8 trillion over the next 10 years, we can save American consumers \$630 billion. That is real money, and that is real money out of the pockets of either our seniors or the taxpayers here in the United States.

I believe that we as Americans ought to pay our fair share of the research cost for pharmaceuticals. I am not here to beat up on the pharmaceutical industry because they have done a lot of wonderful things. There are millions of American that are alive today and living better lives because of what they have done with their research. I think we should pay our fair share, but shame on us if they continue to force us to subsidize the starving Swiss.

PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION BUDGET IS A BROKEN PROMISE

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to question the fiscal responsibility of the current administration and to question their priorities.

On May 23, I came to this great House floor to vote for positive sweeping changes to our Nation's education programs, along with 384 of our colleagues who passed H.R. 1, the Act to Leave No Child Behind. H.R. 1 passed this House and it also passed the other body and was signed by the President this past January. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle stood next to the President to sign the legislation we believed would finally make education what it should be, a number one priority.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening because the administration's budget, its budget for next year, does not make education a priority. The President's education budget is a broken promise. President Bush has stated that he is the education president. Yet resources in his education budget did not match his rhetoric.

Last month, President Bush visited my home State of Ohio and told a crowd of citizens in Cleveland that we must make sure every child in America gets educated. However, the President's rhetoric does not match the resources in his budget.

President Bush did not mention the education programs that would not receive funding in the State due to his budget cuts. Indeed, the education budget that President Bush sent to Congress falls \$7.2 billion, not million, billion short of the funds needed to implement programs that we passed in H.R. 1.

The most troubling aspect of the President's budget to me is that it spends 50 times more on tax cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans than the total of new education spending, 50 times more for those that already have extremely difficult choices for school districts across this country.

The President's budget cuts 57 education programs authorized in H.R. 1, 57 programs are cut, and his budget will fall short by \$4.7 billion needed to support most academically needy students in our country, \$4.7 billion short.

So one can rightly ask the question, is President Bush's education budget a broken promise?

Mr. Speaker, education must continue to be a priority. Couple this with the impact of the recession on State budgets which currently have deficits in aggregate of over \$40 billion and there is no doubt that our governors are going to be forced to place major cuts on State education and spending at the elementary and secondary levels as well as the post-secondary. We already have seen this in States like Ohio.

State colleges are facing the worst State budget crunch in a decade. Frankly, I cannot understand why the college students across this country are not organizing to impact legislation in their State houses and here at the national level because we are witnessing the largest tuition hikes on our college students in recent history. Why are they so satisfied when, in fact, most of them are graduating with a debt of nearly \$17,000 and in medical school over \$100,000 debt for a new doctor coming out of med school?

A congressional survey found that 49 States made \$1.5 billion in mid-year cuts to higher education funding. Public and private universities share a grim budget outlook indeed as public support dwindles during a faltering economy.

Ohio students will pay prices for higher education because the State of Ohio, as are many other States, is cut-

ting support for higher education. Some State campuses, in fact, are facing increases in tuition of 3 to 15 percent.

□ 1700

In the wake of this news, it did not make any sense then for President Bush to propose ending the fixed-rate consolidations of Federal student loans earlier this spring. The administration stated that the funds, once allocated for the student loan program, would be used to cover the current \$1.3 billion shortfall this year in the budget for the Pell grant program, so important for our lower-income students. But then the administration, after substantial criticism, rescinded that proposal.

Members of Congress continue to believe that education should be a number one priority. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I very much want to keep it a top priority, but we need the cooperation of the White House in this endeavor. And the barbeque tonight will not solve the problems of students and school districts across this country. Seven hundred thousand borrowers consolidate or refinance their total Federal student loans each year.

It is important to ask what other programs are going to be slashed, what other promises are going to be broken. Education should remain a number one priority.

REPEAL SUNSET PROVISION OF INHERITANCE TAX REPEAL

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the body regarding the very, very critical issue of repealing the sunset provision of the inheritance tax repeal. As many Americans know, last year we passed a very, very important tax bill. It reduced taxes on working families, it reduced marginal tax rates, it increased the child tax credit, and it had many, many, very, very good provisions.

Indeed, I have been hearing from constituents, particularly parents, in my congressional district about how the tax reductions, even though they are phased in and, for example, the child tax credit only went from \$500 to \$600 in the first year, are helping. They tell me, particularly parents, where one spouse works, typically the father, and the mother is home with small children, struggling with the burden of trying to raise a family, that these tax reductions are really helping them make ends meet.

Naturally, of course, with the Nation in a recession, these tax reductions have been very helpful in blunting the severity of the recession. Many economists claim that if our tax reductions had not gone into place, this recession

would have been much, much worse. We just heard from the gentlewoman from Ohio how State income taxes being down because of the decline in the economy are hurting education expenses. Imagine where we would be as a Nation if this recession was much, much worse. And I think the tax reductions have been very, very helpful in putting more money into the economy and, therefore, helping create jobs and in protecting jobs.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight specifically to address one particular feature of that bill. In the other body there is a rule that says we cannot make any provisions of the Tax Code permanent unless we have 60 votes. So all of these tax reductions which are phased in over several years essentially sunset in 2011. This is an unfortunate feature, and I was disappointed that we were not able to get the necessary votes to make it permanent. Essentially, it is a tax increase that is hanging out there over the heads of the American people, somewhat like the Sword of Damocles.

For most Americans, I do not think it affects behavior. I do not think people will not have a child because their child tax credit might decline from \$1,000 to \$500 per child in 2011. I do not think that because marginal rates could potentially go up in 2011 that people will change their behavior in the sense that they will not pursue personal gain or they will not pursue career enhancements. But the one feature I think that is the most pernicious in all of this is the impact on the inheritance tax. The inheritance tax affects behavior now.

People, today, who are affected by the inheritance tax, engage in extensive planning to mitigate the severity of the inheritance tax on their business and on their family. This was driven home loud and clear to me when I called a constituent of mine who is an auto dealer. Bruce Deardorf is his name. Shortly after we passed the tax cuts of last year, I called Bruce and he said to me, I am glad you passed it, it is a great step; but, he said, I do not know what to do about my estate planning.

Bruce is like hundreds of thousands, probably millions, of small businessmen all over the country. He started out really with nothing. He scrimped and saved and managed to save up \$60,000 and used that as the downpayment, then took out a big loan to open his first auto dealership many, many years ago. He has been successful and was able to acquire a second, a third, and now a fourth auto dealership. He employs 400 people. He has sent millions and millions of tax dollars to Washington, D.C., both from his personal withholding and all the jobs that he has created. All those 400 people of course pay Social Security tax.

Now, this is not a story that is unique to my congressional district in central Florida; it is common all over the country. Really, the prosperity

that enables us to pay for all the features of our government, from defense to education programs to local taxes that are collected is generated by entrepreneurs and family farmers that are going out working every day and creating jobs and creating prosperity.

And Bruce Deardorf said to me over the phone, I do not know what to do with the estate plan I have established. This feature of the bill, this sunset provision, which basically repeals the inheritance tax by 2010 and then brings it back in 2011, makes it impossible for me to retire all the estate planning that I have generated, and I am going to have to keep it all in place.

This is very, very inefficient. Most of the estate planning, granted, generates work for estate planners, accountants, and lawyers; but it is not in the productive side of our economy. And, indeed, I think this is an inefficiency that we have burdened our economy with. So I believe very, very strongly that we need to make the repeal of the inheritance tax permanent. It is impossible for people to plan, and I think it is the right thing to do.

Now, I supported the bill that we passed last month that made all of the sunset provisions on all the features of the tax bill go away. If we cannot get that enacted into law, I think minimally we need to enact this provision.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now recognize my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN). I understand that the gentleman wanted to speak to this issue on the inheritance tax repeal, and so I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding; and I rise in support of making the death tax relief permanent and, quite frankly, with much puzzlement that we really need to debate this on the House floor today.

On the one hand, it is simply a matter of fairness. The taxes being wrenched from the families is money that has already been taxed before. As an issue of morality, it is hard enough for a family to lose a loved one without having to endure the additional grief and burden that the Federal Government delivers to them. Too often business owners are forced to sell their businesses, and family farms are broken up so families can come up with the cash they need to pay the death tax.

Moreover, as a practical matter, when people are planning their estates, it creates tremendous uncertainty when one does not know whether or not the death tax will resurrect itself within 10 years. Surely the Congress would never tell the American people that it is much more economic to die in the year 2010 than in the year 2011. But if nothing is done to make this relief permanent and the death tax is allowed to rise again, that is the sad reality of the policy we have created.

We must be decisive on this issue and continue the good work we did in en-

acting the President's tax cuts. Not acting to make this relief permanent would be a dereliction of duty to the constituents we represent.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Congress would do the right thing and make this death tax relief permanent.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his very important input; and I believe the gentleman's colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), also would like to add to the gentleman's statement on this very important issue; and so I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is a real honor for me to be here with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), and an honor to be here with my colleague, the gentleman South Carolina (Mr. BROWN). I was very honored to serve with him in the General Assembly of South Carolina. He served as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House of Representatives, which was one of the highest positions of our State, and we are just very fortunate that he was elected 2 years ago to serve here in Congress. Those of us from South Carolina are proud of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

I am very happy and honored to have been elected more recently. I ran in the primary last October. I was elected on December 18; and, in fact, I am the second most recent Member of Congress. I am number 434 out of 435. And with that distinction, the point I want to make is that I also have the most recent experience, some of us would call it real-life experience, of being with the public in a private position in my job. And I was very proud of my employment as an attorney. I served as a real estate attorney, and I was a probate attorney until December 18 last year when I was elected to Congress.

My experience in civilian life of being a real estate attorney, probate attorney, is that I heard so much about death taxes and that is why I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for his leadership in working to eliminate death taxes in the United States. This needs to be done. Because I know firsthand how this has chilled the value of real estate, it has chilled development, it has chilled home building, and it has had a negative effect for businesses, particularly small businesses in our country.

Additionally, I know that it has created confusion for those of us who work in preparing wills and assisting people in preparation of wills. But the ultimate confusion has been a law which will provide, as the gentleman correctly indicated, a tax increase. That tax increase will take place on January 1, 2011, when it just kicks in. So what we have is an indeterminate law, in effect, which is the worst kind.

I know from being recently in campaigns, talking with people, meeting with people in their businesses, in their

homes, on the street, at meetings, that this is a key issue. And I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this up, and I really look forward to the vote tomorrow.

I also had the experience of looking back at the debate involving a wonderful colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who spoke on this last year. And I want to commend the membership for passing the tax cuts last year. It was a year ago, on June 6, 2001, when the reforms were put in place to eliminate the death taxes and reduce other taxes.

The way this tax cut would work that was passed provides that there would be a phase-out of the death taxes over the next 9 years, and then it would completely disappear in the 10th year. However, the sunset provision that the gentleman explained provides that after December 31, 2010, on the very next day, the taxes would be fully put back into place, a tax increase, as the gentleman has said correctly. So persons would almost have to plan, which cannot be done, and we do not want it to be done, to pass away on December 31, 2010. It is not only just illogical, it is immoral.

In other words, unless we want to make the tax elimination permanent, we need to vote positively tomorrow, and I look forward to doing so. What we have is a situation where if people did pass away prior to December 31, 2010, they would not pay a death tax. But if they live 1 day more, to January 1, 2011, they would pay a tax, possibly equal to 60 percent of all their assets.

I believe that the death tax is possibly the most ethically disgraceful tax which is levied by the Federal Government; and then, in fact, most States also have adopted this tax through tax conformity.

□ 1715

So this can really be beneficial. Not only what we are doing on the Federal level; the impact will be to eliminate death taxes at the Federal and State level. You have tax on assets already taxed. We need to vote tomorrow to permanently eliminate the death tax.

Another definition of the death tax would be taxes on the property owned at the date of death. When someone dies, the surviving family, not the deceased, and there is some debate, we can call it an inheritance tax, but the general term is death tax. The surviving family pays a tax up to 60 percent on all assets currently over \$675,000.

When we hear about \$675,000, I know from personal experience working with people who are of average means, they do not realize that their homes have appreciated substantially. They could immediately be put into a taxable situation. Many people do not realize that insurance is included within the estate and provides immediately for taxes to be assessed.

For the past 20 years, as a member of the Army National Guard, I have been

traveling all over South Carolina with legal counseling teams assisting people in preparing wills and powers of attorney in the event that they were mobilized. Person after person has had property that has appreciated. It is real estate which was formerly in rural areas, and is now in resort areas. This could result in people having to cut timber early, which would be negative. Timber has been a phenomenal resource which appreciates in value so quickly that immediately people who are of average means become taxed upon the death of a loved one.

I think that another point that needs to be made is that the Federal death tax was enacted in 1916 to provide for funds to fight World War I. We heard a few minutes ago that it needs to be reformed and not eliminated. I will say that reform is simply a code word for keeping the door open for abuse.

The best way to handle any tax is to eliminate the tax. It may sound good that we would reform it and it would apply to a very tiny percentage, but we all know that that is leaving it alive so that in the future it could be increased and they could come back and have it on the books and simply say this is a technical amendment, we understand what that means, and suddenly we have taxes which are increased in all directions.

The real question on this is in regard to grandparents. They should be encouraged to save for their children and for their grandchildren. To me this is an assault on grandparents who have worked hard all their lives. They want to provide for their families and want to pass it on. Tomorrow I will be looking forward to voting on this for the grandparents of America.

The bottom line, a good question, is that normally government will tax gains. That is assets that are appreciating by gains. But why does the government have a right to tax the ultimate loss, which is someone's life?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the leadership he is providing on this issue. I want to just underscore that this is also a jobs issue. This poster I have here says it quite clearly. More than 70 percent of family businesses do not survive to the second generation. I was talking earlier about an auto dealer in my district. He has created his dealership and three others, and 70 percent of family businesses passed from the founder to the children do not survive. Eighty-seven percent did not make it to the third generation.

Mr. Speaker, why is that? One of the principal reasons is the inheritance tax. When businesses go under, it means a loss of jobs. Sixty percent of small business owners report that they would create new jobs over the coming year if the estate tax were permanently repealed. Why is that? It is directly related to what I was talking about earlier.

My friend has estate planning in order to mitigate his death tax when

he tries to pass his business on to his son. If he did not have to do that, to employ those kinds of vehicles, he would have more money, and most of his money is tied up in his business, what would he probably do? He would probably sow it back into the business and create more jobs, which generates more taxpayers.

The theme of the evening is the permanent repeal of the inheritance tax or death tax. Before we go on with that and before I recognize the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and I deeply respect his leadership on the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman has been instrumental in bringing this permanent repeal to the floor of the House, but I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) wanted to speak to some of the education issues that were brought up earlier this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) to speak to this issue.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for letting me go out of order to speak on education. I would tell the gentleman I grew up in Missouri, and many of the folks who pass away, they try to pass down their farms, and they have to sell off the farm that they have had in their family for 200 years because they cannot afford to pay the taxes on it, up to 55 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is the silly season. It is election time. We hear tax breaks for the rich. We hear the Republicans are cutting education. The White House is cutting education. Do not let the facts get in the way of the truth. The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) just spoke, and I would like to address some of the things that the gentlewoman said.

I was in the committee hearing with the gentlewoman when Secretary Paige came and she made the same accusations. The Secretary, point by point, refuted every single claim that the gentlewoman from Ohio was making that we are cutting education, or that the President's budget cuts education.

We here on the House floor had a very bipartisan H.R. 1 vote. The President's primary concern is that no child is left behind. My wife is a special assistant to the Secretary for Education for Management, a position that the Clinton administration totally did away with and caused a lot of the fraud, waste and abuse. The Secretary told the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) point by point where the gentlewoman is wrong. The Democrats have a number for education, an increased number for education. No matter what it is, the Democrats will add to that number. They claim to be the great fiscal responsibility party; but when we look, every single budget, except for defense, they want to increase it out here beyond the budget and actually take money out of Social Security.

We came up with an increase in education. We increased Pell Grants. We

increased money for IDEA. The maximum amount that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle ever funded IDEA for was 6 percent. We quadrupled that.

Pell Grants, all the way down the line, we have increased dollars. And something else that the President did and now that the Department of Education is in Republican hands, what they are doing, they are driving the money to the local school districts so that the parents, the teachers, and the administrators can control those dollars instead of the bureaucrats that the Democrats want to control the money. They want more money in an election cycle so they can pass it down and have bigger bureaucracies. We want to get it down to the classrooms.

