



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2003

No. 15

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LEE TERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) for 5 minutes.

BUDGET AND HOMELAND SECURITY

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has campaigned across the 50 States, has campaigned by issuing promises to strengthen our Nation. He has pledged to improve our schools, to create jobs, to protect our homeland, but soon after these promises were made, we see how empty they are.

President Bush fought against providing funds for his own education bill. It is still unfunded and leaves our children behind.

President Bush fought to prevent Congress from extending unemploy-

ment benefits for laid-off workers. We worked hard to at least to get a reference, and now President Bush is fighting to prevent the Federal Government from spending the funds necessary to protect our homeland.

When we say "homeland security," we are not talking about fancy technology or a building. We are talking about training and equipment for first responders, the men and women of our local police force and fire departments, the ones who will be putting their lives on the line in case of a terrorist attack.

Warren Rudman, the former Republican Senator, who helped lead the United States Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, said about the Bush budget, "The bottom line is that it appears to us we are going to be underfunded in several key areas." His comments were echoed by a current Republican Senator and decorated Vietnam veteran who said Bush's budget is "not even sufficient to provide for the first responder program in the States. It is not sufficient to provide for broader security."

We have known for some time that this President puts children second to tax cuts for the rich. We have known he puts jobs second to tax cuts, but to see our national security sacrificed in favor of a tax cut skewed to millionaires really takes the cake.

Now the President has an opportunity tonight to prove that he values national security more than tax cuts. I urge him to embrace that opportunity.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the state of our Union is not sound. Millions of Americans and their families are not

secure in their home, not because of some new wave of crime or because of some immediate and compelling threat from Iraq or other hostile foreign nations, but because so many have lost their jobs, or many fear the loss of their job or lay-off in the near future.

One point seven million jobs have been lost since January 2001. The number of people unemployed for more than 6 months has tripled in the last 2 years. One point three million more people have fallen into poverty in the last 2 years, the first increase in a decade.

Bankruptcies are up 23 percent in the last year. Forty-four million Americans have no health insurance. The government surplus has evaporated. We have a huge and growing deficit as far as the eye can see. Social Security lockbox has been broken open and pillaged, and the trust funds are being spent on day-to-day operations of the government. The Pension Benefit Guarantee Fund, which insures the pensions of Americans in case their company or plan should fail, is broke. It has spent its entire reserves in the last 2 years.

State budgets are the worst since the Great Depression. We are in a domestic economic crisis. That is pretty clear, but the question becomes what is the President going to propose? It appears that he is going to propose more of the same.

When the President was a candidate, we had a large surplus and a booming economy. He proposed tax cuts for the wealthy. When the President was newly elected, we had a faltering economy, and he said we still had a surplus, and he proposed tax cuts for the wealthy, and he got many of those proposals through. Now he is in his third year as President. We are in a recession. We have huge and growing deficits, and the President has proposed, surprise, tax cuts for the wealthy.

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.

His plan is to exempt dividends supposedly because of double taxation, except most of the corporations who pay dividends do not pay Federal income taxes. They have taken advantage of loopholes through Bermuda and other places to not pay taxes. They are not double-taxed. That is not the issue, double taxation or fairness. It is to give a huge gift to the wealthy.

The average tax cut for an Oregonian, for my State, with an income of \$32,000, people who could use a little help, it will be \$40. Do not spend it all in one place. But the average millionaire tax cut, \$45,000, those who have already done so well under his previous tax cuts, and it will compound the State's financial problems. It will cost the States \$4 billion, this little dividend gift to wealthy investors, and it will cost my State \$100 million, a State already in crisis.

There is no credible economist in the United States of America who pretends that this would in any way stimulate the economy, especially since the money will not be refunded to these wealthy folks until next year even if they choose to spend it in a way that might create jobs.

Then the other leg of his way to boost our economy is a war. I believe many are puzzling over what is this about. Is there this a tremendous threat? Well, he has not yet revealed either to me, the United States Congress in any of our classified briefings here on the floor of the House, or in unclassified briefings or in other materials the proof that there is a credible and immediate threat from Saddam Hussein.

We do know that in North Korea they have nuclear weapons. They are building more nuclear weapons. They have tested long-range missiles. We do know in Iran that they have a very advanced nuclear program. Apparently Saddam Hussein does not have one at all, and his missiles that he has, so-called, can reach only a couple of hundred miles.

So how is it that this is the most credible and immediate threat that we should spend hundreds of millions of dollars, potentially thousands of American lives, tens of thousands of lives of innocents in a war against Saddam Hussein while weapons inspectors are in there, when we have gotten what we proposed, which is let us go in there and find if he has weapons of mass destruction. Give the process time to work. There is no reason to rush to war with potentially catastrophic results and one that is certainly not going to help us with these pressing domestic problems at home.

In fact, it is going to rob from that, since the President is now talking about a long-term occupation and rebuilding of Iraq similar to Japan after World War II despite the fact that, of course, basically their culture is not as integrated as that of Japan. In fact, the people who live in Iraq do not get along very well. There is a number of divisive factions. They have no tradi-

tion in democracy, and a long-term occupation and democracy-building in that area is going to be very problematic.

So the President should focus on real steps to help real Americans with their real problems at home and real threats to our domestic integrity or our international security. Where is Osama bin Laden? Remember, dead or alive? Guess what. He is still alive. He is still planning attacks on the United States of America. The President needs to refocus his priorities.

REJECTING THE APOSTLES OF INACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard a loud and relentless chorus of critics who are attempting to hamstring President Bush and restrict his ability to defend this country. These foreign and domestic apologists for inaction would subordinate U.S. national security decisions to an international litmus test.

They are subverting the real issue beneath the false allure of avoidance and a smokescreen of diplomatic double-dealings and evasions. Under their specious logic, the burden of proof shifts from Saddam Hussein's evil regime to the free and democratic nations insisting that he disarm.

It is a known fact that Saddam developed, deployed and destroyed thousands of lives with weapons of mass terror. It is not a question of whether or not he has terror weapons.

American soldiers found and destroyed chemical weapons depots 12 years ago. Saddam later confirmed our fears with the thousands of corpses that littered the Iraqi countryside.

Here is the real question: Where and when will he choose to use the countless terror weapons he still has? Will it be here in the United States? Will Saddam's agents launch the attack, or will Saddam quietly transfer his chemical or biological weapons to al Qaeda or any other terrorist organization? Will they be leveraged to blackmail freedom-loving nations into inaction in the face of future aggression?

The answer is that we cannot know what this dictator will do, and for that reason the only acceptable outcome to the United States is that either Saddam Hussein voluntarily destroys all the materials related to his nuclear, chemical and biological weapons development programs or a coalition of free nations will do the job, and this brings up a widespread misperception.

The purpose of the U.N. inspectors in Iraq, a purpose that is either misunderstood or it is being manipulated by the left, is simply to verify that Saddam is declaring and destroying his known but hidden weapons of mass destruction programs and weapons caches.

It is not the inspectors' mission to fruitlessly scour the Iraqi countryside in a feckless search for Saddam's terror weapons. In a country larger than the State of California, that would be an empty objective doomed to fail. Outside observers cannot hope to uncover the truth within an uncooperative and hostile regime. It is an impossible task to discover weapons of mass destruction within a ruthlessly wicked and oppressive dictatorship that refuses to cooperate. Iraq is not destroying its weapons.

Let us just be clear about it. Saddam is an evil tyrant. He illegitimately holds power by controlling the thoughts and the behavior of the Iraqi people with a climate of state-administered terror. His secret police coerce the Iraqi people into a terror-driven code of silence.

Time and time again over the 20th century the West learned that the scale of crimes committed by totalitarian regimes was far worse than we even knew. It was not until those brutal regimes fell and their victims documented the full extent of the monstrous abuse that we learned the truth. We saw it in Hitler's Germany. We saw it in the Soviet Union. We saw it in Cambodia, and eventually we will see it in Cuba, and once Saddam fails and falls, the Iraqi people will shock and disgust the world by revealing the full ghastly scope of Saddam's oppression.

This much is obvious today. We will never get to the truth about Saddam's weapons so long as his regime holds power. We need to recognize that it will be extremely difficult for Saddam's past and future victims to tell inspectors what they know.

□ 1045

When they, their friends and their families are subject to brutal and wicked reprisals, including rape, torture and murder at the hands of Saddam's secret police, U.N. inspectors cannot approach the truth in Iraq. And it is not their job to discover Saddam's weapons. No, the onus is squarely on Saddam Hussein to prove to the world that he has disarmed.

Unfortunately, many observers continue claiming that the United States has to round out the indictment of Saddam Hussein's regime with additional evidence. No such evidence is needed. No more facts need emerge before America can rightfully take action against this regime. We have all the evidence that we need. The pages of history. There has never been a threat confronting the United States that was overcome or improved through inaction or the counsels of contrived evasions and equivocations. The American people expect us to face our threats squarely and directly.

Many observers would have us pin the security of the United States to a fading fallacy, the discredited notion that a U.N. inspections team, operating within a hostile regime, can adequately secure our security. They cannot.

There is great danger in so elevating the trappings of international consultation and the rituals of multilateralism that they become a surrogate for our true purpose: we have to protect ourselves and the world by disarming Saddam Hussein.

Some observers refuse to acknowledge the grave consequences of allowing Saddam Hussein to remain in power. In the hierarchy of aggressive and military regimes, Saddam's dictatorship is a clear and present danger to the United States. And by providing Saddam added time, added time to supply, train and support terrorist groups, these endless pleas for patience convert a virtue into a vice. Any nation which naively denies the clear threat from Saddam Hussein's regime is placing the free world at jeopardy by ignoring this dictator's infamous past and evil aspirations.

Regardless of what others may say, the final authority governing American action is not the United Nations. It is the Constitution of the United States and the decisions of our own elected government. If and when President Bush decides America must confront Saddam Hussein's regime, he will be exercising his authority as commander in chief and expressing the broad support already demonstrated by Congress through the Iraq Resolution passed months ago.

The Left is attempting to turn us from our purpose with another bit of sophistry. They claim our imperative to confront Saddam Hussein's dictatorship is a diversion from the war against terrorism. Well, far from a diversion, confronting Saddam Hussein is a central and defining measure of our commitment to win the war on terrorism.

If President Bush determines that America must act, he can be confident that the unified support of the American people will be with him until the danger is defeated. The President should know that we stand beside him and that the United States will not shrink from our obligation to defend freedom.

While we seek the broadest possible coalition of freedom-loving countries in this effort, we cannot let a hunt for international consensus divide us and deter us from our purpose. We will not be dissuaded from taking action to defend America.

GUAM REQUESTS ADDITIONAL FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Guam eagerly anticipate the State of the Union report which President Bush will deliver tonight. While the President will speak in broad terms about the Nation, I take this opportunity to let the Nation know about the situation on my home island of

Guam, which has been recently devastated by Super Typhoon Pongsona.

Super Typhoon Pongsona struck Guam on December 8, 2002, with sustained winds of 155 miles per hour and wind gusts exceeding 200 miles per hour. This severe typhoon battered Guam for 8 long hours; and in its aftermath, Guam's power, water, and wastewater systems were seriously damaged. In addition, Guam had just begun to fully recover from another storm, Typhoon Chata'an, which struck in July 2002, barely 6 months before Typhoon Pongsona.

Our island looked like a war zone. Hotels had their windows blown out and over 120 concrete power poles snapped due to the force of Pongsona. Aluminum typhoon shutters were ripped off the windows; and air conditioners were blown off roof tops and windows, creating holes for rain to destroy the interior of our homes.

Andersen Air Force Base, Naval Station, and Apra Harbor, were hit hard, as well as our own civilian airport, closing both airports and delaying relief flights. Four fuel storage tanks at the Port of Guam caught fire and burned for days, jeopardizing nearby storage tanks filled with aviation fuel, gasoline and diesel fuel. Two tanks were destroyed completely, while two others have been damaged.

Many people on Guam who have lived through other typhoons over the years have remarked that Pongsona was the worst typhoon they had ever experienced in their lives. I was there to witness this.

President Bush declared Guam a major disaster area following Super Typhoon Pongsona, and the FEMA emergency management agency, the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, the Catholic Social Services, and many other volunteers mobilized for the relief and recovery effort. We on Guam are sincerely grateful for all these efforts and for the incredible response of the Guam National Guard, the Government of Guam employees, and the reserve and active duty military units on Guam. There is nothing more humbling to a community than to see the outpouring of assistance to us in our time of desperate need. There is nothing more heroic than to see Guardsmen, government employees, and volunteers leave their own ravaged homes behind and respond to the call of duty.

Seven weeks later, as I speak today, 20 percent of our island is still without power. Power outages plague our community every day. The water system is still not at full capacity, and the government is still coping with the enormous challenges ahead. Governor Felix Camacho and Lieutenant Governor Kaleo Moylan took office on January 6, 2003, facing the daunting task of completing the recovery. The 27th Guam legislature, under the leadership of Speaker Ben Pangelinan also assumed office with these great challenges awaiting them. Our people pray for our

leaders to succeed, because not since the liberation of Guam from its World War II occupation of our island have we faced such difficult times.