The President is also making sure that there is accountability with those dollars. My wife sits on the management team over there in the Department of Education. Do Members realize under the Clinton administration the folks that worked over there had over \$400,000 on their credit cards? There were over 40 of them that charged houses and furniture and personal items on their credit cards. There is one lady still working with her job. The department may be afraid to go after her, but I am going to go after her donkey, and she is not going to have that job after I am through with her. It is fraud, waste and abuse.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, did I hear the gentleman correctly to say that there are employees at the Department of Education that have used government credit cards to charge personal items?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Personal items, furniture, housing equipment, personal items, movies, all kinds of things. One of them still is working over there, and I am going to make sure that she is not working there in the future.

But the bottom line is the President is not cutting education. Tax breaks for the rich, we will hear over and over. Again, do not let the facts get away with the truth. Alan Greenspan said the Democrats tried to go after the President for the recession and the economy. Guess what, tax relief helped stop that. That is not the Republicans talking, that is OMB, that is Alan Greenspan, our economist.

All Democrats want is an item for the election, and they cannot do it. They tried to get the President on Enron, and it did not work. They said he should have helped with Enron on the other end. That did not work. The majority leader in the Senate went after the President on the war, and that did not work. They are trying everything they can in this election year to have leverage and make an issue.

Mr. Speaker, we are not cutting education. The Secretary pointed out to the gentlewoman from Ohio point by point that her statements were false.

I would like to thank the gentleman. I ran over here because I serve on that committee, and it is upsetting in an

election year to make false claims that the President is doing something when he is not. We may not be adding as much as the gentlewoman wants, but we are staying within the budget.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the issue at hand. Many Democrats want to increase it 10 percent, and we put through an increase of 5 percent or 4 percent, and they call that a cut. Indeed, we saw that for years and years and years in this body. I know the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) got elected with me in 1994. That was one of the things in 1994 that I campaigned on. For years politicians in Washington would increase something by 5 percent, but the bureaucrats at the agency would say that they needed a 10 percent funding increase.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman would yield, not only was the money increased, but the accountability was not there. The Department of Education had \$50 million in student loans that they could not account for. Their books were unauditible. The Democrats and their group at the Department of Education, \$12 million in direct student loans went to the wrong students, and so they then had to give another \$12 million up. We are shoring that up. We are not only increasing the money for education, we are making sure that it gets down to the children, and that the parents have control of it.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the critical leadership he is providing on education. Educating our children is perhaps one of the most important issues that we perform here in Washington, although I believe that is really a priority for parents and local school districts, although we need to do everything that we can to try to help.

The issue of the evening is the very important debate we will be having tomorrow. Tomorrow the House of Representatives will take up a piece of legislation that I introduced last year. It is to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent. It is H.R. 2143. It would not have been possible to get this piece of legislation moved to the floor if we did not have the support of a lot of people. Obviously the leadership of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the majority leader, and all of our leadership team. Critical as well was the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and on that committee one of the people actively pushing to bring this bill to the floor was the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for allowing us to share this time. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) who again talked about education and the importance, yes, of dollars, but also the importance of accountability. It is very interesting the differences we see. My son is now 8 years of age, and I remember when he came home from school at 7, and he was talking about the concept of infinity.

□ 1730

And he said, You know, Dad, you will never reach it because you can always add more to it. And indeed it seems, sadly sometimes, along partisan lines the notion is whatever figure is arrived at, oh, no, we can always spend more. The key of course is not just the right allocation of resources. It also of course is accountability. And, Mr. Speaker, now it is time to become accountable to the American family, to family-owned businesses, to ranches and farms and so many different concerns where the scourge of the death tax has come like a thief in the night, not only death robbing people of their lives but the death tax robbing families of their future.

Our good friend who sadly is departing this Chamber, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), once borrowed Patrick Henry's admonition. Said my good friend, "No taxation without respiration," and I think that is evocative not only of history but something very practical. It was one of our great founders, Ben Franklin, gifted in so many different ways, almost with the incredible prescience to see what would come in this constitutional Republic, but even Dr. Franklin with his incredible foresight never predicted that the constitutional Republic he helped to found would tax people upon their death. Remember his days as a humorist writing in "Poor Richard's Almanac," he said: "There are only two certainties in life, death and taxes."

But even Dr. Franklin did not foresee that this Republic would one day tax a person upon the event of his death and of course realty does not affect that person but that person's family. And lest anyone think this is a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker, we would thank those across the aisle who have joined with us to understand how this unfair tax should be eliminated; and we should point out for those, Mr. Speaker, who wonder why we are returning to this, it is because my colleague from Florida very capably pointed out that a rule difference, and again I am not directing this at the other body, but a rule difference did not allow for the implementation on a permanent basis of this particular repeal.

And so we have the curious situation, while we made a profound move to repeal the death tax, to roll it back, as my friend from South Carolina outlined, as my friend from Florida recognizes, we have almost an absurd situation now where if one is going to die, he had better do it in the year 2010 to realize the complete benefit of repeal of the death tax. For if we do nothing, whom, here it is back again in the year 2011. That is why I salute my friend from Florida bringing forward this notion, serving as a catalyst to make this repeal permanent.

And again lest anyone think this is a partisan concern, I would point out that the one-time standard bearer of the Democratic Party in the State of

Arizona for the office of Governor back in 1994 approached me 2 years ago saying "Congressman, you have got to get rid of this death tax." Why? Whatever political disagreements we had in other areas, the gentleman correctly understood his business, his livelihood, of family-owned enterprise, of grocery stores, the capital involved in that business, the fact that so much of the assets are tied up in bricks and mortar and quite literally in the groceries on the shelves, and unless the death tax is repealed, then a business that had been in his family would be in danger of having to be sold off to pay the taxman.

It is even more pronounced in the rural communities I have been honored to represent for the better part of a decade, with farmers and ranchers and so many small businesses owned by families but especially when we come to the whole notion of agriculture and farms and ranches and how quite literally so many families are land rich and cash poor. So much of their assets are tied up in real estate, tied up in farm machinery, tied up in those very tangible assets; and so often we have a situation where, to satisfy this tax bill, people were forced to liquidate their assets, to sell off the family farm, to sell off the family business to satisfy the tax needs of Uncle Sam.

While we are thinking about this, Mr. Speaker, something else we should point out, over the years it has become painfully apparent that the American people do not rely on this death tax. Indeed, as we look back over the last few years, the death tax on an annual basis only accounts for about 1 percent of the revenue that comes in to the Federal Government. Yet three-quarters of that 1 percent is spent pursuing the families of the farmers and ranchers who pass away, the families of the people who created these small businesses, to have them pay a bill that for them is insurmountable, it seems, but in the scheme of things only accounts for about 1 percent of the revenue that comes in to the Federal Government on an annual basis.

No, Mr. Speaker, we can be smarter. This House in a bipartisan way took that important step toward that great day with eventual repeal of the death tax, but we need to make it permanent. Permanency is important, for if we fail to do that, you will have the absurdity of in 2010 seeing it completely repealed but in 2011 the Grim Reaper comes back with a vengeance. I know none of us here advocate state-sponsored euthanasia; yet that is the absurdity we would have if we failed to move to enact permanent death tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, lest you think this is exclusively the domain of family-owned businesses, farmers and ranchers, certainly it is important and perhaps it is more pronounced there, but I would tell you the story of a lady I encountered in Tucson, Arizona. Down on a visit there to that part of our State, a lady came up and spoke of her father's experience. Here was a man who

worked hard, indeed, in a career that very seldom do we see anymore with the modern marketing techniques, but he was a milkman. He worked for a dairy. He came back from World War II and worked hard delivering milk every day, not exactly a highbrow occupation. Certainly there is dignity in every form of work, but very few people would think about that gentleman as being a captain of industry or someone with vast financial resources, but what that gentleman did was incredibly exemplary and so symptomatic of the American experience. The money he made, he was able to save judiciously. He made some wise investments coming home from World War II, getting involved, working as a milkman. His hard work and wise investments paid off in an estate that was worth millions of dollars.

But there is just one catch here. As wise as he was with investments, he did not understand that, oh, gee, you have got to work on estate planning. He did not seek out a team of lawyers to sit down and make all the proper machinations to change the situation to save the funds. And so when he contracted a terminal illness, only then in the twilight of his days did he realize, despite such an exemplary life, hard work, thrift, industry, doing the right thing for his family, only then did he come to the shocking realization that somehow, despite that hard work and industry, his planning had been incomplete.

His daughter told me the story how her father called her in and her sibling in and not only the challenge and the pain of a terminal illness but the realization that he was leaving them in essence with a gigantic tax bill to pay because of this death tax.

Mr. Speaker, if you work hard and play by the rules, must we all be captains of high finance? I understand a modicum of estate planning. I understand the importance of insurance. Certainly having moved from broadcasting, into that profession before coming into public life, I understand the importance of life insurance and financial planning, but must we ask everyone to deal with the machinations and brain power and inner workings of complicated financial measures? No, it should be simple and this should be repealed permanently because it is wrong.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the story the gentleman told was very, very moving. Before I yield to my good friend from the great State of Nebraska, I want to tell another real-life story. I think it is so important when we make things like this understandable from real-life experiences.

I want to talk about a florist in Kissimmee, Florida. His name is Danny Sexton. A lot of people on the east coast have passed through Kissimmee because it is right outside Disney World. Danny started out with a floral shop. His uncle had been established in the floral business in Kissimmee for many years, had a much bigger shop;

he had about 20 employees and his uncle died, and Danny was the sole heir. Danny inherited his uncle's floral shop.

Danny, like so many small businessmen, employed just a small number of people, five or six people. He had been involved in his community for years, giving to the United Way and other charitable programs. He really knew nothing about the death tax. Suddenly he found himself in charge of not only his floral shop, but his uncle's floral shop, which had been established many years earlier, was much bigger, had a lot of commercial accounts and he inherited all these employees. Lo and behold, he discovered that he was going to have to pay a tax bill, and the death tax was \$160,000. But what was the real shocker, what was the real corker in all this is that you do not just take the floral shop and just give it to Danny, you have got to do a lot of other things. Lawyers got involved. There were \$60,000 in lawyers' fees, there was \$14,000 of accountants fees, there was a \$15,000 bill for just miscellaneous expenses. And then this one here I thought was really kind of interesting, an IRS fee. I think that was to appraise the value of this floral business.

If anybody knows, if you run something like a floral shop, the margins are kind of tight and he had to go out and borrow \$253,000 to be able to pay for all of this. It was a real burden on him. He ended up having to lay off, I think, two or three of the employees in the shop. He additionally had to ask a number of the employees that he retained to take a cut in salary. Indeed, it was so bad for him initially that they went the whole summer in the office without the air conditioner. The air conditioner broke. If any of you have ever spent a summer in Florida, you know it is very humid. It is not only hot, it is very humid. And they had to totally cut off charitable contributions and helping out the Boy Scouts and the United Way when they would come around and they would have a special banquet or an event.

Danny is pulling out of this. I know he is going to be okay. But this is really what it is all about. Danny's uncle had employed 20 people for years. Danny's uncle had paid a lot of money to the Federal Government in personal, Federal withholding, in the FICA tax. What is even more so is that all the employees who worked for him were also paying their taxes, their Social Security, their Medicare tax year after year after year. The Federal Government had actually gotten probably millions of dollars of revenue off of the enterprise that had been created by his uncle. And then for him to die and then for the Federal Government to come along and say, No, you've got to give us some more, I think, is taxing that is immoral. It is immoral to tax after you have taxed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from Nebraska, another Member whom I believe has played a critical

role in helping us bring this issue to the floor of the House making the repeal of the inheritance tax permanent law, because until you do that, you are not going to affect really all the estate planning that has to go on to prevent people from being burdened with this tax on their death.

□ 1745

Mr. TERRY. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, our good friend from Arizona here, he has been a great leader, like the gentleman from Florida has, on this important issue. It is important to a lot of people in Nebraska now.

Before I talk about some of the stories that I have heard as I have gone around and talked to businesses in Omaha, small businesses, family-owned businesses, and share our similar experiences, the gentleman from Arizona mentioned that in the totality of our budget, the revenue that is received from the death tax is less than 1 percent, but yet there are a lot of our colleagues here that just fight to keep that money in.

I think it exemplifies why all three of us ran for this office and why we fight to come back every year, is to stop that type of mentality, which is "we need more money, more money, more money." So when we try and reduce spending here by reducing taxation, because it is the only principle here, that budgets fill the money that we have, that if we tax more, we will spend more, but if we tax less, we will spend less, it is a simple proposition.

So of the greater taxing policies of the Nation, I think it is important that we realize the simple premise that the more money we take in from people, the more we are going to spend. So I appreciate the gentleman bringing up that important point.

Now, why? We have all said in our own words why it is bad policy. Why is the death tax bad policy? Well, think about the very principles that this country was founded on, the principles of independence and freedom and entrepreneurship, where people worked hard to build their little businesses, and some worked day and night, day and night, seven days a week, and they were able to build it up and build it up, and maybe even the next generation of family members were able to help build it up as well. I mean, that is the American spirit, is working hard and realizing, you realizing, the rewards of your work.

So, what is the policy? The U.S. Government comes, and many States, by the way, have followed suit, and said, you know, because of our spending habits and our need for more revenues, upon the death and the transfer we are going to confiscate, and I use that word, confiscate a portion of what you have worked hard to build up in your lifetime.

I would say to the gentlemen, I believe that people should keep the rewards. Yes, we have to pay our taxes,

but, my gosh, just taking up to 55 percent of somebody's wealth that they have built up through hard work, through the American dream, and just taking it for our spending needs, is absolutely wrong.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman from Florida will yield, I just wanted to point out again that observation that our friend from Florida made. There is a situation at work here that is so myopic, it is almost to be penny wise and pound foolish. Because, as was pointed out in the case of Mr. Sexton and the flower shop, 20 employees, payroll taxes, people paying their income taxes, though this was a considerable hardship, the money devoted to handle all the details and red tape and the death tax itself in the long term, did it not cost the government more revenue?

You see, here is the difference. And I appreciate the concept that my friend from Nebraska brings forward about taxing more, spending more; taxing less, spending less. But there is something else at work here that we have to understand about the reduction of the tax bill. When the American people have more money to put to work, when the death tax is repealed and more people are at work, guess what? Revenues to the Federal Government will actually increase, because more money is being put to work. It is called the principle of growth.

So we have to be very careful here, and that is the myopia; in addition to the unfairness and injustice, lack of justice, injustice of the death tax, is that really in the long term it actually costs revenue. It is inefficient, as well as immoral.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. I have just become so focused. As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) said, the morality of just confiscating one's work product for the sake of having revenues, we leave out the economic component of in essence taking away a business.

We hear speakers, and we are going to hear them tomorrow when the bill comes up, that say that this is not real; that people do not really have to sell their businesses to meet the death tax; that it is a phony argument.

Well, I want to read an article from the Omaha World-Herald from December 11, 2001. So it is not like we have to go back to the archives of years past to come up with an article that is relevant to our discussion today. But it is about a ranch in western Nebraska, of which kind of the theme of it was Ted Turner buying another ranch in Nebraska.

Let me just read some highlights from this article in the Omaha World-Herald, and I will give them their copy-right credits here. It is talking about media mogul Ted Turner added another 12,300 acres of Cherry County grazing land to his bison ranching empire. The purchase was to be finalized on Monday. It gives Turner about 234,000 acres in three counties in Nebraska, making him the largest private landowner in

Nebraska, as he is in the United States, owning about 1.75 million acres in New Mexico, Montana, South Dakota and Nebraska.

The Coble family, I am going to get to and read this verbatim from the Omaha World-Herald article, Bill Coble of Leewood, Kansas, a grandson of the Cobles, said that the death in August of Doris Coble precipitated the sale. It was necessary to pay off the inheritance taxes, Bill Coble said. The only way you can make it work is with an added amount of life insurance and to work the ranch yourself, Coble said. The purchase ends a 100-year Sand Hills operation of the Coble family. A 100-year tradition of the Coble family gone, because when the operator, Doris Coble, the last of the parents, died, the grandson could not take over the property. He had to sell it to pay off the inheritance taxes. This is a family that did not purchase the millions of dollars of life insurance policy to protect itself. My family buys life insurance to protect our family. Here you buy life insurance to pay your taxes. That is wrong.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am glad the gentleman brought this up, because I wanted to get at some of the arguments we are going to hear on the floor tomorrow from the opposition. What the gentleman was just talking about, I think, segues very nicely into that.

They are going to put forward an alternative proposal. The inheritance tax repeal we passed last year phases in over 8 or 9 years, and then the reason why we have got this bill on the floor tomorrow is in the 10th year it just comes back in its full force.

What the minority will put forward is the notion we should just have a \$3 million exemption and we could enact that immediately. They may point to the farmers and the ranchers and say if we just had this \$3 million exemption, the Coble family that the gentleman cited is a good example, they would be covered, and they could pass the ranch on. Danny Sexton would not have encountered the problem he had. He could have inherited the floral shop from his uncle.

The problem with that is that if your asset is worth more than \$3 million, then everything over \$3 million gets taxed at something like a 50 percent tax rate. We have inflation, and these farms and ranches that they say now are valued at less than \$3 million, what are they going to be worth 10 years from now, what are they going to be worth 15 years from now?

It obviously picks winners and losers, and that is the main gripe that I have. It is basically saying, well, if you have created a small business and it is only worth \$3 million or less, then we will not tax you. But if you have been really successful, or if you have farmland in, say, Napa, California, where it is valued at incredible prices, no, we are going to tax you. I just think that is totally wrong.

Let me also point out, 60 percent of the top black-owned businesses today in America are valued at over \$2 million. That means in another 5 or 7 years, those assets are going to be worth probably over \$3 million, and, boom, they are going to get hit by the inheritance tax.

Another point is a point that I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) was alluding to earlier, that they look at making the inheritance tax repeal permanent and they say we are going to lose \$99 billion. That does not take into consideration at all the fact that if you leave that money in the economy, you are going to put more money in the economy and it is going to create jobs and it is going to create wealth and that we would be able to then tax that.

Indeed, it is estimated by economic analysts that the inheritance tax actually costs, and this is what the gentleman said earlier, I believe, it actually costs us, because it takes money out of the economy, money that would be flowing around the economy; it forces people to sell small businesses; it forces small business owners to take out a loan to pay the inheritance tax; and then their small business does not operate sufficiently.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona. I think we have about 5 minutes left.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mindful of that as a broadcaster, the old time clock on the wall, it is important for us to pass permanent repeal, no matter the siren song of seduction saying "let us set a temporary level that will accommodate some folks." Maybe this is a fundamental philosophical difference.

When you get in the realm of targeted tax cuts, you are asking this Federal Government to pick winners and losers, and you do nothing for the business owners, the grocery store owners, the farm machinery dealership owners, the automobile dealership owners, who have significant capital sunk into that business, who literally are asset-rich and cash-poor. You exacerbate the problem. Our purpose is not to set American against American, not to get wrapped up in the I believe ultimately misguided notion of class warfare, but to allow everyone to succeed.

There is one other note undergirding all of this. It is especially pronounced in Arizona, where one of our local newspapers is concerned about the price of sprawl at an acre an hour. Why do you think farms are being sold off? To satisfy the death tax. Gone is a lot of our agricultural land. That is a real problem in States like Arizona and Florida and across the country. That is another reason to make this repeal permanent.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his input on this special order. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for the last word.

Mr. TERRY. Well, I will let the gentleman have the last word, and thank him for bringing this to the floor. One

of the other points, though, I want to make with that is the cost of the machinery. When we talk about our farms and ranches, we have a plant that manufactures farm equipment. The price of some of that equipment coming out is several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Like a combine.

Mr. TERRY. \$200,000 to \$300,000, and even more if you go to some of the other equipment. A small family-owned printing company that I toured last summer when I was home, one printer runs hundreds of thousands of dollars, half a million dollars for a printer. So when you talk about what level do you set this, if you do not eliminate it, and picking the winners and losers, you fail to recognize that they are eking out a small living with very expensive equipment, but yet we tax on the value of that equipment, not the living that a father and mother and maybe a son and a daughter can make off of that. That is why it remains fundamentally unfair.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank both of my colleagues for their input on this very important issue.

Let me just close with one very important point. We will also hear that making the inheritance tax repeal permanent will hurt donations to charity.

□ 1800

The assumption there in that argument is that people are only giving to charity so they do not have to give it to the Federal Government.

I just think that is not true. If we look at what happened after the Reagan tax cuts in the 1980s, giving to charity skyrocketed. I think wealthy people are motivated by the best intentions when they give. If they do not have to give as much money at death, I think they will give even more money to charity, and that America's charities will benefit from the permanent repeal of the inheritance tax.

EDUCATION DETERMINES THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time, and I will be joined by some of my colleagues a little later, I hope, to talk on this special order on the floor this evening about a very important issue facing this country today, maybe one of the key issues.

Everyone talks about my issue is more important, or that issue is more important. But the truth is, when we are talking about the future of America, that issue is education, because that is the one issue that not only helps us this week, this year, next year, but really secures our future

when we are headed into the 21st century and the challenges we face. This group of young people in our schools today will determine the kind of future we are going to have.

So many times I get perplexed when I have my colleagues come to this floor, and I really sense, number one, that they have not visited a school recently; or if they have been to a school, that they did not go into the classrooms; and if they went into a classroom, they probably did not pay attention to what they were seeing or listening to from the teacher, or they were not looking into the eyes of some of the very bright children who were in those classrooms struggling to learn in conditions, in many cases, that Members of this body would not want to be in every day.

They are overcrowded, and in the summertime they are hot, and in the wintertime they may be cold. Or they are in a trailer outside, and if it is raining, they walk through the rain to get to the classroom, or walk through any kind of inclement weather.

First, this evening, let me talk about some very positive things, some good things that are happening in our public schools. As this hour goes on, I will talk about more of them.

Let me first talk about some schools in my district, something I know about, and in North Carolina. I had the occasion over the last couple of weeks, and I make an effort to visit schools about every week, but I went to a school down in part of my district, Anderson Creek Elementary, and visited with the principal, Ms. Cobb, and an awful lot of the teachers and students.

They have a program where they encourage children to read. It is really a kindergarten through about fourth grade reading program. Some of the schools I am going to mention actually do it in the higher grades.

She got those young people so excited about reading by giving them certificates and tee shirts, and getting the parents involved through kindergarten, that those youngsters in that school, and there are about roughly 700 elementary school students, over 545 of them read at least 100 books. They had read a total of over 155,000 books this year; probably more than that by now.

When we talk about good things, those are the kinds of things that make a difference. Because if a youngster learns to read and they learn to do math and they learn to communicate, that will make a difference. They will be successful students.

I went to North Harnett Elementary the same day, where the leading reader in that school had read 410 books. It is amazing to me that a youngster would read 410 books and still do his or her homework.

At Anderson Creek, they had one student who read 545 books. The children in that school had read a substantial number. It is sort of contagious. These are good things happening in Harnett County.

Lafayette Elementary, the same thing. They went in, had an assembly, and they honored the students. Their program was titled Reading Around the World, where they actually put flags of nations around the world about which the youngsters had read. They got involved. They had tee shirts and they got certificates, and they honored top readers.

These are the things we do not hear a lot about, but we always hear people critical of those people who are giving so much time in the classroom who really are creative, innovative, and thinking about how do we make things better for children.

Then I went to Cleveland Elementary School, a school in the community I grew up in. The same kind of thing: a very caring principal and assistant principal, with an awful lot of hard-working, focused teachers. They were doing the program not only in reading, but in a number of other areas, and they were giving out certificates. Children were really and truly getting ready to build a strong foundation for the future, things we were not doing 10 or 20 years ago.

I went over to East Clayton Elementary School over near Clayton, and the same kind of thing: a very focused principal providing great leadership, and teachers who were caring, creative, and making a difference.

I only mention these schools because they are representative not only of just schools in my congressional district or in my State of North Carolina, but I happen to think they are representative of teachers and students and principals and administrators all across this country.

Do we have problems? Sure. Do we need to improve? Absolutely. But they are about making a difference. This is the way we improve it. I have learned a long time ago that if we want to improve education, we lay out a plan, we work with the people, and we give them encouragement. It is awful easy to be critical.

It is a lot like a little poem I use many times, and I think my colleagues would benefit from that, because it reminds me of being an architect. It takes a long time to go to school to be an architect. It takes a number of years. But the last time I checked, if we want to hire somebody to tear a building down, we can put them in a machine and put a ball at the end of a chain and we can knock it down pretty quick.

"I watched them tear a building down,
A gang of men in a busy town.
With a ho heave ho and a lusty yell,
They swung a beam and a side wall fell.
I asked the foreman, are these men skilled,
The kind you would hire if you had to build?
He smiled and said, 'No, indeed,
Common labor is all I need,
For I can wreck in a day or two
What people have taken years to do.'
And I thought to myself as I went my way,
Which of these roles have I tried to play?
Have I been a builder who builds with care,
Carefully measuring the world by the rule or
a square,

Or have I been content to roam the town, Content with the business of tearing down?"

Too many times we have people who unfortunately are willing to tear down, but are not willing to help be architects. We not only need architects to build buildings, we need architects in our classrooms. We have them in teachers; we need more. Yes, we need resources to help train them better, because the needs for our teachers are changing every day.

I think that is the key issue in education, is that we give encouragement where it is needed. Certainly, we give counsel when it is not working out. If we have people who are not doing the job, then we need to take appropriate action, like we would do in any other area. But we ought to acknowledge when our teachers and our administrators and people who work with our children every day are doing a good job.

Let me just share with Members, if I may, before I get to some prepared remarks, I read an article recently that I want to just read some pieces out of. It is by Gerald Bracey, and it was in *The Washington Post*. I think it is right on target when we are talking about education.

It says, "Why do we scapegoat the schools?" I could not help but think, there is a lot of truth in this. I think I know a little bit about this. I said to my colleagues when they came here, I served as State superintendent of schools of North Carolina for 8 years. That is an elective office in North Carolina, like the governor and some others.

There is one thing I learned. We may not know all the answers of what to do, but I know some of the things that do not work. Sometimes that is worth an awful lot.

Gerald Bracey made this point: "There is no pleasing some people, even when they get what they want. So why do we keep listening to them? For more than 20 years now, people have been bashing our schools."

He goes all the way back to the time when the Russians put up the Sputnik, and we got all carried away in this country and said our math and science programs are in shambles, our schools are failing us, our schools need to be fixed, so we put together a program. Lo and behold, with President Kennedy's focus and commitment, and yes, this Congress, the House and Senate put in resources behind it, and I emphasize, resources, and translated, that is money behind it, we put a man on the moon before the end of the decade.

But Bracey goes on to say, we didn't say to the public schools, you are no longer in crisis, you have done a good job. You make this happen. Then all of a sudden, we walked along, and they did not get credit for what they had done. We stayed quiet. All of a sudden, after that happened, he said that there was no declaration that the crisis in education was over, and the question was raised, do pigs fly? Translated,

that is that we did not give them the credit; it was assumed they had to do it.

He goes on to talk about, again, he says, "I don't mean to suggest, of course, that America's public schools are perfect. The dreary state of some urban and poor rural school systems is well documented." I would agree with that. He said, "But I have been following the anguish over our competitive capabilities since the '83 report, and I've noticed the same pattern. In the early nineties, as the economy tanked and the recession set in, many variations of 'Lousy schools are producing a lousy work force and it is killing us in the global market' could be heard, but those slackards somehow managed to turn things around. By early 1994, many publications featured banner headlines about the recovery that later became the longest sustained period of economic growth in the Nation's history. And then, 'The American economy, back on top,' was the way that *The New York Times* summed up the turnaround in February of 1994."

Well, did the public schools have anything to do with that? Were the people that were employed in those businesses all of a sudden better 2 years later than they were 2 years before? Did we give them any credit for that happening? No. They continued to be hammered.

He goes on to say, "Looking at a number of the different rankings of schools and school reports, the United States looked particularly bad in one DEF category: the difference in quality between rich and poor schools. We finished 42nd lower than any other developed nation, which is shameful for a rich nation."

So if 26 nations had better schools, how did we wind up being number 2 in competitive ranking of all the nations in the world? The DEF used dozens of variables in many sectors, and the United States ranks well across the board.

One important consideration is the brain drain factor. Our scientists and engineers stay here, earning us a top ranking in that category. Other nations of the world who send young people to the United States to be educated, and certainly we have received or we have been the beneficiary of that for a number of years, they come here and many of them stay in the United States, and they make their contributions here. We as a society and as a people have been beneficiaries of their coming to America and getting their educations here. It has made a difference.

I only share this because I think this article is a good article for me to segue into the comments I want to make this evening, because I think there are some good things. There are a lot of good things about our public schools. I think the American public cares very deeply about our public schools.

We have roughly 53 million young people in this country in the public

schools of America. Depending on what State one is in, that may range from roughly 93 or 94 percent in North Carolina to where some States, maybe a little lower, we probably have 95 instead of 94, and some States less because they have more parochial schools. The bottom line is, the bulk of the students in this country are in the public school sector, and historically they have gotten a good education.

The challenge we face today in the 21st century is a much different challenge than we faced 50 or even 100 years ago, or even 25 years ago, for that matter. The world is a different place. We are technology-driven, by and large. We want every child to be able to make it. We do not have the luxury that we had 30 or 40 years ago where we could educate the top 20 percent, the rest of them could get a job on the production line.

Those jobs in industry, wherever it may be, or even on the farm, for that matter, wherever they work, are really tied to technology.

□ 1815

Many of the jobs around this country and increasingly around the globe are tied to technology; and that is why we need our young people better educated today than ever in the history. And that is why we look to the public schools and we are challenging them. Parents are, rightly so, looking at their community. That is why when you see survey after survey, if you look at the rankings, and I have had occasion to follow them for a number of years now, by and large parents tend to rate the schools that their children attend fairly high. They usually get a B or higher for the schools their children attend. And if you look at schools, in general, they tend to get a much lower ranking.

Why is that so? I think the reason is that parents and the people in that community are familiar with those schools where their children go. They know the teachers. They know what happens in that school, so they get a much higher ranking. They do not know about all these other schools. What they hear about these schools is general information that is shared, be it accurate or inaccurate, so they tend to process it. If they tell them schools are bad and they hear public officials continue to say it, they will say, My school is good.

I think it has a lot to do with the same kind of ranking with Members in this body. They say Congress in general, we really do not have that high of numbers; but if you ask about a Member that represents in a district, he is a pretty good guy or lady. I know him. They represent us well. I think that is reflected in that as well.

Let me move now to some of the issues I want to talk about, and I am joined now by some of my colleagues, and I will call on them in just a minute, the gentleman from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who really has

been a tremendous leader in education in this body. But I would like to begin tonight by talking about why education is such an urgent national issue, and it really is.

Since September 11 we have all been heavily focused on the issues regarding our national security, and I think that is appropriate, and on homeland security specifically. And that focus is completely appropriate as we have become aware of threats to our security in this new era of terrorist attacks. I mean, if we pick up a newspaper, we read a magazine, we turn on the TV, it is in front of us. So it is appropriate we deal with it. But we make a huge mistake, I think, if we fail to recognize and act on the reality that increasing the investment in education is imperative but it is absolutely critical to our Nation's security. It is as important, maybe more important, but it is equally as important as protecting our borders, both in the immediate sense and in the long term.

You know, it is a lot like a child developing. It is awful hard for a child to develop healthy if we do not feed them the proper food. And if you give them food to develop the bodies, we have to give them the right education and opportunities to develop their minds, to be a well-rounded person. In the 21st century, America's economic growth and prosperity depend more and more on a knowledge-based economy and on the skills of our people. And we have seen that over the last many years.

Working Americans are beginning to understand that their level of earning is tied directly to their level of learning. Let me repeat that again. Their level of earning is directly tied to their level of learning. And it will be more so in the 21st century. And we really do not think about it; a lot of us as adults think of learning as academic being in the classroom. Let me remind my colleagues that all of us learn every day in the people we come in contact with, the interactions, the bulletins we read, whatever we do. It is things that we pick up. And it really perplexes me when I hear people talk about, and sometimes they do not think before they speak sometimes, they talk about how a student made little of this and a little of that.