We are facing 20 percent unemployment, a bottoming out of our tourist industry, and an expensive recovery that may last the rest of this year. We need the Federal Government to extend whatever help is available, not just to clean up after the typhoon but to help us restore our economy and rebuild our basic infrastructure. We need hazard mitigation assistance to make Guam less vulnerable to the next super typhoon, and we need the prayers and the support of the American people for their fellow American citizens who live on Guam.

We are a community that prides ourselves on our self-reliance and our resilience after any hardship. We have great optimism and great faith in our future. We need a hand right now, and we ask that President Bush and the Congress take just a minute as we reflect on the blessing and opportunities of our great country to remember that some Americans are facing great hardships tonight. Please remember Guam.

AGRICULTURE DISASTER IN NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the sad state of agriculture in my home State of North Carolina. And, indeed, farmers across the Nation took a big hit in their wallets thanks to Mother Nature last year.

As Congress prepares to receive the President's State of the Union address, we must pay special attention to those folks who are hurting down on the farm. At one time last summer, according to the National Drought Mitigation Center, nearly one-third of the United States experienced moderate to extreme drought conditions. The prolonged period of dry weather severely aggravated North Carolina's long-term drought problems.

Consequently, my State experienced the worst drought we have seen in 100 years. This drought impacted every region of North Carolina and nearly every community where commodities are grown. Many farmers had to watch crops wither on the vine and die despite their best efforts. And when rain finally came, it came too late to save what was already lost and impaired their ability to harvest what little they had.

In North Carolina, farmers have experienced \$400 million in crop losses. While crop insurance has paid out \$90 million in indemnities, which helped, it comes at a cost of \$63 million in premiums. So crop insurance has not been a viable solution to losses of this magnitude.

The Secretary of Agriculture designated nearly the entire State of

North Carolina as a disaster area, making low-interest loans available to our farmers. USDA also provided for emergency haying and grazing on Conservation Reserve Program lands, something our livestock producers appreciated. While this assistance is welcome, it does not come even close to meeting the losses that our farmers have suffered.

In addition, many farmers cannot afford to increase their debt burden with new loans. Farmers need more help than just new credit and comforting words; they need direct disaster payments, and they need them now so they can start a new crop year.

For several months we have been pushing for more agriculture disaster relief, along with a bipartisan group of lawmakers representing States that were affected by the drought last summer. We were extremely hopeful last year when the United States Senate voted in favor of a disaster package as part of the 2003 interior appropriations bill. Their plan would provide almost \$6 billion in assistance for our farmers.

In fact, I cosponsored a bill here in the House introduced by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) which matched the Senate's disaster bill. Unfortunately, the administration opposed these agriculture disaster plans. Instead, the President demanded that any disaster assistance be paid for by cutting the farm bill that we passed last year.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a proud bipartisan tradition of coming to the aid of States when they have been struck by natural calamities. When tragedy strikes, we do not let States fend for themselves; we instead respond as one Nation. Whether it is an earthquake in California, wildfires in the Rockies, floods in the Midwest, or hurricanes in Florida, Congress worries more about how best to help these people who have suffered and less about how we pay for it at the moment. The drought which affected my State and much of the West and East Coast deserves the same level of treatment by Congress as these other disasters.

In fact, historically, drought is one of the most costly natural disasters that have struck any region of this country. I call upon this House to show this administration that we understand what is really going on in the farm country and that we are prepared to come to their assistance in their time of need.

As my colleagues know, the Senate included in the 2003 omnibus appropriations bill \$3.1 billion for disaster assistance. Consequently, at the administration's insistence, the Senate was forced to cut education, veterans benefits, and a number of FBI agents. Now, I do not understand this. The President is proposing deficit funding for his massive \$674 billion tax plan, which will do nothing to help the economy and middle-class Americans. However, when we ask for his support for emergency spending for just 1 percent, \$6 billion, to help farmers who suffered from an

act of God and who could lose their entire livelihood, the President says no.

I urge the conference committee to reject these cuts, continue our bipartisan tradition and fully fund agriculture disaster relief as we have done in the past. The Nation's farmers are waiting and watching. Let us not disappoint them.

□ 1100

PRESIDENTIAL CREDIBILITY GAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we all know that tonight the President will deliver his State of the Union Address, and that is often and is supposed to be an opportunity to reflect upon the state of the Nation, the economy, foreign policy, the potential war, and health care, which are just some of the issues that we expect the President to address this evening.

My concern, and I have shared this concern with many of my Democratic colleagues, is that the President constantly comes forward and talks about what he is going to do to address the Nation's problems, to deal with the economy, for example, to deal with health care, for example, but many times those promises are not kept in terms of what action he actually follows up with to meet the commitments that he makes.

I call it a credibility gap. Some of my colleagues on the Democratic side have taken notice of this credibility gap over the last 2 days; and I wanted to particularly mention that today because when I opened the New York Times this morning, I saw a column by Paul Krugman where he actually references a credibility problem with the President, and he talks about it in the context of not only tonight's State of the Union Address, but also in comparison to last year's State of the Union Address to basically draw out the conflict between what the President says he is going to do versus what he actually does.

I would like to quote some sections of Paul Krugman's column and talk about it because I think this is very important in the context of tonight's State of the Union Address.

The column says whether Mr. Bush is held accountable for the promises he made in his last State of the Union Address is a major issue. Krugman says that the President "assured those who worried about red ink last year that 'our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-lived.' He offered comfort for those who remembered his father's 'jobless recovery,' which felt like a continuing recession: 'When America works, America prospers, so my economic security plan can be summed up in one word: Jobs.'

"Fast-forward a year. We now know that the 'small' budget deficit will rise above \$300 billion, and stay there. Even the administration's own, ever-optimistic budget officials now concede that we face deficits as far as the eye can see. Meanwhile, payrolls continue to decline; since the working-age population keeps rising, it's becoming ever harder for ordinary Americans to get jobs, or keep them.

"And there's a good chance things will get a lot worse; with markets sliding, consumers wilting, businesses fearful about the effects of war and oil prices rising, the pieces are in place for a full-blown double-dip recession. And the second dip would take us much further down than the first."

I think this is of a major concern to me. The President identifies that we have an economic problem, that we have an economic downturn, and he says that he is going to do something about it, but what is he actually proposing? The heart of his economic proposal or package is eliminating the tax on corporate dividends, eliminating the tax on essentially the stock market dividends.

Americans know that is not going to accomplish anything. It is not going to do anything to stimulate the economy. It is not going to put money in people's pockets or create jobs. So again, there is a credibility gap. There is recognition on the part of the President that there is a problem with the economy, but the actions that he seeks to take, unfortunately, will not correct the problem.

The President talks about homeland security. He talks about the war on terrorism, both internationally and here at home, but as my colleague from California earlier this morning pointed out, money is not going back to the States and the localities for homeland security. Money is not going back for civil defense or to help the localities or the people that were affected in New Jersey, in my case, directly by the World Trade Center. Many of our towns are complaining that they are not getting the promised funding to deal with the homeland security problem.

The President last year talked about how the deficit was going to be small, but we know that his economic plan will cause huge deficits. We are told if we implement his economic stimulus package and we make the tax cuts permanent that he proposed last year, and we have to fight a war in Iraq, we may end up with a deficit that is over \$2 trillion.

Think about what the President says about veterans. He promises to be a champion for our veterans, but he cuts funding for VA health clinics, forcing 164,000 veterans to be turned away.

He promises that he is going to expand Medicare to include a drug benefit, but instead of actually doing something now to make a difference for seniors, he blocks generic drug legislation that will lower costs for seniors and for those who want to have access to lower-priced drugs right now.

Mr. Speaker, on every one of these issues, look at what the President says tonight. In many cases it is misleading and false promises. It is a credibility gap that we are facing in terms of what he says he is going to do as opposed to what he actually does in these very troubled times.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at noon.

PRAYER

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

As we anticipate the President's State of the Union Address to Congress and the Nation this evening, come let us approach the Lord with praise and thanksgiving. With all humility, let us approach the Lord.

Come, Members of the House and Senate, all who work on Capitol Hill, all Americans, come. Let us join together in honest prayer for our President, George W. Bush, our country, and the world, which watches us with great expectations.

If, in themselves, the awesome tasks of leadership in our times, the great responsibility of homeland defense and efforts to end terrorism around the world do not humble us before the Lord, let us approach the Lord on an even deeper level of faith says the Psalmist.

Trusting in the Lord's continued goodness and guidance, let us approach the Lord with praise and thanksgiving.

As Americans, let us humbly praise God for all His blessings throughout our history. Let us thank God for our three branches of accountable government, our brave military forces and the common sense of people who desire a more perfect Union, and so establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and posterity.

Forever will we praise and thank You, O Lord. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that the practice of reserving seats prior to the joint session by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

DESIGNATING MAJORITY MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 33) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 33

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

Committee on Agriculture: Mr. Combest; Mr. Boehner; Mr. Pombo; Mr. Smith of Michigan; Mr. Everett; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Jenkins; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Ose; Mr. Hayes; Mr. Pickering; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Pence; Mr. Rehberg; Mr. Graves; Mr. Putnam; Mr. Janklow; Mr. Burns; Mr. Bonner; Mr. Rogers of Alabama; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Chocola; Mrs. Musgrave and Mr. Nunes.

Committee on Appropriations: Mr. Regula; Mr. Lewis of California; Mr. Rogers of Kentucky; Mr. Wolf; Mr. Kolbe; Mr. Walsh; Mr. Taylor of North Carolina; Mr. Hobson; Mr. Istook; Mr. Bonilla; Mr. Knollenberg; Mr. Kingston; Mr. Frelinghuysen; Mr. Wicker; Mr. Nethercutt; Mr. Cunningham; Mr. Tiahrt; Mr. Wamp; Mr. Latham; Mrs. Northup; Mr. Aderholt; Mrs. Emerson; Ms. Granger; Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania; Mr. Goode; Mr. Doolittle; Mr. LaHood; Mr. Sweeney; Mr. Vitter; Mr. Sherwood; Mr. Weldon of Florida; Mr. Simpson; Mr. Culberson; Mr. Kirk and Mr. Crenshaw.

Committee on Armed Services: Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Saxton; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Everett; Mr. Bartlett; Mr. McKeon; Mr. Thornberry; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. Gibbons; Mr. Hayes; Mrs. Wilson of New Mexico; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Simmons; Mrs. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia; Mr. Schrock; Mr. Akin; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Cole; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire; Mr. Bishop of Utah; Mr. Turner of Ohio; Mr. Kline; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Gingrey; Mr. Rogers of Alabama and Mr. Franks of Arizona.

Committee on the Budget: Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Thornberry; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. Toomey; Mr. Hastings of Washington; Mr. Schrock; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mr. Putnam; Mr. Tancredo; Mr. Bonner, Mr. Franks of Arizona; Mr. Garrett; Mr. Barrett of South Carolina; Mr. McCotter; Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida and Mr. Hensarling.

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Mr. Petri; Mr. Ballenger; Mr. Hoekstra; Mr. McKeon; Mr. Castle; Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Mr. Greenwood; Mr. Souder; Mr. Norwood; Mr. Upton; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. DeMint; Mr. Isakson; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Platts; Mr. Tiberi; Mr. Keller; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Wilson of South Carolina; Mr. Cole; Mr. Porter; Mr. Kline; Mr. Carter; Mrs. Musgrave and Mrs. Blackburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Mr. Bilirakis; Mr. Barton of Texas; Mr. Upton; Mr. Stearns; Mr. Gillmor; Mr. Greenwood; Mr. Cox; Mr. Deal of Georgia; Mr. Burr; Mr. Whitfield; Mr. Norwood; Mrs. Cubin; Mr. Shimkus; Mrs. Wilson of New Mexico; Mr. Shadegg; Mr. Pickering; Mr. Fossella; Mr. Blunt; Mr. Buyer; Mr. Radanovich; Mr. Bass; Mr. Pitts; Mrs. Bono; Mr. Walden of Oregon; Mr. Terry; Mr. Fletcher; Mr. Ferguson; Mr. Rogers of Michigan; Mr. Issa and Mr. Otter.

Committee on Financial Services: Mr. Leach; Mr. Bereuter; Mr. Baker; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Castle; Mr. King of New York; Mr. Royce; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mr. Ney; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Paul; Mr. Gillmor; Mr. Ryun of Kansas; Mr. LaTourette; Mr. Manzullo; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mr. Ose; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Green of Wisconsin; Mr. Toomey; Mr. Shays; Mr. Shadegg; Mr. Fossella; Mr. Gary Miller of California; Ms. Hart; Mrs. Capito; Mr. Tiberi; Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota; Mr. Feeney; Mr. Hensarling; Mr. Garrett; Mr. Murphy; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida; Mr. Barrett of South Carolina; Ms. Harris and Mr. Renzi.