I used to go to civic clubs. I specifically remember one Rotary Club, and I will not call the name of where it was because somebody might be watching from that town. We had an eighth grade exit math exam for our students in North Carolina. I thought, I will have some fun. So I carried that math exam with me to the civic club. I will not even call the name of it. I handed it out.

I said, I have read in this local paper how this exit exam is not even an eighth grade level. So I passed it out to the people who had come to lunch. Now, I was not so dumb as to not carry the answer sheet with me. I carried it with me. So I watched their faces as they were working on it. Finally as we

got near the end of the meeting I said, if anybody wants to raise their hand and give me the answer, and I would read the question. And I could tell by looking at their face some of them had not done too good on getting their answers right.

The point is we have some of the brightest young people in our public schools today we have ever had. But our challenge today in this body as we develop policy and across this country is to make sure that every child gets that opportunity, and we are trying. I want to talk about it as the evening goes on about the bill of No Child Left Behind and why it is important that, if we are going to do legislation, we have to put the resources behind it.

An educated populace is also critical to the survival of a free people and the sustaining of our democracy. Our Nation's experiment with self-governance can only endure if our people know and understand their stake in its success. And I will talk more later about the long-term challenges we face in education, but I want to now talk about the immediate challenges we face in America's schools. And I think before I do that, though, I want to talk about some infrastructure needs; but before I do, let me turn to my colleague from Chicago, Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who has been a champion for education in this body. But he has really been a fighter for young people since he has been here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE). I was sitting there thinking and recalling that North Carolina is recognized as having one of the best public education systems in the country; and as I have observed the gentleman over the last several years, I kind of smiled to myself and said, yes, I know why. And one of the reasons is because they have had great advocates like the gentleman over the years, even before he came to the Congress, who seriously promoted and functioned as an advocate, who kept pushing and kept recognizing how valuable and how important education is. And so I simply want to commend the gentleman for the kind of leadership that he has displayed in the State of North Carolina and in the United States Congress, pushing the concept that we really cannot afford to leave any child, that we cannot leave any of our children behind, especially as we continue to try and make America become the Nation that it has the potential of being.

So I thank the gentleman for giving me the opportunity to share a bit of the time with him this evening to talk about how important education is because it has always been a priority for me. And I, too, believe that the best way to preserve the safety of our country is to educate our Nation's youth so that they can continue to grow and develop and help be in a position to con-

front the issues and solve the problems that we continue to face.

I was thinking of the fact that we spend and we are going to spend, because we have no choice except to, billions of dollars to protect our Nation from future terrorist attacks and to rebuild what has already been torn down. And I support this kind of spending and know that it is vital to the success of our country. But I also think that we cannot afford to lose sight of the fact that, as we increase military spending, we also need to protect the future by continuing to invest in the education of our children.

I am fortunate to come from a congressional district that has some of the very best public schools as well as private schools. I mean, I have got schools like Whitney Young High School, which has won the academic decathlon every year for the last 10 years. It is known as the best college prep school in the Nation. This is a public high school. Yes, it is a magnet school; but it is also a public high school. Then I have got other schools like the Oak Park and River Forest High School, like Trinity Lutheran. All of these schools have super records.

Then I have got a little school like Providence St. Mel, which is a little private black school in the heart of the inner city where 99 percent of all the young people who graduate from there go to college. And this school has a tremendous program of discipline where every young person has to comply with whatever the rules and regulations are. If not, you just cannot go there. Paul Adams does not allow it. Then I have got St. Ignatius Prep, one of the top prep schools in the country.

And then I also have schools that turn out great athletes, people like Mark Maguire, Kevin Garnett. All of these individuals came out of my schools, schools in my community. Westinghouse just won the boys' championship this year. And Marshall High School has the best woman basketball coach in the Nation. I mean, Dorothy Gaters has won more championships and has had more offers to go to universities and go to the pros, but she will stay right there at Marshall; and that is where she is going to probably end her career.

But we also have to recognize that there is still a tremendous amount of unmet need. And that is to say, far too many of our young people do not have the resources made available to them so that they too can actualize all of the potential that they have, and so we have to keep putting in the resources. I mean, it is not good enough to talk about leaving no child behind. We also have to put the money in where it is necessary. We have to have standards that are high. There must be accountability, and there must be adherence to standards that have been set. And so I agree with everything that I have heard you talking about here earlier this evening. And I certainly want to

keep commending you for keeping education on the front burner, out in the forefront.

Let me just tell you as I end and go back and do some other work, I went to a one-room school when I first started school. As a matter of fact, there was one woman, Ms. Beadie King was the teacher, and she taught eight grades plus what we called then the little primer and the big primer. And much of whatever it is that I know today and much of what I can recall, I am a person who likes to use poetry when I am talking and use vignettes, and most of those I learned from Ms. Beadie King, and I can still remember them. Today I could not remember anything, but I remember them.

So there is nothing greater than good teachers, and we need to make sure that our teachers are well compensated, that they are paid for the work that they do so that the quality of their lives can also be what it should be.

So I commend the gentleman and thank him for the leadership that he has displayed, and it has just been a pleasure to be here these few moments and join with the gentleman.

□ 1830

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and I would say to him that his comments here on the floor and the comments as Members speak and acknowledge great teachers that made a difference in their lives, honors those teachers in a very special way, and all of us could stand up and acknowledge those people who have made a difference.

As the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned about compensating teachers, it is important that we do a better job of it because they want their children to go to college. They want to own a home. They would like to have a nice car. And in some places in this country, they who are some of the more educated people in the communities cannot even send their children to the schools where the people who educate their children do. And that is not right in America and we have got to change that and we can do better.

The number one security threat, though, to our schools is a lack of adequate infrastructure. Let me talk about that just for a minute. My colleague from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) alluded to it a few moments ago talking about the communities that really have some of the resources and others who do not because in many of America's communities, school buildings are old and unfortunately because of the resources of those communities, they are neglected and falling apart and they do not have the kind of quality infrastructure that would make a difference. We send in children into buildings, and I have often said in my communities as I have moved around, and I think it is still true, that we have prisons in this country that we as

members of this United States Congress helped build and pay for that are a whole lot nicer than the buildings we send our children to. That is wrong. It is not wrong that we have the prisons. It is wrong that we have better facilities for them than we do for our children. We have it within our power to do something about that, and I am going to talk about that more in a minute because we come on this floor and argue about issues and policies, and many of them are short term, built to get to the next election, but I am here to tell everyone this issue is far beyond the next election. This is about the next generation and the future of this country, and I think the American people are going to hold some folks accountable for not living up to this part of the bargain because the average school in this country is over 40 years old. If the average is 40, then one can imagine how old some of those buildings are. Some of them were built shortly after the turn of the century and some are approaching 100 years of age. The age is not the issue. The condition is what is the problem. Fifteen million American children currently attend what has been classified as substandard facilities. If these were prisons in the country or if they were jails, because of the codes we have in America, we close prisons and we close jails and we are forced to build them, but there is nothing that says we cannot send a child to a substandard facility, and children, in my opinion, are not as safe as they can be in substandard schools. And they certainly are inviting targets for would-be terrorists, either foreign or domestic, in some of these cases, and let me tell why, and I am going to use my congressional district, which I think is a very progressive district and I am sure other members would probably say the same thing, but certainly they are. Our State passed a \$6.2 billion State bond issue in 1996 and the counties that I am getting ready to cite have raised revenue and built buildings every year, I know, for the last 10 or 12 years, and part of their challenge is they are growing so rapidly, they cannot keep up. The biggest challenge is school overcrowding, certainly in my congressional district, and I am sure it is true in a number of the others, and use of temporary trailers or substitutes for quality classrooms.

Why is that an issue? There are several reasons. One is they are isolated from the rest of the building. In many cases they do not have shelters. They go out to the classrooms in the morning or the afternoon and it is raining or it is cold in the wintertime, they are losing instruction time. The teachers have children put a coat on to go to the bathroom or to go to the cafeteria or to the library. Members get the idea. It is just a challenge, and there are not many businesses in this country that allow their business to operate under those conditions, and yet we send our children to them and we say to the

teachers we want them to send them back to us all A students, and if they do not, we are going to hold them accountable. I do not have any problem holding people accountable for the job they do. I think we ought to hold them accountable and we ought to have high standards, but we ought to have the gumption, as some of my friends would say, to put the quality facilities there to get the job done and put the resources there so they will have the tools to teach with.

Mr. Speaker, in and around the Triangle region of the Raleigh area where I represent, our schools are literally bursting at the seams. Despite the best effort of local, as I have already said, and State officials, our school systems are finding themselves swamped by rapidly increasing enrollment forced on by growth. Many people have moved to the area to find good jobs because we have seen a lot of growth over the last several years, and they have had to put children in trailers.

In my home county, as an example, Western Harnett High School now packs students and teachers into 22 trailers, 22. Multiply that by 25 to 28 students, and my colleagues get an idea of how many young people are outside the main building. They have to go somewhere else to go to bathroom. They have to go to the cafeteria, anywhere else they want to go, and in high school, remember, they change classes every hour if they are on a regular schedule. If they are on a block schedule, it may be every hour and a half or two hours. So there is a lot of movement and a lot of people outside the building.

Think of the security challenges that a high school principal faces in those conditions. They just are not big enough to handle the load. These young people are really young adults, and they are in facilities that are not what they ought to be.

Next year, school leaders on this campus, now it already has 22, are going to have to add six more because the community is growing so rapidly. Someone said, well, are they doing anything? They are getting ready to build a new high school, but the point is that is happening all across our States and many places in America.

Among all the schools in Harnett County, we have 122 trailers. Next door in Johnston County, a county that I grew up in, the school leaders have been forced to employ 169 trailers. That is how fast they are growing, and they are building new schools every year. Four Oaks Elementary alone has 16 trailers. Three-fourths of the schools in Johnston County have at least one trailer, and the story is the same all across the district because it is growing so rapidly.

Local and State leaders have stepped up to the plate and they have built new schools, but the enrollment growth is so rapid that many of these new schools are overcrowded the day they open. Across the State of North Carolina, we have more than 1,500 trailers

today in use, and that number is growing, despite the best efforts of local governments and State government to put money in at a time when they are really feeling the pinch with the economic downturn.

Overcrowded schools and trailers, they are not as safe as brick and mortar, we know that. I do not want to send anyone into a panic because their children attend school in a trailer, but any principal, if he is being honest, will tell someone that security is severely diminished by the use of trailers because they are outside the main building, they do not have the kind of control, and certainly they raise the risk of security around the building.

As Congress thoroughly examines our Nation's security needs in the wake of September 11, we must not fail now because we did and we have spent money and we continue to do as we should have. We must not fail to provide assistance to get students out of trailers and into more safe and secure permanent buildings, and we can do it.

Some of my colleagues say, well, Congress ought not to do it. Let me remind them. We spend money on a lot of stuff. We build schools overseas. We build prisons here at home. I just want somebody to tell me why we cannot build school buildings because there is a bill to do it. In our State and in our local areas, we have issued a record number of bonds to finance school construction in recent years. We did it when I was superintendent.

Congress and the administration now can help provide the kind of leadership to deal with this pressing issue if they will only decide to do it across this country. At a similar time in our Nation's history where we were seeing tremendous growth and the challenge to our public schools, America faced unprecedented school age population growth with the onset of the baby boomers, and when did this happen? It really happened in the 1950s, after World War II, and at that time there was a Republican president who had been an American general that led us through World War II. He responded to the challenge with a proposal worth of \$9 billion in current dollars for the Federal Government to assist with school construction.

So I do not want my colleagues on either side of the aisle saying this Congress is unprecedented, and we spend money. This was a Republican president. It was not a Democratic president. He understood there was a need. It was not about party. It was about ideology. It was about building a future for America, and there are a lot of young men and women in this country who are today adults who went to school in these buildings that were paid for by the Federal Government.

President Dwight David Eisenhower really was an American hero. That is why both parties tried to recruit him. The Republicans got him. He ran for president, but he was not afraid to provide the needed leadership on the do-

mestic front. He understood it. Let me repeat it again. He understood that if we are going to be a strong Nation and we are going to be prepared for the future, we had to have a strong domestic economy, and on school construction, President Eisenhower said, "Without impairing in any way the responsibilities of our States, localities, communities or families, the Federal Government can and should serve as an effective catalyst in dealing with this problem." The president was right then, and we now need that same kind of leadership once again.

Here in the U.S. House, my colleagues and I are working to provide that same kind of leadership. We have endorsed H.R. 1076, the America's Better Classroom Act. This legislation will provide Federal tax credits to the holders of school construction bonds to help leverage precious resources at the local level. H.R. 1076 will help provide more than \$22 billion in school construction bonds across this country, and this is a bipartisan piece of legislation. It is not partisan. It will work to build new school buildings, alleviate overcrowding, strengthen security and improve education in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have worked for several years to pass a similar piece of legislation. We now have 226 cosponsors on this piece of legislation, and I implore the Republican leadership of this House tonight to allow this bill to come out of the committee and come to the House floor. It is an urgent national problem, and it needs to be addressed.

President Bush, who is doing a fine job on the war against terrorism and has shown leadership on other education issues, has unfortunately ignored the school construction crisis facing this country. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. The American people deserve quality schools for their children. Their children are the most precious resource they have.

Talk is cheap. It takes action and it takes responsibility, and the American people deserve the peace of mind that quality, secure schools will provide. I am proud to work with my Democratic colleagues, and yes, Republican colleagues who will join us, to support innovative solutions to this important issue. School construction is an important part of this agenda.

In addition to school construction, there are a great many other educational issues that this Congress needs to address. Over the last several weeks, we have challenged several proposals, one that floated out of the administration, to change college students' loan rates. To their credit, they pulled it back after we raised the issue, that it would cost those students and their parents considerably more.

□ 1845

I have had the great privilege to serve at the local level, the State level,

and now at the national level. And it never fails that whenever budgets get tight, some people insist on putting education on the chopping block. That is distressful because that truly is our future. But I know too well that you cannot strengthen education on the cheap.

Also, it would be less than honest if I did not acknowledge that there are areas that we need to pay attention to. Where there are areas that need to have trimming and cutting back, we should do that. Everyone should acknowledge that; and we should not allow anyone, I do not care who they are, what position they hold, or where they are, to misspend public education money for our children and misrepresent the funding sources that they would be using. Because I happen to believe that when you cut education, you pay a heavy price.

I grew up in a rural farm community; and I always say that when you cut education, it is as dumb as eating your seed corn. Because you always save the best corn to plant the next year. Some people in this town may not understand that reference, but back home, folks understand that eating your seed corn is not a smart idea if you hope to have a crop next year. And the same is true with our children. It is sort of an old cliché, but it is so true when we talk about our children, that they are our future.

I expect if you ask most parents, they would, if they were open and honest, and most of them are, they would say to us that they could get along with a whole lot less than they do, if they had to. Because we all really, I think it is true of me and my wife, most of us want things better for our children. And that is why we work hard, because we want to make sure they are successful and they have the opportunity for a bright future.

That is why the budget resolution that the majority pushed through this body a couple of months ago now contained many, I think, very misguided proposals and misplaced priorities that I think were wrong for this country. And education was caught in that crossfire. The Republican leadership's budget resolution cut \$90 million in education funds from President Bush's own proposal that was just recently enacted, the No Child Left Behind Act. If you are going to have a program and you are going to ask people to live by high standards, and I think we need to have that, if we are going to ask them to do the kind of assessment to know where children are and help them get better, we have to give them the tools to get the job done, especially at a time when we are seeing almost 40 States, I think over 40 States in this country, facing budget crisis. If we do not live up to our part of the bargain, they are probably going to figure out right quick that we did not really mean it. Because they are not going to do it, and then we will be worse off than we were when we started. And I think that budget was misguided.

The budget resolution also cut Pell grants for colleges, cut safe and drug-free schools by \$200 million, improving teacher quality by \$105 million, education technology by \$134 million, and also eliminated 28 important educational efforts, such as dropout prevention, rural education, an area that is really hurting because of the disparate resources there, civics education, and numerous technology and training programs.

It is important that we live up to our commitment at this level. Because if we do not, even though the Federal Government only puts in, depending on the local jurisdiction, 6 to 7 percent, and in North Carolina it is probably no more than about 7 percent of the total budget because the bulk of it is State and local, that is an important piece of money because it sends a powerful signal. It says that this is a priority at the national level; we really do believe in what you are doing, and here is how we want to help those who have fallen behind.

Historically, Federal monies have been to help those who had needs in specific areas, by and large children with special needs, which we really are not meeting that obligation. We originally said we were going to pay a substantial amount more than we are now paying. We are paying 20 percent, and we should be paying more like 60 that we committed to. But these kinds of shortsighted cuts are wrong for our children, and they really are wrong for my home State and I think for the other States who are struggling to meet the needs and who really want to make a difference in children's lives.

I just hope that as this session moves on, and we are now getting into moving into the appropriations process of the budget, which will be coming up in the next several weeks, that we will correct some of these problems; that we will put the resources in that are needed so that teachers can teach and they will have the resources to meet their needs. Because if we do not put in the resources that we need and we put the mandates in for the things we want them to do, and then we threaten to hold back other monies if they do not live up to that obligation, what we do, the people we hurt the most are not the wealthy school systems in this country. They may be getting few of the resources on a percentage basis to the budget than a lot of others, but the ones who are really getting hurt are the children, in most cases, who are the most vulnerable, those in the poorest school systems, the children with special needs who get some of the money.

All those areas that are on the edge are the very youngsters that we are going to need to help. So I think sometimes we do not really understand when we pull the cord and not put the resources in place. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience in the few years I have been here that we put together a lot of words, and talk is awful cheap.

But at a time when we spend a lot of time back and forth about appropriations and budgets and so on, a lot of stuff gets lost in the sound and fury of the debate. But at the end of the day it really is about budget and spending choices that we have to make that really defines the kinds of priorities that we ought to have, and they really express our values as a Congress and as a people.

I trust that in the next several weeks that we will show that we really do value education, because we know that lifetime learning is the key to the American dream for every family, middle class, wealthy, and those who are struggling to get into the middle class. As I said earlier, in today's global economy, America's international competitiveness is absolutely dependent on our people's ability to perform knowledge-based jobs that produce the best products and services in the world. And if we are going to continue to compete, we had better be about making sure the next generation of Americans in this new economy of this Information Age can be able to earn based on what they have learned.

And it is so true. It is as true today as it was last year; but it will be more so over the next 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 years. And so we have been trying to get Congress to give higher priority to strengthening our public schools, really our neighborhood schools; and by doing that they will demonstrate how much we value the education of our children and how much we care about the communities we live in. It is irresponsible, in my opinion, to talk about how much we value education and how much we care about the future and about our children when we come to this floor and squander the opportunity to make a difference and not put the resources in place to help our children be successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say that both our immediate and our long-term security needs depend on our investment in education. It is as critical today as it has ever been in the history of this country. You have heard others talk earlier about a number of things, but it is about looking at the future and how do we, as Members today, help those teachers in the classroom and the administrators teach our children to make decisions for tomorrow. We cannot allow children to be continually placed at risk by being condemned to less than quality facilities, and that same thing would be true for curriculum and instruction. That means we have to put the resources in where we can.

We cannot put them all in. We will never have enough, I realize that. But it has to be a partnership, and a true partnership with State, locals, and, yes, with the private sector to make sure that teachers get the skilled training they need and the ongoing training. Too many times we say to these professionals, you are professionals, we believe in you; and yet,

when they walk out of the classroom and they need to get their certificates renewed or upgraded, they have to take it out of their own meager salaries to pay for it. We do not do that in any other profession I am aware of that pays that kind of wage in this country, but we do it to teachers. And that is wrong. We can do better, and we ought to be doing better.

I think America is looking to Congress to provide leadership on these urgent national priorities, and I trust that not only my Democratic colleagues but my Republican colleagues will also join me. I certainly can say to you that I stand ready to help deliver on that because I think it is critical to the future of this country. We will not get many more opportunities. Even though these are challenging times and resources are tight, if we spend them wisely, we can have a very bright tomorrow. Our children will inherit a better country, and our democracy will be safe and secure. I really believe that an educated citizenry is important to maintaining a democracy. We have seen it around the world. When we do not have quality education, we are in trouble.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. If we want to look at Afghanistan as a place, the first thing they did was shut down the schools. Of course, the first thing they did was oppress the women and then they shut down the schools. But the truth is if you poison the minds of young people and do not give them an opportunity, your future is pretty grim. We are not going to let that happen in America. We are going to work together to make it better. We have the chance, we have limited resources, but we can target them, we can build better schools, we can help those teachers in the classrooms who are telling children about the better world they will have. Someone has said if you want a better world, tell a child, they will build it.

RECENT BIPARTISAN TRIP TO RUSSIA, CHINA, UZBEKISTAN AND NORTH KOREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will perhaps not take the entire hour, but I want to take this opportunity to review a recent congressional delegation trip that I led over the Memorial Day recess.

Mr. Speaker, this was a historic trip, and one that has laid the groundwork for, I think, some future historic activities for this Nation in a number of areas. The trip was to basically countries involving Russia, a visit to Moscow and then on to Tashkent, Uzbekistan; on to Beijing, China; Seoul, Korea; visiting military sites along the way. And the only disappointment of our trip was that we

had planned to be the first large bipartisan delegation into Pyongyang, North Korea, to begin a dialogue with the leadership of that nation to lower the tension and the rhetoric and to see if we could not find some common ground in comparison to the recent negative feelings between the U.S. and the North Korean leadership.

□ 1900

Unfortunately, despite our best efforts to try throughout the entire trip, we were not successful, and I will talk about that effort over the next several minutes.

The bipartisan delegation consisted of 13 Members of the House. We had 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans. The delegation represented almost every one of our major committees in the Congress, but had a heavy emphasis of the Committee on Armed Services. The delegation was interested in a number of issues, but in particular cooperative threat reduction, ways that we could decrease the threat posed by nuclear weapons and stockpiles, ways that we could retrain, help retrain those individuals, especially in Russia, that were involved in nuclear and weapons activities, issues involving counterproliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and ways that we could work with former Soviet states and other nations to continue our counterproliferation efforts, dealing with the issue of nuclear waste and contamination and other environmental issues, energy production and distribution, cooperative efforts in the war on terrorism, Sino-American relations, and North and South Korean relations.

In addition to meetings that we had formally, we met with a number of our military troops and I will talk about some of the findings that we came away with as we visited troops throughout the region.

Mr. Speaker, we left Washington a week ago this past Friday on May 24, and traveled initially to Moscow. In Moscow, we were met by both our embassy officials and other Russia leaders that had been advised of our visit. On the first day, despite a very long trip, we spent some time with our embassy officials and got a briefing on an American company that is based in the district of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN). The gentlewoman suggested that we visited with officials of the Atari Corporation, which we did, and got an overview of the kinds of activities that they are involved with, including the presence of that company here in America.

We continued our visit over the weekend with a trip to the American University in Moscow, an institution that was started over 10 years ago. Their director assembled a group of academics and leaders in the educational area, and briefed us on a whole new series of initiatives relative to the training and education of young Russian leaders with American institutions, and in this case the American University in Moscow.

We have a continuing dialogue with the American University, and in fact the exchange process has already started in terms of cooperation on academic programs with the American University.

Also on Sunday we met with the leadership of the Kurchatov Institute. Dr. Evgheny Velikhov is the head of Kurchatov. Kurchatov is the largest and most prestigious nuclear institute in Russia, named after its founder, who was the developer of the atomic weapon for the Soviet Union. Today Kurchatov, which is smaller than it was in the Soviet era, has a number of nuclear scientists that are in need of work. Part of the efforts of our government through the Department of Energy and the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program has been to find ways to have those nuclear scientists and weapons scientists work in a productive way for both Russian and American corporations, and take them away from the former work that they did, which was all military-related.

Our discussions with Kurchatov centered around a number of very specific projects and programs, programs that involve American corporations, American NGOs, and American governmental entities. They were very positive meetings, and we discussed everything from fusion energy, disposition of fissile materials, nuclear sites, clean fuel cycles, magnetic fusion, low-yield nuclear warheads, ballistic missile defense interceptors, and a number of other issues. We came away with a number of ideas of how we can further engage the folks at Kurchatov in a cooperative way to benefit both the United States and Russian people peacefully.

In addition to that meeting, we met with leaders of the petroleum industry and the oil and gas industry in Russia, and talked about the efforts of many of us to steer America away from our reliance on Middle Eastern crude, and to work with the Russians, who have huge deposits of energy, to allow us to help them develop that energy, thereby giving us a new source of fossil fuels and gas, reducing our dependency on Middle Eastern crude, and at the same time helping Russia grow its economy. Those meetings were very positive, and I think will be fruitful in the future.

In addition, at that meeting, I invited the North Korean commercial attache in Moscow, Mr. Ku Song Bok, to attend an evening event with us. I did that as a gesture of good faith toward the North Korean government, the DPRK government, to show them that this delegation was interested in starting a positive initiative to work to establish a framework for discussion between the leaders in DPRK and those of us in the Congress that want to pursue this new avenue of dialogue with North Korea's leaders, both their president or chairman, as well as the members of their high parliament.

Mr. Speaker, we also had meetings with the Moscow and the Russian

Duma. The Duma is the lower body of the Russian parliament, the Federation Council the other body. In our meetings, we had probably some 40 Duma deputies and Federation Council members interact with us. We had a number of discussions relating to a variety of issues. But the key issue was a document that many of us in this body produced last fall, a document that I have addressed on this floor in the past.

This document, 45 pages long with 108 specific recommendations, was prepared to provide President Bush and President Putin a new format for relations between our two nations, with 11 key areas involving energy, the environment, health care, local government, culture and education, science and technology, agriculture, and defense and security, among others; recommendations that we could undertake to bring the Russian people and the American people, Russian institutions and American institutions, closer together.

This document, as I have explained to my colleagues in the past, was given to both President Bush and President Putin over the signatures of over one-third of the House and the Senate, members of both political parties equally divided, signed on to say to our President before the most recent summit that we want to change the nature of our relationship with Russia.

Perhaps one of the highlights of our trip, Mr. Speaker, was during a lunch that we had on Monday afternoon, two of the top leaders of the Russian Duma both said publicly that the Russian approach to the most recent Bush-Putin summit was largely based on this document.

This was significant because this was the first time that Russia publicly acknowledged that the work of our Congress and our Senate in producing this document actually was the basis for the Russian lead-up to the summit between President Bush and President Putin. We knew that they had taken this document seriously because they had produced a document in Russian in response to what we had produced. This document is the Russian Academy of Sciences' response to our proposal for these new initiatives.

My understanding is that the Academy of Sciences is setting up 11 task forces to work on the specific areas that we identified as key areas for America and Russia to work together. So our meetings in Moscow were extremely fruitful. They were positive. They were building on the success of President Bush and President Putin for a new relationship that in fact is much broader and much more engaging than our past relationship, which was largely based on agreements of strategic weapons.

The contention here by many in this body is for us to have even greater success in strategic and defense issues, we have to work aggressively to build more confidence.

One other interesting offer made by the Russians at our final luncheon meeting in Moscow, Mr. Speaker, I bring forward to this body and ask for our consideration and help, and it shows the state and the change of our relationship. Ten years ago a meeting between Russian officials and American officials would probably have had some screaming and shouting and accusations against each other. Our meetings today are totally changed. Over the past 10 years we have established a major new positive dialogue so that the last discussion we had before we left Moscow and in the spirit of the goodwill games currently being held in Japan and South Korea was a challenge by our Russian Duma colleagues to have a series of athletic events between members of the Duma and Members of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, I challenge our colleagues to work with me, having played in a number of congressional baseball games where our Democrat teams play our Republican teams and we raise money for charity, and being aware of our congressional basketball games and our golf matches where Republicans play Democrats and other events, we now have a new challenge. Members of the Russian Duma have challenged this body to a series of athletic contests in the spirit of goodwill both in Moscow and Washington, where we can get together and have some friendly fun and also agree to a series of what hopefully will become annual events between the leaders of two parliaments.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to establishing a task force on the American side, hopefully comprised equally of Democrats and Republicans. We will look at what types of competition we want to have because some that we would do would be favorable to America, some the Russians might want to do would be favorable to them. We want to find the middle ground. We will start a whole new era of cooperation in the same spirit that we have in this city in basketball and baseball and other competitions between our two parties. In the spirit of friendship and goodwill, we will now take the same atmosphere to our colleagues in the Russian Duma.

Mr. Speaker, we left Moscow on Monday afternoon and flew again on military transport to Tashkent, Uzbekistan. We wanted to visit Uzbekistan because it is a prominent former Soviet state, a Central Asian nation that has stepped up and played a critical role in our battle against terrorism. In that country, after having met with the officials of the Uzbeki embassy here in Washington, we were greeted with a meeting with President Karimov. It was an extremely positive, 2-hour meeting as we discussed a new level of cooperation with Uzbekistan, efforts to bring more focus on the Central Asian nations, and to thank the people of Uzbekistan for allowing America to use a base in their country

with the cooperation of their military to fight the war on terrorism.

In fact, when we met with President Karimov, as we did in our meeting with the foreign minister, Mr. Kamilov, our U.S. embassy country team, we also extended an invitation through members of their parliament to establish a bilateral parliamentary exchange, much like we started with the Russian Duma. We now challenged the Uzbekistan parliament to establish a formal relationship between the House and the parliament, the lower body, actually the only body in Uzbekistan. They accepted overwhelmingly, and very eagerly anticipate the first meetings of the delegation that will start an annual series of meetings both in Tashkent and Moscow to find ways to work closer together with the people of Uzbekistan.

Our ultimate goal is to produce a document similar to this document, outlining ways that we can bring the people and the institutions of Uzbekistan closer to the people and institutions of America.

In addition to our visit with the President and the foreign minister, which were separate meetings, we traveled to one of our primary military bases in Uzbekistan at Karshi-Khanabad, more commonly known as K-2. This military base is down fairly close to the Afghan border. We have right now approximately 3,000 troops at that site. They are doing a variety of work, and represented most of the services.

The purpose of our visit was to assess the spirit and morale of our troops, and to let them know how proud we are of their work. In fact, we carried with us almost 7,000 cards and letters from school children across America who are writing to individual members of our military to thank them for the services that they are providing to our country. We also took from my home State of Pennsylvania cases of TastyKakes and Hershey bars, and boxes of homemade cookies made by individuals and families and the spouses of Members of Congress to give to the troops to thank them from the people back home for the job that they are doing.

□ 1915

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, the morale of our troops at the K-2 base was unbelievably positive. The morale was so evident in everyone that we met with. Their needs are being met. They obviously would like to be home with their families, but they are there to do a mission, they understand that mission, and they are committed to follow through and complete the task assigned to them by our President and by our military command officers.

We did have a problem with one of the engines on our cargo plane that took us into the K-2 base. While I bring up this not to embarrass our military, I bring it up to show that we are having success because the starter would not work on one of our engines as we

prepared to leave. But because we have taken great efforts in this body to provide additional funds for spare parts and training, and that has been supported by both Democrats and Republicans, within 2 hours a spare part was made available and the men and women of the unit in K-2 were able to replace that so that we could take off in time to make our meeting with President Karimov back in Tashkent.

So our military, in fact, is doing a fantastic job. We are proud of them, and we were there to say thank you on behalf of not only Congress and the House but all America. Following our 1-day trip to Tashkent, having achieved our objectives to work with the President and a commitment to follow on with the parliament of that nation, we traveled and arrived late at night in Beijing, China, starting on May 29.

In the People's Republic of China, in Beijing, we met with President Jiang Zemin, a very historic opportunity for us to meet with the top leader of the People's Republic. The meeting was extremely interesting because President Jiang spoke to us not just in Chinese but also in English, which showed the level of comfort that he had with our delegation. He was very much interested in hearing our views. He put forth his commitment to work with America in trying to provide some stability in the current conflict between India and Pakistan, and he reiterated his commitment to work with us to provide peace for the world.

We discussed the issue of Taiwan. We heard his strong feelings toward that independent entity, and we again reaffirmed to President Jiang that we are committed to a one-China policy, and we are committed to the peaceful process of bringing China and Taiwan together. We also reiterated the fact that the Congress would not tolerate any armed hostilities in an attempt to bring Taiwan back in, and he assured us that that was not China's intent, that they were certainly totally committed to a peaceful resolution of the independent status of the two nations so they in fact could become one China again.