Committee on Government Reform: Mr. Burton; Mr. Shays; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Mica; Mr. Souder; Mr. LaTourette; Mr. Ose; Mr. Lewis of Kentucky; Mrs. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia; Mr. Platts; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Putnam; Mr. Schrock; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Sullivan; Mr. Deal of Georgia; Mrs. Miller of Michigan; Mr. Murphy; Mr. Turner of Ohio; Mr. Carter; Mr. Janklow; and Mrs. Blackburn.

Committee on International Relations: Mr. Leach; Mr. Bereuter; Mr. Smith of New Jersey; Mr. Burton of Indiana; Mr. Gallegly; Ms. Ros-Lehtinen; Mr. Ballenger; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Royce; Mr. King of New York; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Houghton; Mr. McHugh; Mr. Tancredo; Mr. Paul; Mr. Smith of Michigan; Mr. Pitts; Mr. Flake; Mrs. Jo Ann Davis of Virginia; Mr. Green of Wisconsin; Mr. Weller; Mr. Pence; Mr. McCotter; Mr. Janklow and Ms. Harris.

Committee on the Judiciary: Mr. Hyde; Mr. Coble; Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Goodlatte; Mr. Chabot; Mr. Jenkins; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Bachus; Mr. Hostettler; Mr. Green of Wisconsin; Mr. Keller; Ms. Hart; Mr. Flake; Mr. Pence; Mr. Forbes; Mr. King of Iowa; Mr. Carter; Mr. Feeney and Mrs. Blackburn.

Committee on Resources: Mr. Young of Alaska; Mr. Tauzin; Mr. Saxton; Mr. Gallegly; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Hefley; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Calvert; Mr. McInnis; Mrs. Cubin; Mr. Radanovich; Mr. Jones of North Carolina; Mr. Cannon; Mr. Peterson of Pennsylvania; Mr. Gibbons; Mr. Souder; Mr. Walden of Oregon; Mr. Tancredo; Mr. Hayworth; Mr. Osborne; Mr. Flake; Mr. Rehberg; Mr. Renzi; Mr. Cole; Mr. Pearce; Mr. Bishop of Utah and Mr. Nunes.

Committee on Science: Mr. Smith of Texas; Mr. Shays; Mr. Weldon of Pennsylvania; Mr. Rohrabacher; Mr. Barton of Texas; Mr. Calvert; Mr. Smith of Michigan; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Gutknecht; Mr. Nethercutt; Mr. Lucas of Oklahoma; Mrs. Biggert; Mr. Akin; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Ms. Hart; Mr. Sullivan; Mr. Forbes; Mr. Gingrey; Mr. Bishop of Utah; Mr. Burgess and Mr. Bonner.

Committee on Small Business: Mr. Combest; Mr. Bartlett of Maryland; Mrs. Kelly;

Mr. Chabot; Mr. Toomey; Mr. DeMint; Mr. Graves; Mr. Schrock; Mr. Akin; Mrs. Capito; Mr. Shuster; Mrs. Musgrave; Mr. Franks of Arizona; Mr. Gerlach; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire and Mr. Beauprez.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Mr. Petri; Mr. Boehlert; Mr. Coble; Mr. Duncan; Mr. Gilchrest; Mr. Mica; Mr. Hoekstra; Mr. Quinn; Mr. Ehlers; Mr. Bachus; Mr. LaTourette; Mrs. Kelly; Mr. Baker; Mr. Ney; Mr. LoBiondo; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Gary Miller of California; Mr. DeMint; Mr. Bereuter; Mr. Isakson; Mr. Hayes; Mr. Simmons; Mrs. Capito; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mr. Johnson of Illinois; Mr. Rehberg; Mr. Platts; Mr. Graves; Mr. Kennedy of Minnesota; Mr. Shuster; Mr. Boozman; Mr. Sullivan; Mr. Chocola; Mr. Beauprez; Mr. Burgess; Mr. Burns; Mr. Pearce; Mr. Gerlach; Mr. Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida and Mr. Porter.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Mr. Bilarakis; Mr. Everett; Mr. Buyer; Mr. Quinn; Mr. Stearns; Mr. Moran of Kansas; Mr. Gibbons; Mr. Baker; Mr. Simmons; Mr. Brown of South Carolina; Mr. Miller of Florida; Mr. Boozman; Mr. Bradley of New Hampshire; Mr. Beauprez; Ms. Ginny Brown-Waite of Florida and Mr. Renzi.

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Crane; Mr. Shaw; Mrs. Johnson of Connecticut; Mr. Houghton; Mr. Herger; Mr. McCrery; Mr. Camp; Mr. Ramstad; Mr. Nussle; Mr. Sam Johnson of Texas; Ms. Dunn; Mr. Collins; Mr. Portman; Mr. English; Mr. Hayworth; Mr. Weller; Mr. Hulshof; Mr. McInnis; Mr. Lewis of Kentucky; Mr. Foley; Mr. Brady of Texas; Mr. Ryan of Wisconsin and Mr. Cantor.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKING CLEAR THE RESOLVE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it was written long ago that without a vision, the people perish. Tonight, the President of the United States from this very Chamber will offer a vision of moral clarity and purpose and resolve for the American people and the world.

It will be resolve to see our war on terror through to its just conclusion and protect our people; it will be resolve against any rogue state who, through its weapons or associations, threatens our peace and security; it will be resolve to renew our economy during struggling recessionary times and resolve to renew our cities through a faith-based initiative; and it will be resolve to keep our promises to seniors in reforming and expanding Medicare.

The President will describe our challenges at home and abroad as clear; but this President, Mr. Speaker, will make the resolve of the American people to overcome these challenges clearer still.

WEAKENING TITLE IX NOT AN OPTION

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn any weakening of Title IX.

This week a national commission will vote on various proposals to reform Title IX for the Secretary of Education, Rod Paige. Since 1972, Title IX has made landmark strides to prohibit sex discrimination in education and to reverse discrimination against women in collegiate sports. However, under one proposal, women would be given only 43 percent of collegiate scholarships versus the 55 percent of enrollment in universities.

Critics of Title IX are saying that the law should be revised according to female interest. However, since its enactment, athletic participation by women in college has increased five times, despite the lack of resources devoted to make it an attractive thing to do.

Title IX has been a cornerstone for improvements for women not just in sports, but in key areas such as standardized testing, higher education and math and science employment. Until women are equal in all areas, weakening of Title IX should not be an option.

TRIBUTE TO MONIQUE BROWN

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, just last week a beautiful young woman named Monique Brown died and went home to be with her Maker. Monique worked in my office as my legislative correspondent.

A month ago Monique was released from the hospital just in time to get married, giving her husband Christopher the opportunity to love her and care for her at home. He did so with amazing integrity and dedication. But then Monique returned to the hospital, where she fell into a coma and soon passed away.

Mr. Speaker, Monique was only 23 years old. She had a strong faith, and, though she wanted to live, the prospect of dying did not frighten her at all.

In Psalm 39 David wrote, "Show me, O Lord, my life's end and the number of my days; let me know how fleeting is my life.

"You have made my days a mere handbreadth; the span of my years is as nothing before You.

"But now, Lord, what do I look for? My hope is in You."

Monique's hope was always in the Lord, but she does not need to hope anymore. She is now with her Lord.

SADDAM HUSSEIN, A SERIOUS THREAT TO THE WORLD

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, when we think of terrorism, we often limit our thoughts to just Afghanistan, but we must not forget the despicable role Iraq has played in supporting, training and harboring international terrorist organizations.

There are many reasons why Iraq is no friend to the free world. There are many reasons why Saddam Hussein poses a detrimental threat to the United States and the entire world.

It has been said time and time again that Iraq possesses chemical and biological weapons and that Saddam is ready and willing to use his arsenal against innocent civilians, even his own people. Just imagine what would happen if Saddam gave these weapons, capable of killing entire populations, to terrorists like the al Qaeda.

We cannot bury our heads in the sand and say, "Oh, he wouldn't do that." Saddam Hussein has lied to the words for over a decade and continues to defy the United Nations. He not only provides a safe harbor for terrorists, but provides them with state-of-the-art training camps. He cannot be trusted. He poses a serious threat to the United States, and he must be disarmed to protect the freedom and lives of Americans.

COMMENDING ANOTHER YEAR OF PRESIDENT BUSH'S LEADERSHIP

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, President Bush has shown courageous leadership on many fronts since his last State of the Union Address a year ago.

In November, the President moved forward in the war on terrorism by securing a unanimous vote by the United Nations Security Council to force Saddam Hussein to disarm. Day by day, these inspectors uncover more evidence of Iraq's noncompliance and continued threat to Americans and our allies. As a result, President Bush is building a coalition to secure a regime change in Iraq. On this issue, the President is not just leading America, he is leading the freedom-loving world.

The President continues to work with our allies to capture al Qaeda terrorists wherever they may be hiding, and he has pushed for the creation of a new Department of Homeland Security.

I applaud the President for his leadership and inspiration to the American people, and I know tonight's State of the Union Address will send a message to the world that America is strong, united, determined and prepared to take on the challenges of 2003.

RECOGNIZING THE MERCURY RED-BONE CELEBRITY TOURNAMENT SERIES AND GARY AND SUSAN ELLIS

(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. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Mercury Red Bone Celebrity Tournament and their founders, Gary and Susan Ellis, members of my Congressional district, for their outstanding commitment to the fight against cystic fibrosis.

On March 15 of this year, Mercury Redbone and the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation will hold their fourth annual 10K Walk to Pigeon Key. The walk will benefit the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, an organization dedicated to the fight and the cure of this disease. Cystic fibrosis is the number one genetic killer of children and young adults in our country, and thousands of people have it.

Please join me in thanking the Ellis family and Redbone for their commitment to this noble cause.

PROMOTING RURAL HEALTH CARE ACCESS

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

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting efforts to adequately address one of the most vulnerable aspects of the health care system, rural America.

This very minute, over 60 million rural Americans live with the risk of being without critical health care services. We must make sure that we have meaningful health care reform, guaranteeing all Americans access.

In my home State of West Virginia, 50 of the 55 counties are designated as "medically underserved." In addition, physicians in our State, like many other States, are experiencing a medical liability crisis that threatens to deprive us of critical care specialists. This situation has the makings of a "perfect storm."

Whether you live in New York City or Moorefield, West Virginia, we should all have access to proper health care. From ambulance service to community health centers to hospitals to nursing homes, millions of Americans are counting on us to make sure that rural health care delivery systems will be there for us when we truly need them.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 13, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 29 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 29

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 13) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the joint resolution equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon receipt of a message from the Senate transmitting House Joint Resolution 2 with a Senate amendment thereto, it shall be in order to consider in the House a motion offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and request or agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

□ 1215

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose 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 the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 29 is a closed rule providing for the consideration of a very straightforward 1-week continuing resolution. The continuing resolution itself, H.J. Res. 13, makes further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003. The rule provides that H.J. Res. 13 will be debatable in the House for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The rule waives all points of order in consideration of H.J. Res. 13, and it provides 1 motion to recommit the underlying measure.

I want to note that section 2 of the resolution provides that upon receiving a message from the Senate transmitting H.J. Res. 2 with a Senate amendment, it shall be in order to consider in the House a motion by the Committee on Appropriations chairman or his designee that the House disagree to the Senate amendment and request or agree to a conference with the Senate. This provision in this section of the report is necessary to permit the Committee on Appropriations chairman the authority to offer a motion to go to conference on the omnibus appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clean continuing resolution that will ensure that the United States Government remains open through February 7 and that all Americans who are expecting any kind of Federal benefit, a Social Security check, Medicare payments, or veterans benefits will continue to do so without interruption.

While we can debate the substance of the continuing resolution in subsequent general debate, I will note that as negotiations continue on the overall appropriations package, this continuing resolution will make sure that ongoing programs are continued at current rates under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2002, except for the defense and military construction bills that have already been enacted into law. Current funding expires at midnight on Friday, without action on the continuing resolution that this rule permits. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this rule so that we may proceed to consideration of the continuing resolution and ensure that the Federal Government remains open until February 7.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, two important things will happen today on the floor of this House. First, we will debate and pass yet another continuing resolution, the eighth temporary stopgap measure for a fiscal year that began almost 4 months ago. This continuing resolution represents an abdication of responsibility that has become almost run-of-the-mill under Republican control. Today's resolution, which extends the date of the current CR through February 7, means that Republicans will be 4 months late in addressing priorities like homeland security and the economy. America is struggling through dangerous, uncertain times; but the Republican Congress may as well still be on vacation.

Republican leaders are hoping this shameful failure will be obscured by today's second important event: the President's State of the Union address. The Republican majority is expecting to hide behind the glib rhetoric we have all come to expect from President Bush.

But political slogans only go so far, especially in the face of the wide and growing credibility gap facing a Republican Party that has spent the past 2 years saying one thing and doing another. And no matter how eloquent President Bush may be tonight, words alone cannot fix the primary problem this Republican government has created for the Nation at this difficult time.