In addition to those meetings, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) had been in China for approximately 4 days. They were a part of the delegation but did not formally join us until we arrived and they had been there in advance. They were there for a very historic purpose and opportunity. Mr. Speaker, they went to a suburban city outside of Beijing. The purpose of their visit with a group of UPS officials was to help build a new school for a small Chinese community to bring the Internet and computers to that village and to that institution. As we all know, China's income level for their average person in that country is about \$300 per year. So when you get outside of Beijing and Shanghai, there is not much in the way of modern technology.

UPS, United Parcel Service, with 40 of their employees and two Members of Congress, set up a process to build a new school, which they did, and to equip that school with computers for the children that live in this community. It was an outstanding success and, in fact, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) on the day after that we met with President Jiang Zemin, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the three of them were given an audience with Premier Zhu Rongji. President Zhu expressed his thanks to the people of America, to UPS and to our three Members of Congress for their outstanding work in helping to provide this new resource for the children of the community in China known as Zunhua.

Mr. Speaker, also in China we met with the Deputy Foreign Minister Zhou. It was a very positive meeting regarding economic reforms in China. He gave us an overview of the economic program that is in place. We talked about how America and China must work together to open new markets for American companies to allow that balance of trade to become more equal. He talked to us specifically about Taiwan, and we discussed again as we did with President Jiang Zemin the need for us to have a peaceful dialogue and a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan-China situation.

We were hosted on our visit to China by the Chinese People's Institute for Foreign Affairs. President Mei was our host. He had a luncheon arranged for us. In fact, the discussion there was broad ranging and discussed everything from economic cooperation to advancements in science and technology. It was very positive, and again they were the host that allowed us to arrange the meetings that took place in China.

Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights for me of our trip to China was the opportunity for me to speak for the second time at the National Defense University of the People's Liberation Army. It was a real eye opener. I had spoken at this university back 5 years ago. I believe I was the first elected official invited to speak at what is the premier military training institution for their mid- and senior-level officers. This invitation came before I went to Beijing to again address senior military officers in the PLA.

What was interesting about this trip was that it was not just me going to the National Defense University. In fact, eight of our colleagues who were with the delegation went with me. We drove for about 1 hour out of downtown Beijing until we arrived at the compound that is the major training site for China's mid- and senior-level officers. On the way, we talked to our defense attache who briefed us on what to expect. He told us to expect the Chinese officers to have canned questions, not to have any ability to go off the party line, and to be very stern and

strict in terms of the way that they asked questions of me once I had finished my presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I told our defense attache on the way in that I was going to do something different this time, that I was going to break this large group of officers into subgroups and have Members of Congress directly interact with them. Our defense attache said, "That will never happen. The Chinese will never go for that. They are not used to doing things in an ad hoc way."

Mr. Speaker, what a great surprise we had in store for us. When our bus arrived at the front door of the main building of the National Defense University, after having driven through the entranceway, there was a full Chinese PLA military band and orchestra. In fact, it was all female, all dressed up in their military uniforms, which were white in color; and there they were playing for us a series of military musical selections, welcoming us to the premier training center for the Chinese military. As we departed the bus and walked up the stairway, a number of generals and top leaders greeted us to welcome us to the National Defense University. It certainly was a good start to our meeting.

Inside, I was taken aside and allowed to meet with the general in charge of the National Defense University, where I explained to him that following my presentation, which would last about 40 minutes, instead of me answering questions, I wanted to divide the group up and allow Members of Congress to directly interact with the soldiers and leaders of the Chinese military. He looked at me in some bewilderment, but did not object.

So we went into the room, and there in the auditorium were some 300 senior military leaders of the Chinese People's Liberation Army. As they sat in the room and were extremely attentive, I was introduced, and I made my presentation which I did not have in writing but basically gave from my own feelings about the need to improve our relations with China, and I went through the entire context of why we were there. I discussed the meeting we had had with President Jiang Zemin, and I challenged them to help us find new areas of common concern where we could bring our military together with the Chinese military to reduce the potential for conflict and misunderstanding.

Mr. Speaker, following my presentation, I told the assembled group that I wanted to divide them up into four groups and have two Members of Congress each set aside with those individual groups and have a dialogue. Within 5 minutes, the group divided itself into four, the Members of Congress broke up into groups of two, we had interpreters at each group, and for the next 45 minutes, something happened that I would never have thought could occur. American Members of Congress were interacting not in a formal way but informally in answering

questions and asking questions of the next generation of Chinese military leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell you, the comments were all positive. The tone was positive. And there were no canned questions or canned responses. It was an absolutely unbelievable opportunity to see American Members of Congress, our colleagues, interacting in an informal, sit-down way with Chinese military leaders around them in kind of a small-group setting asking questions and responding about American-China relations.

Mr. Speaker, this gave me a great deal of encouragement and leads me to believe that we must do more of this. We must continue to reach out, to tear down the barriers of misunderstanding and find ways to engage and be candid in the process where we have disagreements but also let these people know that we want to be friendly with them. We are not looking to have animosity or tension, but rather find ways that we can address common concerns together.

Mr. Speaker, leaving China, we had planned to go into North Korea. Unfortunately, all along the way, despite numerous attempts, we were getting nowhere with the DPRK leadership. In fact, I even at one point in time, one morning in Beijing had a call from Kofi Annan at the U.N., whom I had asked to assist us. Kofi Annan from the U.N., the Secretary-General, and five other groups were working aggressively with us to convince the DPRK leadership that it was in their best interest that this delegation be allowed in, not to criticize the North Korean leaders but to begin a dialogue, to talk, to try to break down the barriers and discuss common areas of concern and opportunity. Unfortunately, that was not to be.

But throughout our trip in Moscow, again in Uzbekistan and throughout our stay in China, we sent faxes, e-mails, telephone calls, had meetings with representatives of groups that were working in North Korea but were not having success, so finally we decided to leave Beijing and travel directly to South Korea. In Seoul, South Korea, our first stop was at the Yongsan U.S. Army air base. There we spent time with the troops. They were having a picnic on Saturday afternoon. We visited with the family members. We thanked them for the work they are doing, and we spent time letting them know that we wanted to hear about the concerns that they had being stationed in that country.

Mr. Speaker, this is something that we heard throughout our stop in South Korea with all of our military: this body and the other body and the Pentagon has got to do more to increase the pay level, to provide more incentives and decrease the amount of time that our troops have to spend when they are assigned to South Korea. We learned from our military leaders, from our top generals, and from our CINC in

that region that South Korea is the least desirable stay that any member of the military has when they are given an assignment. In fact, in many cases, a young soldier would rather go to a theater where there is active hostility than they would to South Korea because the tour of duty is longer, usually a year, and the pay rates are significantly lower because of added incentives in going to Japan or other theaters. They are significantly lower when our military is assigned to South Korea.

Mr. Speaker, as you well know, we have 37,000 troops in South Korea. It is a major location for our troops overseas. This Congress has got to respond by changing the way that we are currently operating so that young people who are serving in Korea can bring their families with them, because today the bulk of them cannot get the pay level they should get when they serve in other parts of the world, and find ways to reduce the level of commitment in terms of the time they have to serve there. The commanding officers in that theater understand what steps they have to take.

And so our delegation came back to America convinced that we are going to work to commit to that military to change those requirements, to change those support mechanisms, so that our military when it is assigned to South Korea does so with pride, wants to go there, and does not feel that being assigned to South Korea is the least possible priority that they would have as a part of their military career and tenure.

Mr. Speaker, we spent time with Ambassador Hubbard. He gave us an overview of Korea. We had an in-team briefing with our leaders, both on South Korea, and they also gave us a briefing on the North.

□ 1930

We talked about the upcoming elections. We were scheduled to meet with the candidates for the presidency, but because they were off campaigning with elections coming up next week, we were not able to have those meetings. We did meet with Foreign Minister Choi. We met him at his home. We talked for over 1 hour about our relations between the South and America, and we talked about our interests in going to the DPRK, or North Korea.

He, along with the Japanese, along with the Chinese, along with the Russians and the Uzbekistanis, all said that our intent to go to North Korea is extremely important. President Jiang Zemin encouraged us to pursue entrance to North Korea, the leadership in Moscow encouraged us to pursue our entry into North Korea, and so did the South Koreans. That was articulated by the foreign minister of South Korea. We talked about programs that we have together between our two nations, and we talked about ways that we could work even closer together, assuming we can break down the barrier by gaining entrance into North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, we met with Members of the National Assembly of the Republic of Korea. We talked about the importance of our forces there. They are unequivocal in saying that they want America to maintain a presence. It is extremely important to deter conflict on the peninsula.

We talked about cooperation in the war on terrorism, political and military stability in the Korean peninsula, the strong desire for unification of the two Koreas, and we talked about e-government and the need to bring our government and their governments into the new digital divide and the way we can in fact bring information technology to all the people in South Korea.

We also met with the Senior Combatant Commander for United Nations Command Forces, General Leon LaPorte, to get a detailed assessment of the current operations of the United Nations' efforts in South Korea.

We had meetings with the American Chamber of Commerce in Seoul. They also told us that they had tried to take a delegation into North Korea. Mr. Speaker, they had had a group of American companies that are prepared to go to Pyongyang and announced they were going to invest significant new dollars in North Korea. Despite being assured by the North Korean leadership that they would be given entrance, as they went to get their visas, they were told they were denied and they should come back later.

It is extremely frustrating, Mr. Speaker, to try to open doors in a positive way with a regime so closeted and isolated from the rest of the world. So I appeal today, Mr. Speaker, that those leaders in the Democratic Republic of Korea, the DPRK, that they understand that we want to go to their country not to cause problems, not to blame, not to cast negative statements against them, but, rather, to simply open a dialogue, because having a dialogue is a way to eventually ease tensions and find ways to deal with common concerns and common opportunities.

While also in South Korea, Mr. Speaker, the delegation was given an opportunity to travel to the DMZ, or Demilitarized Zone. Traveling up to Panmunjom, members were able to meet with our military once again, engage with the various military officials, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) took on a personal crusade to engage our military on the issue of the remains of Corporal Edward Gibson who has been missing in action since November 26, 1950.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) raised the issue that so many Americans continue to be concerned about, the lack of a full accounting of those who are missing in action from the Korean conflict, the Korean War.

As an indication of the support of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the honor that Corporal Gibson gave to his Nation by paying the ultimate

price, he had an American flag flown over the DMZ in honor of Corporal Gibson. In fact, every member of Congress had the same flown. Corporal Gibson's family will be given that flag by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) back in Ohio.

We discussed the issue with the leadership along the DMZ about that very hostile environment, perhaps the most tense environment today in the world, where American and North Korean forces and allied and North Korean forces stare each other down across this boundary line of barbed wire and concrete, that differentiates the North from the South. It really gives one a full perspective of the need, the absolute need, for us to find a way to begin a dialogue with the leadership of North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the delegation's trip was exciting. It was almost without flaw. Unfortunately, the final part of our mission, the trip into North Korea and Pyongyang, did not occur. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not giving up. We are renewing our efforts.

We have already started work on another visit. This visit will go into Pyongyang, we will meet with their leaders and we will begin a positive dialogue, so we reduce the tensions and find ways that we can find common ground.

Hopefully President Bush's envoy, Ambassador Pritchard, will travel to Pyongyang very shortly to open the door that the administration has in fact offered, and following that visit, I am extremely optimistic that a congressional delegation that I will be a part of will travel to Pyongyang in an historic way so we can begin a process, much like we began 15 years ago in the Soviet Union. Look at where we are today with Russia's leaders. Today, we have just completed a major thrust of new initiatives. We are challenging each other to athletic contests and we are now considered good friends.

Hopefully that same process can occur and grow in China as we saw in our meetings at the National Defense University, and will also begin to grow in North Korea as we reach out to the people, as we reach out to show them that America wishes no harm, America only wants to find ways to understand, to have a dialogue, and to reduce the threats that come from the kind of actions that the North Korean leadership have taken over the past 20 years in building up a vast military complex, while denying many of their citizens the most basic human needs.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the entire CODEL report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point, to make it available for the public to see all of the various actions I have described, the delegation members, the various contacts, the people that we interacted with, because I think it is important that we take these kinds of trips, and that we have total transparency in terms of our purpose, our actions, and the results that we achieved.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who went with me. It was an outstanding trip. We truly have an unbelievable institution. Thirteen members of Congress, seven Democrats and six Republicans, working together with a common agenda, working together to achieve peace and harmony, in those nations that in the past have been our adversaries, or in the future might become our adversaries.

So I thank my colleagues for their cooperation, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the staff for sticking around long enough for me to make this report to our colleagues and the American people on the congressional delegation trip that took place from May 24 to June 3, 2002.

U.S. CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION (CODEL WELDON) TO RUSSIA, UZBEKISTAN, PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND REPUBLIC OF KOREA, MAY 24–JUNE 3, 2002

OVERVIEW

A bipartisan congressional delegation of 13 Members of the House of Representatives, led by Representative Curt Weldon, "CODEL WELDON," visited Moscow, Russia; Tashkent and Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan; Beijing, China; Seoul, Yongsan (U.S. Army) Base, and the Demilitarized Zone, Republic of Korea, May 24 through June 3, 2002. The delegation also made considerable efforts prior to departure from Washington, D.C., to arrange meetings with the leadership of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK). These efforts continued throughout the delegation's travel, to no avail. Given the major issues of mutual concern, the delegation was disappointed that the DPRK leadership did not accept the opportunity to open a dialogue and engage such a large delegation of the Congress.

Delegation members included Representatives Curt Weldon (R-PA), Solomon Ortiz (D-TX), Roscoe Bartlett (R-MD), Jim Turner (D-TX), Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Joe Wilson (R-SC), Steve Horn (R-CA), Eni Faleomavaega (Del-American Samoa), Corrine Brown (D-FL), Alcee Hastings (D-FL), Carrie Meek (D-FL), Steve Chabot (R-OH), and Brian Kerns (R-IN).

In each of the countries visited, the delegation met with the senior executive branch and legislative branch officials; political leaders and organizations, educational groups and technical institute officials; U.S. and foreign military officers; and U.S. and foreign business leaders for the purpose of furthering greater communication; expanding inter-parliamentary exchanges and information sharing; and addressing common concerns on issues vital to international economic growth, human rights, peace and stability. Issues addressed included:

- Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR);
 - Securing nuclear stockpiles and materials in Russia.
 - Retraining human resources.
- Counterproliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction:
 - Protecting, reducing and/or Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction.
 - Nuclear Waste and other environmental issues.
 - Energy Production and Distribution.
 - Cooperative Efforts in the War On Terrorism:
 - Furtherance of trade through better inspection methods at ports of debarkation and embarkation.
 - Sino-American Relations.
 - North and South Korean Relations.

The Members also took the opportunity to visit with U.S. military personnel based in

Karshi-Khanabad ("K-2"), Uzbekistan serving in the war on terrorism in Afghanistan; military personnel in Seoul and the DMZ; and their families in the Republic of Korea supporting peace and stability in Southeast Asia. Representatives Bartlett, Ortiz, Turner, Reyes, and Wilson visited Morale, Welfare, and Recreation sites and facilities in the Seoul area.

The delegation visits coincided with a number of international events and crises that reinforced the critical nature and timeliness of the purpose of its meetings and discussions. The delegation arrived in Moscow the day following the historic signing of the strategic arms reduction treaty and declaration of strategic partnership by Presidents George W. Bush and Vladimir V. Putin. Shortly thereafter the NATO nations met in Rome and agreed to Russian limited membership in NATO. India and Pakistan experienced increased tension and cross-border firings resulting in casualties on both sides. Pakistan completed several medium range ballistic missile tests. The war on terrorism continued in Afghanistan. And suicide bombings and reprisals continued the cycle of violence between the Israelis and Palestinians.

Moscow, Russia (May 25–27)

State Duma

In Moscow, the delegation had several opportunities to meet with their legislative counterparts, Members of the State Duma, in furtherance of the objectives of the Duma-Congress Study Group—the official inter-parliamentary exchange that engages U.S. and Russian lawmakers in meetings and discussions. The delegation also met with Russian business leaders, many of whom are involved in gas and oil exploration and energy production; Kurchatov Institute officials, to discuss energy and counterproliferation issues; and American University in Moscow officials.