Simply put, there are two states of the Union in America today. For the vast majority of Americans, these are difficult and anxious times; but for the Republican politicians and the privileged few they represent, like the corporate lobbyists invited to the White House today for a special sneak preview of the State of the Union, the good times just keep on coming.

It is a tragedy, Mr. Speaker; but it is the truth. Just take a look around the country. We will see hard-working

Americans struggling to make it through the weakest economy in a generation. Since President Bush took office, 2.3 million private sector jobs have been lost, the worst jobs record for any President since the end of World War II. The unemployment rate is stuck at a 6-year high. We will see millions of Americans whose retirement plans have been crushed by the fall of the stock market. The Dow dropped below 8,000 again yesterday; and overall, the market has lost trillions of dollars in value since President Bush took office. We will see firefighters and police officers who still sit exposed on the front lines of homeland defense, desperate for help from this Congress. It has been nearly a year and a half since September 11, but Republicans have done shockingly little to increase America's defenses here at home.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have fought for these priorities. We have proposed economic stimulus plans to create at least 1 million new jobs this year, put money and purchasing power in the hands of consumers, and provide relief to struggling small businesses; and we have tried time and again to make Americans safer at home by meeting critical homeland security needs.

Unfortunately for the American people, Mr. Speaker, Republicans have the power in Washington, and just take a look at the government they control. We will see an out-of-touch Republican Congress that arrogantly refuses to do the job they have been elected to do: address critical needs like homeland security and education. Republicans will not help firefighters or increase port security, but they have relaxed their own ethics rules in the House of Representatives. Mr. Speaker, we will see a Republican Party that has but one answer for every problem: budget-busting tax breaks for millionaires that will do nothing to stimulate the economy this year. Soldiers and firefighters are putting their lives on the line to keep Americans safe at home, and President Bush is pushing \$90,000 tax breaks for everyone making \$1 million or more a year. Middle-class Americans are struggling through the worst economy in a generation, but the Bush plan would provide half of all tax-payers with less than \$100.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Republicans just do not understand the real state of the Union for the vast majority of America, because if they did, they would not insist on sacrificing the security interests of all Americans to pay for tax breaks for the most privileged few. That is just wrong. It is time that Republicans stopped stiffing homeland security to pay for tax breaks for millionaires, and it is time they stopped using their political power to divide this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, last week I attended a mobilization ceremony for a reservist in Grand Prairie Texas who had been called to active duty. These brave men

and women are making a great sacrifice for their country, leaving their families and jobs to support our troops overseas. I was struck by their courage and by their willingness to put aside their own personal concerns to serve their country. That spirit of unity and sacrifice has made America great for the past 2 centuries. I hope it is the spirit President Bush remembers tonight during his State of the Union and that the Republican Congress puts into practice so that we can finally address our economic and homeland security challenges.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, after 9-11, it became obvious to all of us, I think on both sides of the aisle, that we needed to equip the people at the local level who will respond to terrorist attacks with the best equipment that we could possibly find to make certain their equipment was compatible and safe enough to do the job. For reasons that I find difficult to fathom, the White House has resisted efforts to do that on four separate occasions.

The first example is what happened on the supplemental a year ago. After 9-11, the committee, on both sides of the aisle, agreed that we ought to add more money for first responders, and we tried to do that. The White House strenuously resisted. In fact, at one point the President personally told us that he would veto one dime more than the White House had appropriated for homeland security items. Despite that fact, on a bipartisan basis, the House and the Senate approved \$400 million in funding for first responders in that supplemental.

Then, last year, in their second supplemental which the administration sent up, they still provided no request for first responders. Again, the House and the Senate, acting on a bipartisan basis in both Houses provided, after much White House resistance, \$551 million for first responders for firemen, for policemen, and the other folks at the local level who are our first line of defense against terrorist attacks in our communities. The President vetoed \$350 million of that \$500 million.

Finally, the administration did request \$3.5 billion for first responders in the regular 2003 appropriations bill, but it then proceeded to back the political strategy in the House that prevented the veterans under the VA-HUD bill from coming to the floor; and it prevented the State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill from coming to the floor. As a result, neither of those bills which were supposed to contain funding for first responders, neither of those bills passed. And then, when the continuing resolution finally passed, which was supposed to contain \$650 million for first responders, the White House saw to it that the agency would not apportion that money among the States and localities.

So after we have that track record, the White House resistance to bipartisan congressional support for adding money for first responders, the White House chief of staff went on national television last Sunday, Mr. Card did, and told Mr. Russert, the moderator, and the entire country that the only reason first responders were not getting their money is because the Congress had not done its job.

Baloney. In capital letters, BALONEY.

The fact is that both political parties, on a bipartisan basis in both the House and the Senate, on four separate occasions tried to meet our responsibilities in providing the funding that was needed for first responders and, the White House, in each of those instances, either flatly rejected the money or saw to it that they would use their power in order to squeeze down the amount of money that we wanted to provide for those initiatives.

So now, what I am going to urge Members to do when we get to the resolution today is to vote for a motion which we will offer which restores that needed money for first responders.

It is time for two things to happen: it is time for the White House to stop peddling fiction about why the first responders at the local level do not have badly needed money to deal with terrorism problems at the local level; and, secondly, it is time for us to actually get the money out to them so that we do not have to sit, the next time we have a terrorist attack saying, gee whiz, I wish we had done something.

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

Mr. LINDER. 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.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 13, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule just adopted, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 13) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 13 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 13

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-229 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof “February 7, 2003.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 29, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us, H.J. Resolution 13, is a continuing resolution to continue to allow the government to operate through February 7th of this year. This is merely a date extension. It does not change anything else. We have not added any anomalies to those that were previously agreed to.

We need to pass this CR today for one very simple reason. If I can just go back quickly and remember, the last CR we passed, we actually passed two CRs, one that was sent to the President to allow the government to continue to function, and the other that was sent to the other body to be used as a vehicle for the final appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003.

The other body has now worked its will on that CR. They have added to it, the remaining 11 appropriation bills that had not been concluded prior to the adjournment of the 107th Congress. We are still awaiting the paperwork from the other body so that we can appoint conferees and go to conference on that package.

I would say to my friends that there are many differences between the Senate version of this appropriations bill and the House version, so there will have to be a conference.

If we can receive those papers expeditiously, like today or tomorrow, we will move to go to conference immediately. Some of the pre-conference work has already been done, but there is still a lot more to be done, so we are anxious to receive the papers. But since we are not to that point yet in the process, we do need this CR to keep the government up and running until February 7th.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spend just a moment or two discussing how we got to this place, and then repeat for emphasis what I just said on the rule, so people understand what it is we are going to be trying to do here today.

We are really in the situation where, well into the fiscal year, we have yet to pass 11 of the 13 appropriation bills,

primarily because the budget resolution that was brought to this House floor in the first instance unrealistically stated what the needs of the country would be, or the congressional estimate of what those needs would be. So to try to keep the session moving anyway, the majority party brought out two appropriation bills. Then the system just sort of fell apart because of the unreality of the budget resolution, and we have been stuck with no other appropriation bills becoming law, so we have been operating on continuing resolutions.

I would ask the gentleman, is this continuing resolution number 13? Something like that. I have lost track, we have had so many of them.

Now we are supposed to pass yet another continuing resolution so that the House and Senate have more time in order to put together an omnibus appropriation bill which will at long last produce funding for all of the domestic agencies in the Federal Government. So this proposal is here to give us another week to get that work done.

Mr. Speaker, we have two questions left. Number 1 is, what is the appropriate funding for those appropriation bills; and number 2, when are we going to get it done? As far as I know, we still do not have paper on this side of the Capitol, so we still do not know what the Senate has done in detail.

This proposal before us now simply keeps the government open. The question is, what level of funding should we have in this short-term CR? We believe that, in addition to the funding that is being provided under the resolution being brought to the floor by the gentleman from Florida, we ought to add another \$3.5 billion to fund the first responders, so that our policemen and our firemen and our public health people can get about the business of protecting us at the local level. We cannot expect State governments to provide this money, because they are in massive deficits all around the country. If we do not provide it, it is not going to get provided.

The second thing we want to do is to provide \$90 million to Centers for Disease Control for baseline health screening, so we can do a long-term assessment of the health exposure experienced by first providers at the Pentagon and in New York on 9-11 when they ran into the combat zone, so to speak, and experienced an assault by many chemicals, some of which were suspected of being highly toxic.

So that is what we want to do. As I said, I think it is especially important to do this in light of the misstatement by the White House Chief of Staff on national television last week. Last week, as I said in my earlier remarks, Mr. Card, the White House Chief of Staff, told Tim Russert, the moderator of Meet the Press, that the reason that the first responders did not have the money that they needed was because Congress had not acted on the money and had tied it up.

I found that especially quaint given the fact that the President vetoed the lion's share of the money that we provided for first responders in the supplemental last year, money which would have gone through to the local communities if the administration had not vetoed bipartisan congressional efforts. So what we see is that on four occasions, as I said earlier, the White House has either blocked or resisted bipartisan efforts in both Houses to provide additional money for first responders.

I will ask the House at the proper time today to approve this motion to recommit so that we can add this funding. I want to point out that it will still keep us within the Republican budget resolution. We will still have over \$1 billion head room in the Republican budget resolution if we add this amendment, because the continuing resolution is operating at a funding level significantly below that Republican funding resolution.

So I do not want to hear any claptrap on the floor today about how we are busting the budget with this motion. We are not; we are staying within the confines of the Republican budget resolution. But within that, we are saying it is time, it is time to deliver the money that the first responders thought they were going to get a long time ago, so we can get about the business, for a change, of dealing with substantive problems, rather than ping-ponging political arguments while we send no money to the people who are going to be on the front lines if we have any further terrorist attacks.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on the issue of first-line responders, I was a former Baltimore County Executive. Baltimore County is a county of over 750,000 people. The Second District that I represent has BWI Airport and the Port of Baltimore. We are very much concerned about the issue of the monies being put into the budget as it relates to first responders.

One of the most important issues that we have if there is another terrorist attack, which we understand there will be, is that we need to be prepared. Our police officers and our firefighters are the first responders. Not only do they need to be protected themselves, but if they are not protected, they will not be able to protect our citizens.

So we urge the President and urge Congress to move forward with the monies that are necessary to make sure that we secure our homeland.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to walk through once more what the record is with respect to dealing with this problem.

Right after 9-11, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and I went down

to the White House. He and I and our staff chiefs, when we were locked out of our offices because of the anthrax scare, he and I went downtown to the White House after we had spent a week talking to every security agency in town, virtually, trying to find out what they thought the needs were on the homeland security front.

We went down to the White House, expecting to have a give-and-take discussion about what additional funding we ought to provide. We ran smack into the President of the United States, who walked into the room, shook hands, sat down, and then said, and I am paraphrasing, but this is pretty close, he said, well, I understand some of you want to provide more money for homeland security; but I want you to know that my good friend, Mitch Daniels, tells me that we have more than enough money in the budget for our request. I want you to know if Congress spends one dime more on homeland security than we have asked for in our budget, I will veto the bill. Now I have time for four or five comments, and then I have to get out of here. That is what he said.

So when my turn came, I expressed my lack of enthusiasm to that kind of rigid response, and I proceeded to ask the President a number of questions about security threats to a number of Federal installations, threats which were serious and classified. We urged the President to reconsider.

In the end, over White House opposition, this Congress on a bipartisan basis provided \$4 billion additional money for homeland security, including, I believe, about \$400 million for first responders. Then last year in the spring supplemental, as I indicated earlier, the White House asked for no additional money for first responders; so no money for our policemen, no money for our firemen, no money for our public health people.

The House and Senate worked again on a bipartisan basis, and we provided \$551 million in that supplemental. The President vetoed \$350 million of that amount. Then finally the administration slowly awoke, and it provided \$3.5 billion in their budget request for 2003; but then they cooperated in a procedure that prevented that money from ever becoming law, because they agreed with the procedure that kept the VA-HUD bill and the State-Justice-Commerce bill from ever coming to the floor.

So now we are operating under a continuing resolution which provides \$650 million, far less than we need for first responders. We need several billion more. Yet, even after the administration had that authority to spend the money, they refused to allocate the money to the States. They have been fiddling around about proposed formula changes, rather than getting the stuff out there so we can accelerate our preparedness at the local level.

If Members think we are ready for another attack, I invite them to read

the report of the Rudman-Hart Commission, which spells out that we are still mortally unprepared to deal with local attacks.

□ 1245

So now we are faced with this situation, and despite the fact that the track record clearly shows that the administration has been resistant to congressional efforts to provide assistance to first responders, the White House Chief of Staff has told the country that it is the Congress that has not provided the money, when in fact the Congress on three occasions did provide the money or tried to and on each of those occasions the White House resisted.

So what we will be asking the House to do is to provide this additional funding: the \$3.5 billion to first responders and the \$90 million for the epidemiological studies of the health impacts on the firemen and police personnel who had to respond at the Pentagon and in New York after 9-11. And we would remind our friends on both sides of the aisle that this does not bust the budget. If you vote for our amendment, it will still keep us within the Republican budget resolution which seems to be so important on that side of the aisle.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do so to explain to the Members that first responders are extremely important to dealing with any kind of a terrorist attack that might occur anywhere in the United States of America. And we will be addressing the issue of first responders when we do the final appropriations bill, which I have talked about in my opening remarks. But I want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) because he has been very personally involved in identifying not only the needs of first responders but the needs of existing security agencies, and police agencies. And as he pointed out, he and I both did a very thorough survey of all of the needs of those agencies, especially the FBI, for example. Those will be the things that we will be addressing very shortly in the final appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003. I appreciate his interests and I know they are genuine, but we are going to deal with them in the regular order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the distinguished ranking member for raising the point about the first responders. And I want to say as a member of the committee I certainly want to do everything I can to support addressing this issue with the first responders. It is very important. And yet at the same time, I think we need to go ahead and pass this resolution today

because, Mr. Speaker, it is unfinished business, unfinished from last Congress. There were a lot of dynamics that kept us from passing it. Frankly, it kind of got away from the Committee on Appropriations, otherwise, I think we would not be standing here today.

But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, we need to get this off the table so that we can move on to other things, addressing the economy, addressing Iraq, addressing Medicare and a prescription drug benefit, some of the things that I hope the President will talk about tonight when he addresses this Chamber.

One of the things I want to mention is in terms of the situation in the Middle East, and I guess people are reading what Mr. Blix and the weapons inspectors' report is, and they are spinning it their own way for their own convenience and their own purposes; but it is very clear that it is a very difficult question that Saddam Hussein has had weapons of mass destruction, terrorist and biological weapons. And the question is not so much, well, he won the scavenger hunt, but did he prove that he has disarmed. And I think most people will agree that that has not been proven.

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, because in my district a week ago I stood dock side at Savanna, Georgia, and then boarded a ship called the U.S.S. *Mendonca*, which was named after Private Leroy Mendonca, who was killed in the Korean conflict on July 4, 1951, who was a member of the Third Infantry Division. That ship is a special cargo roll-on, roll-off ship that was loading along with its sister ship about 450,000 square feet of tanks, Humvees, personnel movers and helicopters, on their way to destinations not clearly known.

A few days later I stood at the dais at Hunter Air Field and watched some of America's youngest, finest and most experienced and some of the older soldiers boarding airplanes going off to Kuwait. As I shook those soldiers' hands, and I went out there a couple of times, and I want to say parenthetically, great work is being done by a group called Southern Smiles, the U.S.O., and the Red Cross in terms of giving these soldiers some very needed personal items, but as I stood there and said good-bye to these soldiers I thought, they are going off to do their job, and now it is our turn and my turn as a Member of Congress to go off and do my job in Washington, D.C. and that is to protect the country as we see it from our standpoint, often through legislation and usually through appropriations. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is so important that we get this bill finished up so that we can start the appropriations process once more for the coming term with a special eye to the troops overseas, and not just in the Middle East, but all over the globe.

We have a very troubled universe as we know it, but we have got to get our modernization continued. We have to

have our troops ready for any contingency, and we have to have the quality of life of soldiers in mind at all times.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this House to support this resolution and let us get on with next year's business.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Let me simply say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) that as far as I am concerned he has done everything humanly possible to try to see to it that we could provide the needed money to first responders. He tried that a year ago on the supplemental when he was pushed into backing away by the White House and by his own leadership, but we still got \$4 billion additional homeland security money in that bill despite the resistance of the White House. And he also worked with us cooperatively to see to it that we had more money in the supplemental this previous summer for homeland security and for first responders. Again, the White House vetoed those efforts, so I congratulate the gentleman for his efforts. I just wish that the White House had been responsive to them. If they had, we would not be sitting here now worrying about the fact that they still do not have dime one that they need at the local level.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their diligent efforts in trying to adequately fund our homeland security needs. And I think what this motion to recommit is all about on this floor today is to try to ensure that we do that promptly.

I think we all know that September 11 was a declaration of war by terrorists against the United States. It was an unprecedented cruelty perpetrated against the American people that foreshadowed a new age in our country, a new kind of war, a new challenge. And this motion to recommit seeks to make good our response to that challenge.

We clearly confront an enemy that lurks in the shadows, runs from battle; and we must be willing to make the necessary changes in our budgeting and the necessary sacrifices as a people to ensure that this new kind of war is won and won decisively by the United States.

Today the frontline of the war on terror is found in places like the airports in Boston, the hospitals in Houston, the ports of Los Angeles. Those who fight this war for America are the police officers, the firefighters, the health care workers. They are the first on to respond to any kind of attack on our homeland, and they will be there to respond to those attacks.

Mr. Speaker, in this new kind of war, the struggle to end an effort by a cruel and merciless foe, we know that victory will not come out without a dedication on our part to seeing this battle through. The keys to victory are vigilance, preparedness and perseverance;

and that is why it is also important today to recommit this bill to ensure that we put the necessary money in the bill now to fund these very, very legitimate needs.

I heard a State senator from my home State yesterday who said, Is homeland security going to be another unfunded mandate to the States? The answer to that should be clearly no. It is a national responsibility to protect this homeland; and the only way to do it is to put the money in the bill now to take care of these homeland security needs that I think the chairman and the ranking member of this committee both believe should be in it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct something that our colleague from Texas just said. He said that the only way to do this is to deal with it in this bill. This bill is simply a continuing resolution to keep the government functioning for another week. There will be plenty of time for this kind of debate. I think they will find plenty of support on this side of the aisle for the first responders. I do not think there is anybody over here who does not appreciate what the first responders do. But the fact of the matter is that the bill that is before us today is a continuing resolution to keep the government open. I think we all agree that that ought to happen. Nobody here, not on that side, not on this side, wants the government to shut down. So the idea that it has to be done on this bill or it will not get done is simply not true.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was assured that the gentleman said there will be debate on these appropriations. My only question is, in which fiscal year will the debate on the current appropriations occur, this one or next one? We are starting to run out of fiscal year.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, obviously there will be debate when the matter comes before the House on the bill coming back from the Senate. I suspect there will be additional debate when we take up the budget resolution and the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year. There will be adequate time both in that year and in this year to have that debate, but that is not the debate for this afternoon.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank him. I am reassured because he just said something very important and precedent setting. He said when we debate the appropri-

tions bills for the next fiscal year. We did not debate the appropriation bills for this fiscal year. So at least I will take comfort from an assurance from the majority that in the next fiscal year, unlike the current one, the House may actually debate the appropriations bills.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, well, the good news is this year the House and the Senate are under the same management. We do expect thorough debates on all of the appropriation bills this year; and more importantly, we expect for the first time in a year and a half they will actually have a budget resolution in the Senate that we can work with and that will make life easier for both of us.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing we will do it next time around for a year and a half. Meanwhile, you have gotten zip to the local people who need it the most. We were told a year ago, oh, we will do it down the line. We were told in the supplemental, oh, we will do it down the line. Now you are saying here, we will do it down the line. Do it now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to do it now. What we want to do now is get the continuing resolution off the desk and get it down to the other body and to the President. Then we will do it now on the final wrap up bill for the fiscal year 2003. And if that is not adequate to satisfy the needs of the first responders, then we will have a supplemental appropriations bill which will be before the House very shortly. And if that does not take care of everything, then we have the fiscal year 2004 appropriations bill; but I think we will get this job done pretty quickly.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned supplemental. I would suggest he call the White House and tell the President to reconsider his veto of the last supplemental that we sent to him where he denied us the ability to get \$300 million to those first responders.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman just touched a sore spot, there is no doubt about that. The Congress and the President had a little different opinion on that particular bill.

But I wanted to comment on the remarks the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) who just spoke. He said that this is a national responsibility. Mr. Speaker, protecting the homeland, being able to respond to a terrorist attack or whatever the threat might be threatens everybody, not just the national government, not just the State governments, not just

the local governments. But the response to a terrorist attack has to be a partnership.

□ 1300

The local governments have a responsibility to do things that they do far better and far more effectively than the Federal Government. We need the ability that is provided by local governments and local organizations and local first responders.

In addition, we need the partnership with the States because the States do certain things that we cannot do nearly as well, and then, of course, the Federal Government has a major responsibility. So this is not just a national obligation or responsibility. This is a partnership.

We all have to be in position to play our respective roles in responding to a terrorist attack or preventing a terrorist attack. We all have to work together. It is not just the Federal Government. And so, again, I go back to this, Mr. Speaker, let us get this continuing resolution through the House, down to the other body and to the President, and then hopefully, during that same time period, we will be able to conference the final appropriations bill for fiscal year 2003, and then we will clear the decks for a supplemental and for the 2004 appropriations business.

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

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

It does require a partnership between the local and Federal Government. The problem is the Federal Government will not come out on the dance floor and dance. They are leaving the locals out there alone. They have yet to provide one dime in new money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, it amazes me how glibly we talk about the fact that this is just another continuing resolution, we are going to do something later. When immediately after September 11, 2001, we sprang into action here, passing legislation giving the world and certainly the people of the United States that the Congress was not afraid to meet its obligations, but certainly one of the most important obligations we have is to fund the Federal Government.

Instead, we have dithered and dallied and dallied around discussing continuing resolutions. The Senate passes an omnibus bill. We will go to conference with them. We may do another CR. We just do not know. Are we going to do two budgets simultaneously? I really think it is outrageous that so little attention has been paid in the country to what has been going on here. Frankly, it distresses me that while all this is going on, we are back home in our districts when I think we should be here working.

We made promises after September 11, couple of days later, we are going to fortify our Army at home. The President and most Members of Congress went to New York to Ground Zero promising enormous amounts of help and to do something about the borders of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the borders of the United States are in disarray. I represent part of the northern border area. We are concerned all the time with the people who come across the border into Vermont and to Maine. INS told me shortly after September 11 that there were 11 million persons in the United States illegally. They did not know who they were, where they were or what they were up to.

We have a mammoth task before us, and certainly getting the Federal budget straightened out and money back to the first responders is critical.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my colleagues that I have no further requests for speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 11½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for not only yielding time, but offering this most important motion that I believe that all of us who say we want to defend the homeland should be on this floor supporting when the time comes.

Tonight the President of the United States will come before the Congress and the Nation. He will talk about the state of the Union. He will say that our economy is headed in the right direction. We believe it is headed in the wrong direction, but more importantly, in some respect, he will talk about the challenges we face abroad.

But we have two wars, Mr. President. One is the one that you seek to have us engaged in Iraq. There you are sending the greatest talent that America has to offer. You are sending an incredible amount of equipment. You are sending billions of dollars.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests that the gentleman address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the other war is here at home, and in that war, America has been left virtually defenseless, virtually defenseless. Instead of putting the best resources, the greatest opportunity to those people who I witnessed from my congressional district which sits on the west bank of the Hudson for which the World Trade

Center was, in fact, a part of the normal landscape, those who responded on that fateful day of September 11 was not the Federal Government, was not the Defense Department, was not the Federal emergency management.

No, it was police officers and firefighters and emergency management and hospitals and public health systems, and to them, we have taken many pictures, but we have done absolutely nothing about providing one red cent so that they can be prepared, God forbid, for the next attack.

Who did the CIA say was America's greatest threat? It was al Qaeda and bin Laden, the greatest threat to terrorism on domestic soil, and yet all of our focus is elsewhere, and yet the President takes picture with individuals, with our police officers, with our firefighters, and no wonder, when they have not received one red cent, they say, Mr. President, you have merely been using firefighters and their families for one big photo opportunity. The Virginia Professional Firefighters Association and others, the president of the International Association of Firefighters says, Mr. President, you are either with us or against us. You cannot have it both ways. Do not lionize our fallen brothers in one breath and then eliminate funding for our members to fight terrorism and stay safe.

There is a war here at home, and we have not prepared nor have we funded for it. I know that as I have traveled the country when I chaired the task force for House Democrats on homeland security, I can tell my colleagues that what I heard from first responders is that the plans we have on the shelf have nothing to do with chemical or biological weaponry, has nothing to do with the potential nuclear activity. We are not planning for it. We have not prepared for it, and we do not even have the equipment to deal with it.

It is time for us not to listen to the counsel of patience and delay and wait for the next attack to be prepared. It is time for us to act now. Vote for the gentleman's motion to recommit so that we can give the first responders in this country the possibility of responding to the Nation's security and the next possible attack. God forbid, we do not do this now. We have waited already too long.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire again how much time we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 8 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 18 minutes remaining and previously advised the Chair he does not have any further speakers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the rescue workers were there for us when

we needed them. The question before this body today is will we, the Federal Government, be there for them when they need us? I rise strongly in support of the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) motion to recommit that provides the necessary funding to help protect this country, but I particularly want to speak about one program that was instituted and planned to help the first responders in New York City, and that is the \$90 million proposed monitoring of health care at Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York.