Discussions with Members of the State Duma were in furtherance of the issues addressed in "U.S.-Russia Partnership," (see attachment 1), coauthored by Representative Weldon, supported by a bipartisan group of one-third of the U.S. Congress, and presented to the Duma in September of 2001, that provides over 100 recommendations in 11 subject areas for U.S.-Russian engagement. The delegation was advised by State Duma representatives that the recommendations made in this document had been used as the foundation for the Russian initiatives to President Bush during his visit. The State Duma Members indicated that the Speaker of the Duma had prepared a response to "U.S.-Russia Partnership." Representative Weldon stated his desire to establish U.S.-Russia co-chairs at the earliest opportunity in each of 11 subject areas addressed in the study.

International Republican & National Democratic Institutes

A meeting sponsored by the International Republican Institute, with National Democratic Institute participation, allowed Member-to-Member/House-Duma dialogue on a number of subjects, including the status of the repeal of Jackson-Vanik (Cold War legislation that conditions U.S. trade relations on Russian Jewish emigration); combating international terrorism; using academic research and science to address political problems; joint environmental efforts; WTO; steel and poultry imports/exports; the Bush-Putin statement on the U.S.-Russian strategic partnership; and engaging the youth of both countries in issues of mutual interest, including cultural and sports events. Members on both sides demonstrated their belief that there is a new basis for working together on issues of common interest and concern because for the first time there is mu-

tual agreement on goals and values and a sharing of vision on the security threats of the 21st Century.

Kurchatov Institute

The delegation also visited the Russian Research Center, the Kurchatov Institute. The Institute was established to design the Soviet Union's first nuclear weapons. Its current mission is research on safe and environmentally friendly nuclear fission and fusion power generation and fundamental physical research and development. The staff of the Institute is down to approximately 5,000 people from a Cold War high of 11,000. A goal of the Institute's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) and counterproliferation programs has been to provide productive training and employment training and employment for many of the Institute's personnel. The Institute's President, Evgheny Velikhov, and his staff engaged the Members in briefings and discussions of counterproliferation; CTR; nuclear site physical security; disposition of fissile materials, fusion energy, nuclear medicine; safe, clean fuel cycles; magnetic fusion; electromagnetic pulse effects; low yield nuclear warhead, Russian-like, ballistic missile defense interceptors; a thorium-based nuclear fuel cycle (the Institute claims that the Department of Energy won't agree to consider programs that provide an alternative to Yucca Mountain); joint NAS-Institute programs for nuclear energy based space programs; software technologies for counter-terrorism; information technology training programs for former nuclear weapons scientists and engineers; and a visit to a nuclear power reactor being used for testing of thorium-based fuel.

American University in Moscow

The delegation also met with the staff and supporters of the American University in Moscow to demonstrate support for their program. Representative Weldon and the delegation were presented a copy of the "Russian response" to "U.S.-Russia Partnership." Other discussion topics included the transportation of nuclear waste and initiation of U.S.-Russia Exchange Centers (information exchange using the internet) between cities in the U.S. and Russia.

Moscow Petroleum Club

The delegation met with senior Russian government officials, Members of the Federation Assembly, and business leaders from the oil and gas industry. Victor Chernomerdrin, the former Prime Minister, led the Russian delegation. Also included, at the request of the U.S. delegation, were KU Song Bok, commercial attaché of the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea, and his assistant, KIM Jong-Do.

Tashkent & Karshi-Khanabad, Uzbekistan (May 27–28)

In Tashkent, the delegation met with President Karimov; Foreign Minister Kamilov; the U.S. Embassy country team; and visited U.S. military personnel at Karshi-Khanabad. The delegation expressed to the President, U.S. appreciation for Uzbekistan's support for the war on terrorism. For his part, the President acknowledged his nation's shortcomings in human rights and economic reforms, but indicated he is taking actions in these areas in making reforms. The President provided an assessment of the regional geo-political environment and his views on the campaign in Afghanistan. He emphasized a desire for a long-term U.S. presence in Central Asia and Afghanistan and expressed a concern over the long-term intentions of Russia, Iran and particularly China. He was supportive of Representative Weldon's proposal to establish a joint U.S. Congress-Uzbek parliamentary working group. President Karimov sees the

U.S. as a political, legal, and economic model he would like to replicate.

American Embassy officials noted their concerns about the long term economic health of the country, citing the 50 percent inflation rate over the past year and the unwillingness of most foreign companies to invest in Uzbekistan because of the lack of convertibility of the currency.

The delegation was transported via an Air Force C-130 cargo aircraft to Karshi-Khanabad in southeastern Uzbekistan, near the Afghanistan border, to visit with U.S. forces personnel deployed in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. All Members had an opportunity to meet with constituents and took the opportunity to make the military members fully aware of the total support of the American people for the job that they are all doing.

The President, acknowledging fully "what wars can cause on the main continent, briefly digressed, citing China's experience with a number of wars—"Japan against China"—and mentioned his personal participation in Japan's war against China. "China and the U.S. were on the same side against Japan in Japan's War of Aggression." He further mentioned his visit to Hawaii and the Arizona War Memorial—"I shared the same feeling as your Commander of the Pacific Fleet. If you look at history and major events, you see history evolves in cycles. People unify then fall apart. Now Japan and the U.S. get along well . . . Maintenance of the imperial system in Japan had a lot to do with General MacArthur."

"My advice to the U.S. is that not every place in the world can follow the U.S. model. In the world, each place has its own model, but that should not stop contacts and communication . . . The first principle should be to seek common ground while putting aside differences . . . Do not let differences interfere with communication . . . We have more in common than divergences."

Premier Zhu Rongji

Representative Turner, accompanied by Representative Spencer Bachus (R-AL) and Arnie Welman, Vice President of Commercial Affairs for the UPS Corporation, met with Premier Zhu at the Purple Light Pavilion for over an hour.

Representatives Turner and Bachus, along with Representative Pete Sessions (R-TX) had participated in the construction of a computer laboratory with 40 UPS government affairs employees in the City of Zunhua, located northeast of Beijing in Hebei Province.

Premier Zhu expressed his appreciation to the representatives' and the UPS employees' for their tangible contribution to the children of Zunhua and was pleased that the group had experienced rural China.

Premier Zhu stated the importance of the "one China" policy and stated that the PRC does not desire to use force against Taiwan to achieve reunification. He cited Hong Kong as a successful example of reunification and said reunification with Taiwan would not require a change in Taiwan's economic system. Representative Turner expressed his support for the "one China" policy and indicated that his support for permanent normal trade relations and the PRC's admission to the WTO was based on his belief that the ability of the U.S. and the PRC to build a strong bond of friendship and cooperation is critical to world peace and prosperity over the next 25 years.

Assistant Foreign minister Zhou

In a later meeting, Assistant Foreign minister Zhou outlined China's plan to "intensify" its economic reform program. "With 25 million people entering the work force each year, if we are to avoid problems, we need to speed up reform." He stated

Beijing, China (May 29–June 1)

In the Peoples Republic of China (PRC), the delegation met with President Jiang and senior foreign ministry officials; met officials of the Chinese Peoples Institute of Foreign Affairs; engaged the U.S. Country team in discussions; and visited the National Defense University, where Representative Weldon addressed the student body and delegation members met in breakout sessions with the PLA students attending the University. There was also a side-group meeting by Representatives Turner and Bachus with Premier Ju.

President Jiang

In the delegation meeting with President Jiang, Representative Weldon expressed the desire of the majority of the American people for a productive long-term relationship with the PRC.

President Jiang indicated that China and the U.S. have more interests in common than differences and encouraged mutual respect and moderation. He urged that the U.S. should accept that there are other acceptable models than that of the U.S. for political and economic development. President Jiang stated that the most important and sensitive issue in Sino-American relations is Taiwan. He cited the importance of continuing the "one China" policy. "The Chinese relationship boils down to one question: Taiwan . . . The question is a very simple one . . . We have already agreed (citing normalization, the three joint communiqués, and "three no's") . . . we don't understand why the U.S. is sending weapons to Taiwan . . . We place much hope in you as representatives that we can get much done."

Representative Weldon indicated he supported the "one China" policy. "Arms sales take place when there is a perception, right or wrong, that a threat exists to the people of Taiwan . . . I am the Chairman responsible for authorizing the procurement of all our military systems. But I am a teacher by profession. I would like to spend money on education, not weapons . . . We do not want conflict with China in any form."

Representative Hastings, citing the importance to both China and the U.S. of engaging the DPRK, asked President Jiang if he would consider having his officials contact the DPRK on the delegation's behalf to arrange a visit. He also asked the President what China is doing to ease tensions between India and Pakistan. The President encouraged the delegation visit to the DPRK, but "whether they allow the visit must be totally up to them . . . We cannot take decisions in their place. North Korea will have to decide. China is China. North Korea is North Korea." On India and Pakistan, the President indicated that both countries are "China's neighbors" and said he hoped the Kashmir problem can be solved peacefully. "Although people are of a view that we are closer to Pakistan, we are trying to get each side to work together. Our relationship with India has fluctuated, but more recently we have had a constantly improving relationship with India." He also said that because of the U.S. need to fight terrorism, he believed that "the U.S. attitude toward Pakistan has changed." the purpose of their foreign policy is world peace and common development. "China is not a threat to anyone and should not be perceived as a threat . . . perception is important . . . China is an important force in the region for peace . . . In our relationship, we have accomplished a lot . . . the only problem is Taiwan . . . The issue of Taiwan should be left to the Chinese to work out. The U.S. should not become involved . . . Our policy goal of peaceful reunification remains. If they (Taiwanese) accept one China, we can be very patient. I hope you will not send signals that can be misinterpreted."

Representatives Bartlett suggested that Taiwan is a "tiny island" with relatively small population and that China and the U.S. should focus on the 90 percent of what we have in common. Representative Horn indicated that "it would be the biggest mistake ever made for China to invade Taiwan." Mr. Horn also expressed his concern over a quote attributed to a Chinese admiral citing "missiles over LA" as a Chinese option. Minister Zhou indicated that such a quote was incorrect.

In response to Representative Brown, Minister Zhou agreed there are both obligations and benefits to entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). "We will honor our words." He indicated there would be challenges for China as a WTO member, but also opportunities. In acknowledging the \$100 billion annual trade imbalance between the U.S. and China, Minister Zhou said that "China wishes to buy more, but that there are too many restrictions." Also in response to Representative Brown, he cited the need for the Three Gorges Dam project as primarily for flood control, acknowledged the importance of environmental protection, and said that electricity production is secondary.

In response to a question from Representative Hastings on India and Pakistan, Minister Zhou indicated that the Foreign Ministers involved had talked and cited the need "to be cautious and avoid escalation . . . The President of Pakistan said he would not use force. We have encouraged them to talk together."

Minister Zhou concluded that "China will not commit to not use force in the case of Taiwan because we don't want to use force . . . If we make such a commitment (Taiwan) separatists will push for a proclamation of independence, which would be a disaster for everyone." Representative Hastings indicated that the issue of Taiwan would likely take care of itself over time because of the large and increasing investment by Taiwan interests in mainland China.

Chinese Peoples Institute for Foreign Affairs (CPIFA)

President Mei indicated that the CPIFA had worked for 50 years doing exchanges, sponsoring research on international affairs, and hosting high level delegations to promote mutual understanding and bilateral relationships. He cited the importance of economic development and discussed the wide variance within China of economic well-being, with per capita GDP in cities like Shanghai being \$4,000, while in many regions it is \$300/person. He stated that last year began a policy of developing China's west (12 provinces, two-thirds of China's land area) and cited the need for a stable international environment for economic development. He also discussed the Taiwan issue, citing all of the same factors mentioned by President Jiang and Assistant Foreign Minister Zhou.

In response to a question from Representative Horn, President Mei said China had three domestic goals: develop the west economically, achieve sustained growth throughout the country, and advance education in science and technology. "The quality of human resources is key to China's development."

National Defense University

Representative Weldon addressed the military students at the National Defense University for the Peoples Liberation Army on Sino-American relations; America's policy toward Taiwan; the need for increased dialogue and cooperative programs between the PLA and U.S. military; the common threat to China and the U.S. posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and drug trafficking; and the role the Congress plays in the U.S. system of government. After Representative Weldon's address, Members of

the delegation had the opportunity to participate in small group discussions with the military students. Taiwan was again a topic of discussion. Also of interest to the students, was the Members' views on international terrorism and the Falun Gong.

Seoul, Yongsan U.A. Army Base, and the DMZ, Korea (June 1-3)

In Korea the delegation met with the foreign minister; the U.S. Ambassador, Thomas C. Hubbard; Members of the National Assembly; senior U.S. and Korean military officials; Korean business leaders; and family members of U.S. military personnel.

Ambassador Hubbard

Ambassador Hubbard provided the delegation an overview of the Republic of Korea (ROK) political and economic situation, indicating that the South Korean economy continues its recovery from the 1997 economic crisis, currently growing at five-to-six percent a year, making its growth second only in the region, to China. He also advised the delegation of the significant and prompt support provided by the ROK to the events of 9/11. The ROK "stepped up quickly to our war against the Taliban and al-Queda in Afghanistan, and provided shipping, aircraft, and a field hospital to support U.S. operations . . . In addition they have provided \$40 million in aid to Afghanistan." The Ambassador further highlighted the critical importance of local and provincial elections taking place in June and the national election in December 2002. He indicated that the South Koreans continue to make major strides in political and democratic reforms.

Foreign Minister Choi

In the delegation meeting with Foreign Minister Choi, Representative Weldon expressed his appreciation for all that the ROK had done and continues to do in support of the international war on terrorism. He also reaffirmed our total commitment to the defense of the ROK. Foreign Minister Choi indicated that his country's prompt support for the U.S. led war on terrorism was an expression of the importance of the effort as well as its appreciation for all the U.S. has done on the Korean Peninsula.

Foreign Minister Choi highlighted the rather significant contribution to ROK-Japanese relations made by the joint sponsorship of the on-going World Cup. He commented that the opening ceremonies were the first time that the Japanese national anthem had been played at an official event in the ROK. He also noted that at the opening ceremonies, in a spontaneous sign of friendship, the two Presidents stood and raised clasped hands, signaling the friendship between their two countries. Foreign Minister Choi described the event as a "spectacular moment" for the two countries—the "first time this has happened in a thousand years."

Representative Weldon also expressed to the Foreign Minister, the delegation's consternation with the North Korean, DPRK, failure to approve the delegation's visit request. The delegation had hoped to visit the DPRK to open a dialogue with the North, to express the interest of the legislative branch of the U.S. Government in addressing food aid, agriculture, health, education and other humanitarian assistance. The delegation had hoped to deliver a "totally positive" message to the North—that as a coequal branch of the U.S. government, Congress could work with the DPRK to further peace and stability on the Peninsula and help the people of North Korea.

Foreign Minister Choi indicated that the ROK continues its efforts to maintain the dialogue with the North, but the pace of discussions is much slower than what had been hoped for. He expressed considerable concern

over the state of the DPRK economy and the well-being of its people. "Our interest is to try and engage, help them improve their situation, to try and increase cooperation." The foreign minister indicated the North is in desperate need of food, health care, and electrical power. He also indicated that the next year will be a critical period because of ROK elections, potential instability in the North due to its dysfunctional economic system, the issue of the DPRK nuclear power reactor and related required inspections by the international community.

National Assembly

The delegation later met with Members of the ROK National Assembly. Discussions related to trade; the importance to the ROK of U.S. Forces in Korea for deterrence purposes; the war on terrorism; political and military stability on the Korean Peninsula; the strong desire for eventual reunification of the DPRK and ROK; internet voting in the ROK; "e" government; and the "digital divide."

United Nations/Combined Forces Command

The Members of the delegation also met with the senior combatant commander, General Leon LaPorte, and his staff to get a detailed assessment of the military balance, force readiness, personnel morale, and classified issues.

American Chamber of Commerce

Regarding the difficulty and frustration the Delegation experienced in attempting to arrange a visit with DPRK leadership, American Chamber of Commerce officials the delegation met with indicated a similar frustration with the "on again, off again" nature of visits they had attempted to arrange.

Demilitarized Zone (DMZ)

Delegation Members were provided the opportunity to visit the DMZ. Representative Chabot was able to engage military officials on behalf of the relatives of Corporal Edward Gibson, who has been missing in action since November 26, 1950. Representative Chabot acquired an American flag which had been flown at the DMZ in honor of Corporal Gibson and will present the flag to the Gibson family. During the course of the CODEL, Representative Chabot also stressed to Foreign Minister Choi, Ambassador Hubbard, and other U.S. Embassy personnel the importance of making every effort to recover the remains of Corporal Gibson and other U.S. servicemen missing in action.