The 12 million that was originally allocated will run out in July, and only a small portion of the roughly 40,000 workers, and I mean laborer, fire, construction worker, those that were exposed to these deadly, deadly toxins, have been screened.

Earlier, in a bipartisan way, we passed a supplemental, but that was vetoed, and these heroes need to be helped, and what I see is sort of the selective amnesia. When it is time to have a photo op or time to talk about heroes, everybody is there for the photo op, but when it comes to the time to allocate the money to the men and women who need the health care and need the continued services, it has not been there.

Underscoring this is an important Mt. Sinai study that came out yesterday showing the illnesses and persistent illnesses caused by 9-11, and I include it for the RECORD.

I rise in support of Representative OBEY's motion to recommit, which provides crucial funding to help protect the country.

In particular, I support the \$90 million to continue the health monitoring at Mount Sinai hospital for the men and women who were on the front lines of defense on September 11th and the days that followed.

Sixteen months after that fateful day, we must make sure that those brave men and women who entered a battle zone of a new kind of war, and are really the first victims of the war, receive the medical care they deserve.

Underscoring the need for this money was a report released yesterday by Mount Sinai hospital showing that a majority of ground zero workers and volunteers screened for health problems have serious persistent illnesses from the disaster.

The initial screening program which ends this July will screen only about 9,000 of the approximately 40,000 rescue workers in need of medical attention.

Dr. Stephen Levin and Dr. Robin Burton said the findings showed "disturbing levels of long term health problems" and that it was "alarming." The analysis reveals that over 50 percent of the sample study have pulmonary illnesses, ear, nose, and throat ailments, or persistent mental health problems.

They believe the same statistics will hold for the roughly 3,500 responders they have seen to date: 78 percent of the participants reported at least one World Trade Center-related pulmonary symptom that first developed or worsened as a result of their rescue efforts; 52 percent reported mental health symptoms requiring further evaluation; and only about one-third of the sample participants had received any

prior medical care for any of their symptoms and conditions.

In other words, for about one-third of these participants, their trip to Mount Sinai had been their only source of medical care; emphasizing the critical need to fully fund this program now, not later, not months down the road. Medical monitoring delayed is proper health care denied.

Last week Senator CLINTON, in a bipartisan effort, again successfully directed \$90 million dollars from FEMA for this purpose. But again we face the challenge of securing the House support and the Administration's support and leadership to make this happen.

These firefighters are just here to pick up their check not only for themselves, but for the ironworkers, the construction workers, laborers, rescue workers, volunteers, and their families who care deeply about their health.

Medical monitoring delayed is proper health care denied.

The rescue workers and volunteers were there for us when we needed them, now the question is will the federal government be there for them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for offering this recommit motion and implore my colleagues all to support it.

Members of the New York State delegation, both Republican and Democratic, met with retired Marine Corps General and now director of antiterrorism for the New York City Police Department Frank LiButti this morning to discuss New York City's homeland security needs.

Our needs are real, they are deep, and they are not being reflected in this budget. The President has talked a good game of protecting our first responders, but then why did he veto the medical monitoring funding of \$90 million added on a bipartisan basis by the New York delegation in the summer supplemental? Mr. Bush said it was not an emergency.

Many of my friends are firefighters. Many of those friends are conservative Republicans. They know and the entire New York City Fire Department know the people who first rushed into the World Trade Center, the people who lost over 300 of their brothers and sisters that day know that this is an emergency. Why does not our President and why does not President Bush recognize the emergency to protect my city and all of our major metropolitan areas from terrorism?

Do we rationally think that if we go to war with Iraq that al Qaeda and other terrorist groups will not strike again? The question is not if, but when. The sound bites from the White House are great, and the President, he will talk tough tonight, and the Republican leadership here will say that they are working on it, but the time for back-slapping is over. It is now time to deliver for New York City.

We have missed Osama bin Laden. We have ignored our firefighters at Ground

Zero. Let us not ignore them anymore. Let us recommit and pass the Obey supplemental bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank him for his leadership in bringing this very important motion to the floor.

I stand here beside this photograph of the first responder with the President of the United States with great pride. We can all associate ourselves with that moment. As the President embraces the firefighter, so did the entire Nation.

On September 11, the whole world watched in horror when we saw the tragedy unfolding in New York and elsewhere and resolved that we must do everything in our power to make sure that such a tragedy never happens again. We also watched in awe to see the courageous action of the first responder, the police and firemen. That is why it is so hard to understand why we even have to go through this today.

Does not the entire country agree that these firefighters and policemen, the first responders, are owed a debt of gratitude by our Nation? Do we want people to take risks to save the lives of others when we will not even fund a study to take a measure of what impact their courage may have had on their personal physical health?

In the President's State of the Union Address last year, he promised to help local communities train and equip their first responders and provide for other homeland security needs. I listened with interest as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said that this is not just a national responsibility, it is also a State and local.

□ 1315

It is indeed that. But as elected officials at the national level, our first responsibility is to protect the American people, to make this country safe. Certainly we do that jointly with the local and State governments, but they have incurred tremendous costs, \$2.6 billion as far as the municipalities are concerned; practically \$75 billion in terms of the States in order to help take up some of our national responsibility that we have not funded.

And why have we not funded it? Because the administration and the Republicans have said that, for example, the \$5 billion that was proposed in the other body as an amendment for first responders was well-intentioned but unaffordable. Well-intentioned but unaffordable. And the \$1.5 billion that Congress passed and the President refuses to spend cannot be spent because we are on a war-time budget.

How do we explain this to the American people? How do we explain it to this brave firefighter and his family, that we can afford a \$674 billion tax

cut, largely benefiting the wealthiest people in our country, but we cannot afford \$1.5 billion already passed by Congress for our law enforcement, for homeland security, and we cannot afford the well-intentioned, but unaffordable, \$5 billion for homeland security? And this amendment includes a \$90 million study.

Nothing could be clearer in terms of the need. Nothing could be more specific in terms of the remedy. Nothing challenges our conscience more that we would turn away from the first responders when they are suffering effects from the courage that we all identified with, worshipped at the shrine of, embraced, yet now we cannot do it. We are too busy giving \$674 billion largely to the wealthiest people in our country. Where are our priorities?

So tonight when the President comes to the floor to give the State of the Union address, I, like every other person in America, will welcome him with great anticipation and great respect. We all want our President to succeed. We all want to be in as much agreement with him as possible. But we cannot listen to rhetoric about first responders. We cannot look at photo ops and see the sincerity that we know is there, because our President is a sincere person, if this Congress refuses to match the compassion with the \$90 million that is necessary for this study.

I commend our colleagues from New York for bringing this to our attention and just say that this all takes place in the context of rejecting the \$5 billion; rejecting the \$90 million, rejecting the \$1.5 million, the pocket veto of the \$150 million in emergency responder grants in August of last year, and the Justice Department temporarily suspending award grants to the first responders that I already referenced, and, according to calculations, the slashing in the budget is roughly \$200 million out of the \$3.5 billion for first responders.

It just goes on and on and on. There is a consistent pattern of saying we cannot afford this. Well, if we cannot afford to come to their rescue, how can we expect them to come to ours? If we cannot afford to come to their rescue, how on Earth can we afford a \$674 billion tax cut for the wealthiest people in America?

I know that is not the sentiment of this body. I know that is not the sentiment of our distinguished chairman. So let us all follow the lead of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and get this over with quickly before more people find out what is going on on this floor today; that this House may reject this \$90 million study.

Mr. Speaker, with that I urge my colleagues to support the Obey motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms.

PELOSI) and congratulate her. This is the first chance I have had to congratulate her publicly for her ascension in a historic way to the high position of leadership of her party. However, what it means is that she has removed herself from the committee that I have the privilege of chairing. And I would say that while we did not always agree, it was always a very distinct pleasure to work with her as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. So I would say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that we will miss her, but I am sure we are going to see her a lot during the 108th Congress.

I listened to her statement, and I appreciate the fact that she used the picture, as well as the previous speaker's use of the picture, of President Bush standing alongside a firefighter at Ground Zero in New York City. President Bush responded quickly and effectively to September 11th. No one can even challenge that. I think maybe what is happening here today, while we are talking about a continuing resolution, is a lot of debate that has to do with the regular appropriations bill. Maybe we are trying to make an argument where no argument exists.

As I listened to the gentleman from New Jersey talking about the first responders at the local level, he is absolutely right. He made the point far more effectively than I did when I mentioned the importance of first responders. The people on the scene, the people in the cities, the people in the counties, are going to respond first to any event that is of a terrorist nature or a weapons-of-mass-destruction nature. They are going to respond. And they do need the support and the help of the Federal Government and of the State governments. The States have some responsibilities as well.

So we are arguing about something that doesn't really need arguing about. The problem is the motion to instruct by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be dealing with an appropriations issue and this bill is a continuing resolution, that just continues funding at last year's level. It does not create any new programs. It does not appropriate any new money. The final bill for fiscal year 2003 that we will be dealing with is available to deal with first responders.

But I want to get back to September 11th and this picture. Again, I say I appreciate the fact that the minority used the picture of President Bush, because he did respond. He responded in a local way, in a State way, in a national way, and in an international way.

Please, do not take the picture away. It encourages me when I look at it.

The President did a really good job, but he did it in partnership with the Congress. Right after September 11th occurred, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I sat down with our counterparts in the other body, and we came up with an appropriations bill, an emergency appropriations bill, of \$40 billion.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say the gentleman is correct, we did; and I was immensely proud of the House on both sides of the aisle for cooperating in producing that bill, and I was flabbergasted that that cooperation on the part of the White House did not extend to our next request to provide for additional money, including the first responders.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and I was happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin, but I would point out the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I sat down with our counterparts in the Senate and we produced a bill of \$40 billion that was, I think, passed unanimously in the House and I believe in the Senate as well, to make money immediately available to the first responders, to FEMA, to police, to firemen, to whoever needed the money after September 11th.

As a matter of fact, we did something very unusual, Mr. Speaker. Of the \$40 billion, we allowed the executive branch to use immediately \$10 billion with no strings attached to respond to September 11th, to respond to terrorism, and to do what had to be done immediately. Then we gave them an additional \$10 billion that they could basically do whatever they wanted to with, but there were a few congressional strings. We just required that they report to us on what they were doing with that \$10 billion.

So the Congress responded rapidly. The Administration moved quickly. Then the other \$20 billion, the second half of the \$40 billion, we allocated through the appropriations process; but we asked the executive branch to suggest to the Congress how that money should be used. We did have some differences, but we worked out a plan that I think worked fairly well.

Now, there is a lot more that needs to be done. September 11 was something that many people in this country had never seen before. I think the only thing that really compares to September 11 was December 7, 1941, when Pearl Harbor was attacked and we went to war in World War II.

But, Mr. Speaker, this President responded well. This Congress responded well. The agencies of the government responded well. FEMA responded well. The folks in New York responded well, the Pentagon in Northern Virginia responded well, and Pennsylvania responded well when Flight 93 went into the ground. The Nation mobilized and responded very well. So we are creating an argument here where there is no argument. But maybe that is part of the process. You have to have an argument no matter what you do.

I want to get this CR passed from here today, and I want to get it off the

deck; and then I want to be able to proceed to the conference on the final bill for fiscal year 2003 where we will again address first responder-type issues as well as practically everything else in the government, except for defense and military construction, which have already passed and have already become law.

So let us pass this CR today. Let us defeat the motion that would slow down the process, that would make this an appropriations bill as opposed to a continuing resolution. Let us do that and then get on with our business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will give his State of the Union address and next week the President will release his fiscal year 2004 budget, and we in the Congress have yet to pass 11 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2003 funding. We are now on our seventh continuing resolution. I am concerned that Congress is abdicating its Constitutional responsibilities. Before the adjournment of the 107th Congress, we had ample time to pass the physicians, hospitals, nursing homes, home health services and other health care providers. Our nation's seniors deserve better.

A cornerstone of a stable and dependable Medicare program is a system of adequate and appropriate reimbursements for health care providers. If payments are too high, or too low, the system will collapse and access to critical care for our seniors will be denied. Health care providers are being penalized for past federal accounting and legislative mistakes. Short-term fixes are necessary to ensure continuing access to quality care, while a comprehensive and thoughtful system of determining clinician reimbursements is developed. Medicare payments to physicians have already been cut by \$139.4 million. Under the current law, payments will be cut an additional \$695 million over the next three years.

I have been in close contact with physicians and other health care providers in the Houston area, many of whom appropriations bills. Again, we are faced with uncertainty in the budget process, which we cannot afford with the condition of the economy.

The latest unemployment figures indicate that nearly 6 percent of Americans are unemployed; 17 percent of African Americans are unemployed. Our nation is in an economic crisis that calls for leadership and a bold economic plan.

The nation's health care system is in need of reform. Millions of seniors rely on Medicare for their health care needs. Any Omnibus Appropriations Bill and the President's fiscal year 2004 budget must stabilize the Medicare program. Many Medicare beneficiaries, including seniors in my 18th Congressional District, are losing access to critical health care services because of the inadequacy of the current Medicare payment rates.

As a result of physician reductions in reimbursements, many Medicare bene-

ficiaries risk losing access to their work in small- and medium-sized businesses. They have made good faith efforts to ensure the continuity of comprehensive care for their Medicare patients, but they tell me that they cannot afford to do this forever. I am a co-sponsor of the Medicare Physicians Protection Act, which would impose a one-year freeze on the physician's fee schedule to protect our health care providers, and the patients who depend upon them.

Last week, the Senate passed a \$390 billion Omnibus Appropriations bill. The bill was passed with little debate and loaded with last-minute amendments. The large number of spending bills included in the Omnibus Appropriations package—11 in all—makes this year's budget debacle especially appalling. For instance, a provision in the bill may have major implications for how immigration applications are processed and how much they will cost. In the Senate Omnibus Appropriations bill, a provision to re-establish old requirements that immigrants applying for visas, citizenship or adjustment of family status pay a surcharge to subsidize the processing of applications by asylum seekers and refugees was included. However, the Homeland Security Department bill passed in November removed the surcharge on applicants, which can add as much as \$80.00 to a citizenship application. This is one issue that must be worked out in the conference committee on the Omnibus Appropriations Bill. This would adversely affect many of my constituents applying for visas, citizenship or adjusting their status in my 18th Congressional District.

In addition to immigration concerns, the Omnibus Appropriations bill must contain adequate funding levels to implement the Leave No Child Behind Act. We have become a government run by continuing resolution. I do not believe our Founding Fathers in their wisdom with grantings Congress the authority to raise revenue would have conceived a Congress not disciplined to follow our Constitutional mandate. This process is bad for the country and a poor reflection on the House and Senate.

On the issue of the economy, the President has the wrong plan. It will not stimulate the economy and create jobs. The cornerstone of the plan is the elimination of tax dividends, a proposal, which only helps the wealthy in this country and does not provide a stimulus to the economy.

Continuing resolutions, because they historically have been viewed as "must-pass" measures in view of the constitutional and statutory imperatives, became a major battleground for the resolution of budgetary and other conflicts. Consequently, the nature, scope, and duration of continuing resolutions began to change. I recognize the urgency in passing continuing resolutions; however, Congress must pass a serious comprehensive appropriations

bill that adequately funds domestic programs for our nation citizens from education to health care.

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

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

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to House Resolution 29, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. OBEY. Without the pending recommit motion, certainly.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 13, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with an amendment:

Section 101 of Public Law 107-229 in further amending by adding at the end:

"Provided further, \$3,500,000,000 is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency, Emergency Management and Planning Assistance, for state and local first responders homeland security grants to equip first responders, and \$90,000,000 is available for the Centers for Disease Control for baseline health screening and long-term medical monitoring of emergency response and recovery personnel exposed to toxic substances at the World Trade Center site."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the motion to recommit because it violates section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act. Section 302(c) prohibits the consideration of any amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year until the Committee on Appropriations has made the suballocations required by section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

This motion to recommit increases the amount of budget authorities provided by the measure. The suballocations published by the Committee on Appropriations on October 10, 2002, lapsed upon the adjournment of the 107th Congress and no new 302(b) suballocations have been made for the 108th Congress. Hence, I make a point of order that this motion to recommit violates section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly do, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman contends the motion is not in order because the majority has failed to file its 302(b) allocations. If this amendment were to be ruled out of order, what that would mean is that the majority has put the fix in in the Committee on Rules so that they can bring what they want to bring to the floor but the minority cannot.

In other words, the minority would be penalized procedurally for a failure to act on the part of the majority. I would find that to be a quaint interpretation indeed. It is patently unfair to allow the majority to bring up a bill without filing its suballocations and then punish the minority for something the majority has not done.

□ 1330

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). If no further Members wish to be heard on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

As the Chair ruled on January 8, 2003, supported by the House on appeal, section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 precludes consideration of an appropriations measure, including an amendment, providing new budget authority after the Committee on Appropriations has received a section 302(a) allocation for a fiscal year until the committee makes the suballocations required under section 302(b).

The Committee on Appropriations has not made the required section 302(b) suballocations, and the motion to recommit provides new budget authority in violation of section 302(c) of the Budget Act. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the majority is going to abuse the rules in such a way that the minority is precluded from meeting its responsibilities, I have no alternative but to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. PUTNAM

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) to lay the appeal on the table.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 196, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]
YEAS—222

Aderholt	Gibbons	Ose	Fattah	Lucas (KY)	Rothman
Akin	Gilchrest	Otter	Ford	Lynch	Royal-Allard
Bachus	Gillmor	Oxley	Gephhardt	Maloney	Ruppertsberger
Baker	Gingrey	Paul	Gonzalez	Markey	Rush
Ballenger	Goode	Pearce	Gordon	Marshall	Ryan (OH)
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Pence	Green (TX)	Matheson	Sabo
Bartlett (MD)	Goss	Peterson (PA)	Grijalva	Matsui	Sanchez, Linda T.
Barton (TX)	Granger	Petri	Harman	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez, Loretta
Bass	Graves	Pickering	Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Sanders
Beauprez	Green (WI)	Pitts	Hill	McCormick	Sandlin
Bereuter	Greenwood	Platts	Hinchey	McDermott	Schakowsky
Biggert	Gutknecht	Pombo	Hofeller	McGovern	Schiff
Bilirakis	Hall	Porter	Holden	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Portman	Holt	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Blackburn	Hart	Pryce (OH)	Honda	Meehan	Serrano
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Putnam	Hooley (OR)	Menendez	Sherman
Boehlert	Hayes	Quinn	Hoyer	Michaud	Skelton
Boehner	Hayworth	Radanovich	Inslee	Millender	Slaughter
Bonilla	Hefley	Ramstad	Israel	McDonald	Snyder
Bonner	Hensarling	Regula	Jackson (IL)	Miller (NC)	Solis
Bono	Hobson	Rehberg	Jackson-Lee	Miller, George	Spratt
Boozman	Hoekstra	Renzi	(TX)	Mollohan	Stark
Bradley (NH)	Hostettler	Reynolds	Jefferson	Napolitano	Stenholm
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Rogers (AL)	John	Neal (MA)	Strickland
Brown (SC)	Hulshof	Rogers (KY)	Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Hunter	Rogers (MI)	Nadler	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Burgess	Hyde	Rohrabacher	Kanjorski	Turner (TX)	Tierney
Burns	Isakson	Ros-Lehtinen	Kaptur	Lampson	Towns
Burr	Issa	Royce	Kilpatrick	Pallone	Udall (CO)
Buyer	Istook	Ryan (WI)	Kind	Pascrill	Udall (NM)
Calvert	Janklow	Ryun (KS)	Kleczka	Langevin	Van Hollen
Camp	Jenkins	Saxton	Kucinich	Lantos	Payne
Cannon	Johnson (CT)	Schrock	Larson (WA)	Pelosi	Velazquez
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Sensenbrenner	Larson (CT)	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Jones (NC)	Lee	Pomeroy	Waters
Carter	Jones (NC)	Sessions	Levin	Price (NC)	Watt
Castle	Keller	Shadegg	Lewis (GA)	Rahall	Weiner
Chabot	Kennedy (MN)	Shays	Lipinski	Rangel	Wexler
Chocola	King (IA)	Sherwood	Lofgren	Reyes	Woolsey
Coble	King (NY)	Shimkus	Lowey	Rodriguez	Wu
Cole	Kingston	Shuster	Ross	Ross	Wynn
Collins	Kirk	Simmons			
Cox	Kline	Simpson			
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)			
Crenshaw	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)			
Culberson	LaHood	Smith (TX)			
Cunningham	Latham	Souder			
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Stearns			
Davis, Tom	Leach	Sullivan			
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Sweeney			
DeLay	Linder	Tancredo			
DeMint	LoBiondo	Tauzin			
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)			
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Terry			
Doolittle	McCotter	Thomas			
Dreier	McCrery	Thornberry			
Duncan	McHugh	Tiahrt			
Dunn	McInnis	Tiberi			
Ehlers	McKeon	Toomey			
Emerson	Mica	Turner (OH)			
English	Miller (FL)	Upton			
Everett	Miller (MI)	Vitter			
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Walden (OR)			
Ferguson	Moran (KS)	Walsh			
Flake	Murphy	Wamp			
Fletcher	Musgrave	Weldon (FL)			
Foley	Myrick	Weldon (PA)			
Forbes	Nethercutt	Weller			
Fossella	Ney	Whitfield			
Franks (AZ)	Northup	Wicker			
Frelenghuisen	Norwood	Wilson (SC)			
Gallegly	Nunes	Wolf			
Garrett (NJ)	Nussle	Young (AK)			
Gerlach	Osborne	Young (FL)			

NAYS—196

Abercrombie	Boyd	Davis (CA)		
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Davis (FL)		
Alexander	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)		
Allen	Capps	Davis (TN)		
Andrews	Capuano	DeFazio		
Baca	Cardin	DeGette		
Baird	Cardoza	Delahunt		
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Deutsch		
Ballance	Carson (OK)	Dicks		
Becerra	Case	Dingell		
Bell	Clay	Dooley (CA)		
Berkley	Clyburn	Doyle		
Berman	Conyers	Edwards		
Berry	Cooper	Emanuel		
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Engel		
Bishop (NY)	Cramer	Eshoo		
Blumenauer	Crowley	Etheridge		
Boswell	Cummings	Evans		
Boucher	Davis (AL)	Farr		

Fattah	Lucas (KY)	Rothman
Filner	Lynch	Royal-Allard
Frost	Majette	Ruppertsberger
Gephhardt	Maloney	Rush
Gonzalez	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Gordon	Marshall	Sabo
Green (TX)	Matheson	Sanchez, Linda T.
Grijalva	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Harman	McCarthy (MO)	Sanders
Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin
Hill	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hinchey	McGovern	Schiff
Hinojosa	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Pombo	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Porter	Meehan	Serrano
Portman	Holden	Sherman
Pryce (OH)	Holt	Skelton
Randall	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Rehberg	Menendez	Snyder
Renzi	Michaud	Solis
Rodríguez	Millender	Sparr
Rothman	McDonald	Stark
Rush	Miller (NC)	Stenholm
Ryan (OH)	Miller, George	Strickland
Sabio	Mollohan	Thompson (CA)
Sánchez, Linda T.	Napolitano	Thompson (MS)
Sánchez, Loretta	Neal (MA)	Taylor (MS)
Sanders	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Sandlin	Obey	Tierney
Schakowsky	Towns	Towns
Schiff	Kilpatrick	Turner (TX)
Scott (GA)	Kind	Udall (CO)
Scott (VA)	Kleczka	Udall (NM)
Serrano	Lipinski	Van Hollen
Sherman	Lantos	Payne
Skelton	Pelosi	Velazquez
Slaughter	Petersen (MN)	Visclosky
Snyder	Turner	Waters
Solis	Pascrill	Watt
Sparr	Lampson	Weiner
Stark	Pastor	Wexler
Stenholm	Langevin	Woolsey
Strickland	Pelosi	Wu
Thompson (CA)	Petersen	Wynn
Thompson (MS)	Neal (MA)	

NOT VOTING—16

Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Smith (WA)
Burton (IN)	Herger	Watson
Combest	Johnson, E. B.	Waxman
Cubin	Lewis (CA)	Wilson (NM)
DeLauro	Olver	
Doggett	Shaw	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to record their votes.

□ 1351

Messrs. McDERMOTT, RUSH, RUPPERSBERGER, EVANS, SCOTT of Georgia, LYNCH, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. RYAN of Kansas, ROGERS of Michigan, and HALL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

So the decision of the Chair stands as the judgment of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber on January 27, 2003 and I would like the record to show that had I been present in this chamber, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 13 and “yea” on rollcall 14. Also, I was briefly absent from this chamber on January 28, 2003 and missed voting on rollcall vote 15. I want the record to show that had I been present in this chamber, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote 15.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have another motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair assumes the gentleman is still opposed to the resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Safe assumption, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 13, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back promptly with an amendment further amending Section 101 of Public Law 107-229:

1. to provide \$3,500,000,000 in homeland security grants to equip first responders, and

2. to provide \$90 million for the Centers for Disease Control for baseline health screening and long-term medical monitoring of emergency response and recovery personnel exposed to toxic substances at the World Trade Center site.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 5 minutes, but let me simply say that this motion simply does two things. It would provide that we will approve \$3.5 billion in homeland security grants to first responders, and it will provide the additional \$90 million that is needed to continue the study of long-term medical effects caused by the disaster of 9-11 when our firemen and our policemen and other emergency workers immediately responded to the hits on the Pentagon and the World Trade Center.