U.S.-RUSSIA PARTNERSHIP—A NEW TIME, A NEW BEGINNING

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Agricultural development

Assist in agricultural production.

Expand private-sector investment.

Enhance capacity to purchase essential agricultural inputs, commodities and equipment.

Cultural/educational development

Expand cultural ties outside the major cities.

Assist regional museums in generating tourism.

Provide for more Russian language and cultural studies in U.S. schools.

Defense and security

Initiate new bilateral talks similar to the Ross-Mamedov talks on a Global Protection System.

Move forward with joint talks on a new nonproliferation regime.

Encourage progress on the RAMOS program and restructure the Nuclear Cities Initiative.

Economic development

Help facilitate Russia's accession to the WTO and its acceptance of all WTO agreements.

Increase funding for OPIC and EX-IM Bank projects in Russia.

Work with Russia to improve intellectual property rights.

Energy/natural resources

Foster cooperative pilot projects, starting with oil and gas exploration in Timan Pechora.

Convene bilateral task force to discuss the energy ramifications of the war on terrorism.

Eliminate bureaucratic obstacles to joint cooperation on energy.

Environmental cooperation

Develop a revolving fund to assure development of promising Russian technologies.

Expand debt for nature swaps.

Dramatically expand cooperation on marine science research.

Health care

Increase emphasis on chronic diseases like cardiovascular disease and diabetes.

Develop more extensive physician exchange programs.

Augment existing cooperation between NIH and appropriate Russian research institutes.

Judicial/legal systems

Support expansion of jury trials into all Russian regions.

Expand Environmental Public Advocacy Centers into Russia.

Encourage a doubling of the number of legal clinics.

Local governments

Propose ways to expand the tax base available to local governments.

Encourage political participation by increasing local partisan affiliations.

Encourage the gradual devolution of services to the local level.

Science and technology

Increase cooperation in the area of nuclear fuel cycles.

Expand cooperative fusion research on nonpolluting energy solutions.

Involve Russian industry in embryonic U.S. nanotechnology efforts.

Space and aeronautics

Utilize commercial joint ventures to enable Russia to meet its Space Station obligations.

Increase joint projects on space solar power, propulsion technology, and weather satellites.

Cooperate on mutually-beneficial planetary defense tracking technologies.

DELEGATION

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Rep. Curt Weldon (R-PA), Rep. Solomon Ortiz (D-TX), Rep. Roscoe Bartlett (R-MD), Rep. Jim Turner (D-TX), Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D-TX), Rep. Joe Wilson (R-SC), Rep. Steve Horn (R-CA), Delegate Eni Faleomavaega (D-American Samoa), Rep. Corrine Brown (D-FL), Rep. Alcee Hastings (D-FL), Rep. Carrie Meek (D-FL), Rep. Steve Chabot (R-OH), and Rep. Brian Kerns (R-IN).

COMMITTEE STAFF

Mr. Pete Steffes, Mr. Carl Commenator, Mr. Ryan Vaart, and Mr. Doug Roach.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. John Merrill and Mr. Mark Cameron.

DREXEL UNIVERSITY

Dr. Roy Kim.

MEDICAL STAFF

Dr. Michael Keith.

U.S. AIR FORCE ESCORTS

Colonel Pete Bunce, Lt. Colonel Laura Shoaf, Senior Master Sergeant JJ Cook, and Staff Sergeant Dave Scieszka.

KEY CONTACTS
MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Victor Chernomerdrin, Former Prime Minister.

Andrey Kokoshin, Member, Chairman of the Committee on Industry, Construction Industries, and High Technologies, State Duma, and former National Security Advisor to President Yeltsin.

Vladimir Lukhin, Member, State Federation Council.

Grigory Vavilinsky, Vice Speaker, State Duma.

Andrey V. Skoch, Member, State Duma, Metallurgy and Mining Caucus.

Valdimir Rushkov, State Duma.

Svetlana Gvozdeva, Member, State Duma.

Boris Nadezhdin, Member, State Duma, Union of Right Forces.

Alexander Burataeva, Member, State Duma.

Evgheny Velikhov, President, Kurchatov Institute.

Nikolai Ponomarev-Stepnoi, Vice President, Kurchatov Institute.

Ku Song Bok, Commercial Attache, DPRK. Seth Grae, Thorium Corporation (USA).

Dr. Edward Lozansky, President, American University, Moscow.

Karen Aguilar, U.S. Embassy.

U.S.-Russia Business Council.

International Republican Institute.

National Democracy Institute.

American Chamber of Commerce.

Moscow Petroleum Club.

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN

Islam Karimov, President.

Abdulaziz Kamilov, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

John E. Herbst, U.S. Ambassador, Uzbekistan.

Larry Memmott, Chief Political-Military Section, U.S. Embassy.

KARSHI-KHANABAD, UZBEKISTAN ("K-2")

Colonel Lovelad.

BEIJING, CHINA

Jiang Zemin, President, PRC.

Ju Rongyang, Premier, PRC.

Zhou Wenzhong, Assistant Foreign Minister.

Mei, Zhaorong, President, Chinese People's Institute of Foreign Affairs.

Clark T. Randt, U.S. Ambassador, PRC.

Brigadier General Gratton Sealock, Defense Attache, U.S. Embassy.

James Wayman, U.S. Embassy.

National Defense University.

SEOUL, KOREA

Sung Hong, Choi, Foreign Minister.

Jay Kun Yoo, Member of National Assembly, ROK, Chairman of U.S.-Korea Interparliamentary Exchange Council.

Dai-Chul Chyung, Member of the National Assembly, PhD.

Unna Huh, Member of National Assembly, ROK, Information Technology Committee.

Joo Hong Nam, Professor of Unification and National Security, Kyounggi University.

Un Yong Kim, Executive Board, International Olympic Committee.

Kyung Soon Chang, Chairman, Senior Council, The Parliamentarians Society.

Thomas C. Hubbard, U.S. Ambassador, South Korea.

General Leon LaPorte, Commander in Chief, United National Command (UNC), Combined Forces Command (CFC), and U.S. Forces Command (USFC).

Lt General Dan Zanini, Chief of Staff, USFC.

Brigadier General John Defreintas, J-2 (Intelligence), USFC.

Colonel Bud Redmond, J-5 (Plans), USFC.

H. CON. RES. 36

Whereas over one million Americans suffer from juvenile (Type 1) diabetes, a chronic,

genetically determined, debilitating disease affecting every organ system;

Whereas 13,000 children a year 35 each day are diagnosed with juvenile diabetes;

Whereas 17,000 adults a year 46 each day are diagnosed with juvenile diabetes;

Whereas juvenile diabetes is one of the most costly chronic diseases of childhood;

Whereas insulin treats but does not cure this potentially deadly disease and does not prevent the complications of diabetes, which include blindness, heart attack, kidney failure, stroke, nerve damage, and amputations;

Whereas the Diabetes Research Working Group, a non-partisan advisory board established to advise Congress, has called for an accelerated and expanded diabetes research program at the National Institutes of Health and has recommended a \$4.1 billion increase in Federal funding for diabetes research at the National Institutes of Health over the next five years; and

Whereas a strong public private partnership to fund juvenile diabetes exists between the Federal Government and the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, a foundation which has awarded more than \$326 million for diabetes research since 1970 and will give \$100 million in fiscal year 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Federal funding for diabetes research should be increased in accordance with the recommendations of the Diabetes Research Working Group so that a cure for juvenile diabetes can be found.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 4, 2002, AT PAGE H3102.

The following version of H. Con. Res. 36 and the amendment in the nature of a substitute was inadvertently printed in the RECORD incorrectly. The correct versions are as follows:

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

Mr. TAUZIN. Madam Speaker, I offer an amendment to the text.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. TAUZIN: strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That Federal funding for diabetes research should be increased annually as recommended by the Diabetes Research Working Group so that a cure for juvenile diabetes can be found.

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. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 6.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1366. An act to designate the United States Post Office building located at 3101 West Sunflower Avenue in Santa Ana, California, as the "Hector G. Godinez Post Office Building".

H.R. 1374. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Calumet Street in Lake Linden, Michigan, as the "Philip E. Ruppe Post Office Building".

H.R. 3448. An act to improve the ability of the United States to prevent, prepare for, and respond to bioterrorism and other public health emergencies.

H.R. 3789. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2829 Commercial Way in Rock Springs, Wyoming, as the "Teno Roncalio Post Office Building".

H.R. 3960. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3719 Highway 4 in Jay, Florida, as the "Joseph W. Westmoreland Post Office Building".

H.R. 4486. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1590 East Joyce Boulevard in Fayetteville, Arkansas, as the "Clarence B. Craft Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 2002, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7188. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 107-225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7189. A letter from the Directors of Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the National Defense Function (050) outlays for Fiscal Year 2003, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7190. A letter from the Deputy Commissioner for Education Statistics, Department of Education, transmitting the annual statistical report of the National Center for Education Statistics entitled, "The Condition of Education 2002," pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 9005; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Land Disposal Restrictions: Granting of Two Site-Specific Treatment

Variances to U.S. Ecology Idaho, Incorporated in Grandview, Idaho and CWM Chemical Services, LLC in Model City, New York [FRL-7214-4] received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7192. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maine; New CTGs [ME-066-7015a; A-1-FRL-7171-7] received May 16, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7193. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District [CA 245-0311a; FRL-7202-1] received May 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7194. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Final Approval of Operating Permit Program Revisions; Indiana [IN004a; FRL-7212-6] received May 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7195. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan; Utah; Revisions to Air Pollution Regulations [UT-001-0034a, UT-001-0035a; FRL-7201-3] received May 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

7196. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 124-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7197. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Russia, Ukraine, Norway and Cayman Islands [Transmittal No. DTC 123-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7198. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the semi-annual report of the activities of the Office of Inspector General during the six month period ending March 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7199. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the semi-annual report of the Department of Labor's Inspector General covering the period October 1, 2001 through March 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7200. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-377, "Government Attorney Certificate of Good Standing Filing Requirement Amendment Act of 2002" received June 5, 2002, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7201. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-380, "Omnibus Anti-Terrorism Act of 2002" received June 5, 2002, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7202. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Commerce,

transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7203. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7204. A letter from the Director, White House Liaison, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7205. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7206. A letter from the Director, Executives Resources and Special Programs Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7207. A letter from the Secretary/CAO, Postal Rate Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7208. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semi-annual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period October 1, 2001 through March 31, 2002 and the Management Response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7209. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a copy of the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States, held in Washington D.C., on September/October 2001, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7210. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's amendments to the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and official commentary, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(p); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7211. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Award of Infrastructure Grants to Implement the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan—received May 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7212. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Award of Grants for Counter-Terrorism Coordination Activities by States and Territories—received May 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7213. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Allocation of Fiscal Year 2002 Operator Training Grants—received May 14, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7214. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the 2002 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-193, section 231 (110 Stat. 2197); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7215. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, Commercial Activities Panel, transmitting the final report of the Commercial Activities Panel prepared in accordance with Section 832 of the Floyd D.

Spence National Defense Authorization Act of 2001; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

7216. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2002-14 concerning waiver and certification of statutory provisions regarding the Palestine Liberation Organization; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7217. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting 23 recommendations for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(9); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue right-of-way permits for natural gas pipelines within the boundary of Great Smoky Mountains National Park (Rept. 107-491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4609. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer, located in Idaho and Washington (Rept. 107-492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 3969. A bill to enhance United States policy diplomacy, to reorganize United States international broadcasting, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 107-493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 435. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2143) to make the repeal of the estate tax permanent (Rept. 107-494). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOEHLERT: Committee on Science. H.R. 2486. A bill to authorize the National Weather Service to conduct research and development, training, and outreach activities relating to tropical cyclone inland forecasting improvement, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-495). 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. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4864. A bill to combat terrorism and defend the Nation against terrorist acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WU, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FILNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LYNCH, Mr.

FRANK, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FORD, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HILL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MOORE, Mr. STARK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GORDON, Ms. HARMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. REYES, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. BACA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 4865. A bill to protect inventoried roadless areas in the National Forest System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr.

ISAKSON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 4866. A bill to make technical amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 incorporating the results of the Fed Up Initiative; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4867. A bill to prohibit the exportation of natural gas from the United States to Mexico for use in electric energy generation units near the United States border that do not comply with air quality control requirements that provide air quality protection that is at least equivalent to the protection provided by requirements applicable in the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 4868. A bill to make the diversity of the American people a resource to promote national security; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia:

H.R. 4869. A bill to preempt of local taxation with respect to satellite digital audio radio services and to provide for determining State authority for taxation of satellite digital audio radio service; 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. HANSEN:

H.R. 4870. A bill to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of the Mount Naomi Wilderness Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. HART:

H.R. 4871. A bill to designate Pennsylvania State Route 60 and United States Routes 22 and 30 as part of the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 4872. A bill to amend section 124(a) of the Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1999 to permit criminal background checks for nursing facility and home health agency personnel involved in indirect patient care; 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. LEACH:

H.R. 4873. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a scholarship program to recognize scholar athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OTTER:

H.R. 4874. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to disclaim any Federal interest in lands adjacent to Spirit Lake and Twin Lakes in the State of Idaho resulting from possible omission of lands from a 1880 survey; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 4875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the employee portion of Social Security taxes imposed on individuals who have been diagnosed as having cancer or a terminal disease; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:

H.R. 4876. A bill to modify the project for shoreline protection, Brevard County, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. Con. Res. 413. Concurrent resolution honoring the invention of modern air-conditioning by Dr. Willis H. Carrier on the occasion of its 100th anniversary; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 13: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 40: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 218: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 250: Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 287: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 360: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 425: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 481: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 563: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 633: Mr. OWENS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COYNE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 638: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 699: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 902: Mr. KIND, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 952: Mr. MOORE and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 975: Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 984: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 1109: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 1184: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1274: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1307: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 1322: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1433: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1452: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1487: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 1671: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1683: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1808: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1810: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1812: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1859: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1904: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1911: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1990: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2012: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2014: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.

H.R. 2055: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2074: Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2118: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2125: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 2143: Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 2173: Mr. KING, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 2219: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 2284: Mr. ROSS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2337: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2588: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2592: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 2641: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2788: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2800: Mr. HOSTETTNER.

H.R. 2820: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2874: Mr. EVANS and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2953: Mr. MCKEON and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2966: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 3027: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3132: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 3185: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

- H.R. 3278: Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 3340: Mr. MICA.
 H.R. 3360: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. SIMMONS.
 H.R. 3430: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. SWEENEY.
 H.R. 3496: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. LAFALCE.
 H.R. 3533: Ms. HART and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
 H.R. 3545: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3569: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
 H.R. 3606: Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 3618: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 3659: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
 H.R. 3661: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KELLER, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 3686: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
 H.R. 3741: Mr. SCHROCK.
 H.R. 3794: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 3814: Mr. LUTHER.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROSS, and Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 3884: Mr. OBEY.
 H.R. 3912: Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 3974: Mr. PASTOR.
 H.R. 4012: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 4013: Mr. OLVER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 H.R. 4019: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BE-REUTER, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. ENGLISH.
 H.R. 4043: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 4446: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 4481: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
 H.R. 4483: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. HART, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 4515: Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 4524: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 4575: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BACA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 4600: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. OTTER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. KINGSTON.
 H.R. 4635: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 4642: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. HANSEN.
 H.R. 4646: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. RANGEL.
 H.R. 4653: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. FORBES.
 H.R. 4654: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 4668: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 4669: Mr. FATTAH.
 H.R. 4676: Mr. GOODE, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. EHRLICH, and Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 4683: Mr. HOLT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 4754: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 4757: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 4763: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 4784: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 4792: Mr. ORTIZ.
 H.R. 4795: Mrs. CUBIN.
 H.R. 4796: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. HART.
 H.R. 4839: Mr. PAUL, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GILMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. STRICKLAND.
 H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H. Con. Res. 197: Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
 H. Con. Res. 346: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. WAXMAN.
 H. Con. Res. 385: Mr. SERRANO.
 H. Con. Res. 401: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. SHUSTER.
 H. Con. Res. 408: Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. WAMP.
 H. Res. 410: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H. Res. 416: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. CRANE.