When those firemen and policemen and other emergency workers responded to the Nation's needs at the Pentagon and at the World Trade Center and in Pennsylvania, for that matter as well, on 9-11, they did not stop to ask does this fit in our fiscal year? Are we going to exceed our budgets? They simply responded, did their duty, and did what had to be done. Today I want to make clear this motion will not bust the Republican budget. Even if this money is still provided, we will still be within the overall ceilings of the Republican budget resolution. So no one can claim if they vote against this motion that they did so in order to preserve the sanctity of the budget, resolution because we do not breach it.

I would simply urge the House to adopt the motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we do not have a real argument here because we are not opposed to providing this funding, and the only difference we have is that it does not belong on a CR. It belongs in the 2003 final bill, or it belongs in the supplemental which will be coming very quickly. So what I would suggest is that we defeat this motion, we pass the CR, and then we get prepared to finish up the fiscal 2003 appropriations business.

Again, as I pointed out in my earlier comments, I think what is happening here is that we are trying to create an argument where no argument really exists. We believe in homeland security and first responders as strongly as anybody else. We have already proven that. We have taken the lead in that. President Bush has taken the lead in that. We have done a good job as the majority party in leading this Congress to deal with the preemption of, and the need to respond to, weapons of mass destruction, and terrorist attacks or whatever else we may have to face. And we still recognize the need to do more.

□ 1400

Now, there is a lot of work that needs to be done. But the funding that is called for in this motion is going to be addressed but it does not belong on a CR.

Let us kill the motion, let us pass the CR, and then get along with the rest of our business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Mr. OBEY's motion to recommit this CR.

By now, we've all read or heard about the Hart-Rudman Independent Task Force report stating that the United States remains "dangerously unprepared" for another terrorist attack.

The Task Force determined that first responders are not prepared for a chemical or biological attack, their radios cannot communicate with one another, and they lack the training and protective gear to protect themselves and the public in an emergency. As the Task Force report stated simply and chillingly—"The consequence could be the unnecessary loss of thousands of American lives."

I am outraged that this President, who declared war against terrorism, is itching for a war with Iraq, and started sowing the seeds of conflict with North Korea with his "axis of evil" speech, is now telling the American people that we can't afford to invest in homeland security. It stands to reason that the closer our nation gets to war, the greater the threat of another domestic terrorism attack becomes.

When your national security policy stumbles from a vague declaration of war against an ideology, to crying foul before the first IAEA inspector enters Iraq, to antagonizing national leaders with name-calling, you can't afford not to pay for homeland security.

Federal funds are desperately needed to equip firefighters, protect our ports and borders, enhance airport security, defend against agricultural terrorism, and protect our critical infrastructure.

I'd like to quote, if I may, a letter I received from the Mayor of the City of Oakland Park, Florida. "I am writing to express my deep concern that funding for first responders, promised nearly a year ago, has still not been provided to America's cities, towns and villages." I have received similar letters from community leaders throughout my District, and when they write expressing concerns about homeland security, they have my undivided attention. I would venture to guess that most of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have received similar letters as well.

I urge you to support Mr. OBEY's motion.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9, rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 222, not voting 11, as follows:

	[Roll No. 16]	
	AYES—201	
Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Miller (NC)
Ackerman	Gordon	Miller, George
Alexander	Green (TX)	Mollohan
Allen	Grijalva	Moore
Andrews	Gutierrez	Moran (VA)
Baca	Harman	Murtha
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Baldwin	Hill	Napolitano
Ballance	Hinchey	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Bell	Hoeffel	Obey
Berkley	Holden	Ortiz
Berman	Holt	Owens
Berry	Honda	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Hooley (OR)	Pascarella
Bishop (NY)	Hoyer	Pastor
Blumenauer	Inslee	Payne
Boswell	Israel	Pelosi
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rahall
Capps	John	Rangel
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Cardin	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Cardoza	Kaptur	Ross
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Rothman
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Royal-Allard
Case	Kilpatrick	Ruppersberger
Clay	Kind	Rush
Clyburn	Kleczka	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Kucinich	Sabo
Cooper	Lampson	Sanchez, Linda T.
Costello	Langevin	Sanchez, Loretta
Cramer	Lantos	Sanders
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Sandlin
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Davis (AL)	Lee	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Levin	Scott (GA)
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Serrano
Davis (TN)	Lofgren	Sherman
DeFazio	Lowey	Skelton
DeGette	Lucas (KY)	Slaughter
Delahunt	Lynch	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Majette	Snyder
Deutsch	Maloney	Solis
Dicks	Markey	Spratt
Dingell	Marshall	Stark
Doggett	Matheson	Stenholm
Dooley (CA)	Matsui	Strickland
Doyle	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Emanuel	McCullom	Tauscher
Engel	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Eshoo	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Evans	McNulty	Tierney
Farr	Meehan	Towns
Fattah	Meek (FL)	Turner (TX)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Ford	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Frank (MA)	Michaud	Van Hollen
Frost	Millender-	Velazquez
	McDonald	

Visclosky
Waters
Watson

Watt
Weiner
Wexler

Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—222

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach

Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne

Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiabert
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Combest
Cubin

Herger
Johnson, E. B.
Lewis (CA)
Olver

Shaw
Waxman
Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1416

Mr. GILLMOR changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 15, Table the Appeal of the Ruling of the Chair (House Joint Resolution 13), had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 16, On Motion to Recommit with Instructions (House Joint Resolution 13), had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MAJORITY MEMBERSHIP TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 34) election of majority membership on the Committee on House Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 34

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives: Committee on House Administration: Mr. EHLERS; Mr. MICA; Mr. LINDER; Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. REYNOLDS.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 111

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 111.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the two Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privileges of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint session by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now recognize Members for Special Orders until 5 p.m., at which time the Chair will declare the House in recess.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 200 AND 200

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker. I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2003 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2003 through 2007. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional budget Act and section 301 of House Concurrent Resolution 353, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House. This status report is current through January 27, 2003.

The "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 353. The comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2003 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 353 for fiscal year 2003 and fiscal year 2003 through 2007. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. A separate allocation for the Medicare program, as established under section 231(d) of the budget resolution, is shown for fiscal year

2003 and fiscal years 2003 through 2012. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts

committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table gives the current level for 2004 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 301 of H. Con. Res. 353 printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This list is needed to enforce section 301 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of

order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2003 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 353

Reflecting Action Completed as of January 27, 2003 (On-budget amounts, in million of dollars)

		Fiscal year 2003	Fiscal years 2003–2007
Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority		1,784,073	n.a.
Outlays		1,765,225	n.a.
Revenues		1,531,893	8,671,656
Current Level:			
Budget Authority		1,769,984	n.a.
Outlays		1,756,173	n.a.
Revenues		1,535,583	8,696,643
Current Level over (+) under (-) Appropriate Level:			
Budget Authority		-14,089	n.a.
Outlays		-9,052	n.a.
Revenues		3,690	24,987

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2004 through 2007 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

Budget Authority—Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2003 in excess of \$14,089,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2003 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Outlays—Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2003 in excess of

\$9,052,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2003 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Revenues—Enactment of measures that would result in revenue reduction for FY 2003 in excess of \$3,690,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would

cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 353.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period FY 2003 through 2007 in excess of \$24,987,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 353.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION

Reflecting Action Completed as of January 27, 2003

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2003		2003–2007 total		2003–2012 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture						
Allocation	7,825	7,271	37,017	34,479	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level ¹	8,532	8,406	49,206	47,592	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	707	1,135	12,189	13,113	n.a.	n.a.
Armed Services						
Allocation	516	516	5,804	5,804	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	111	111	2,170	2,170	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	-405	-405	-3,634	-3,634	n.a.	n.a.
Education and the Workforce						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Commerce						
Allocation	95	59	2,709	2,649	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	776	776	405	289	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	681	717	-2,304	-2,360	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	640	650	6,233	6,238	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	640	650	6,233	6,238	n.a.	n.a.
Government Reform						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	7	7	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	7	7	n.a.	n.a.
House Administration						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
International Relations						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	13	265	75	327	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	13	265	75	327	n.a.	n.a.
Judiciary						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	7	7	11	11	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	7	7	11	11	n.a.	n.a.
Resources						
Allocation	0	0	700	700	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	-3	2	-1	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	-3	-698	-701	n.a.	n.a.
Science						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Small Business						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure						
Allocation	0	0	17,476	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	3	6	15	24	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	3	6	-17,461	24	n.a.	n.a.
Veterans' Affairs						
Allocation	0	0	0	0	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	1	1	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	1	1	2	2	n.a.	n.a.
Ways and Means						
Allocation	2,203	174	7,855	5,861	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level	7,913	7,808	10,575	10,448	n.a.	n.a.
Difference	5,710	7,634	2,720	4,587	n.a.	n.a.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION—Continued

Reflecting Action Completed as of January 27, 2003
(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House committee	2003		2003–2007 total		2003–2012 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Medicare						
Allocation	4,650	4,575	n.a.	n.a.	347,270	347,270
Current Level	0	0	n.a.	n.a.	0	0
Difference	–4,650	–4,575	n.a.	n.a.	–347,270	–347,270

¹ HR2646, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, was enacted May 13, 2002, prior to the adoption of the FY2003 House Budget Resolution on May 22, 2002.

Note: HR5005, an act to establish the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, was enacted November 25, 2002. That legislation, which increased direct spending, is not reflected in the table above because the temporary committee that reported the legislation was not contemplated at the time that H. Con. Res. 353 was passed by the House.

STATEMENT OF FY2004 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 301 OF H. CON. RES. 353

Reflecting Action Completed as of January 27, 2003

(IN MILLIONS OF DOLLARS)

Budget Authority

Appropriate Level	23,178
Current Level:	
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee	
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (head start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Transportation Subcommittee	
Transportation (highways; transit; Farley Building)	0
Treasury, General Government Subcommittee	
Payment to Postal Service	0
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee	
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0
	=====
Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level	–23,178

Current Level over (+)/under (–) Appropriate Level

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2003.Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2003 budget and is current through January 27, 2003. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 353, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2003. The budget resolution figures incorporate revisions submitted by the Committee on the Budget to the House to reflect funding for emergency requirements. Those revisions are required by section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

Since my last letter dated October 16, 2003, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the following acts that changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues for 2003:
The Defense Appropriations Act (Public Law 107–248);
The Military Construction Appropriations Act (Public Law 107–249);
The 21st Century Department of Justice Authorization Act (Public Law 107–273);
An act to amend section 527 of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 107–276);
The Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–282);The Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–295);
The Homeland Security Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–296);The Terrorism Risk Protection Act (Public Law 107–297);
The Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–303);An act amending title 5, United States Code, to allow certain catch-up contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (Public Law 107–304);
The Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act, 2003 (Public Law 107–314);The Veterans Benefits Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–330);
An act amending title 10, United States Code, to make mineral leasing receipts available for environmental restoration (Public Law 107–345);An act amending title 5, United States Code, to allow certain catch-up contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (Public Law 107–346);
An act amending title 10, United States Code, to make mineral leasing receipts available for environmental restoration (Public Law 107–347);An act to extend the periods of authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to implement certain construction projects (Public Law 107–375);
An act to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (Public Law 108–1); andThree acts making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2003 (Public Law 107–244, Public Law 107–294 and Public Law 108–2).
The effects of these new laws are identified in the enclosed table.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
Acting Director.

Attachment.

FISCAL YEAR 2003 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JANUARY 27, 2003

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted before the 2nd session of the 107th Congress:			
Revenues	0	0	1,536,324
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,086,964	1,035,176	0
Appropriation legislation	0	313,591	0
Offsetting receipts	–346,866	–346,866	0
Total, previously enacted	740,098	1,001,901	1,536,324
Enacted in 2nd session of the 107th Congress:			
Job Creation and Worker Assistance Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–147)	3,524	3,587	0
Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–171)	8,532	8,406	0
Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–188)	1	1	0
Auction Reform Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–195)	775	775	0
Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–204)	40	36	43
2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States (P.L. 107–206)	0	8,342	–60
Trade Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–210)	388	312	–669
Foreign Relations Authorization Act, 2003 (P.L. 107–228)	13	265	1
An act making continuing appropriations, 2003 (P.L. 107–229)	146	94	0
An act making further continuing appropriations, 2003 (P.L. 107–240)	1,110	260	0
Defense Appropriations Act, 2002 (P.L. 107–248)	355,108	239,334	0
Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2003 (P.L. 107–249)	10,499	2,722	0
21st Century Department of Justice Authorization Act (P.L. 107–273)	–1,105	–255	0
An act to amend section 527, Internal Revenue Code, to eliminate notification return requirements for state and local party committees (P.L. 107–276)	0	0	–2
Clark County Conservation of Public Land and Natural Resources Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–282)	0	–1	0
An act making further continuing appropriations, 2003 (P.L. 107–294)	118	141	0
Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–295)	3	3	0
Homeland Security Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–296)	418	418	0
Terrorism Risk Protection Act (P.L. 107–297)	600	614	0
Great Lakes and Lake Champlain Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–303)	0	3	0
An act amending title 5, United States Code, to allow certain catch-up contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (P.L. 107–304)	0	0	–29
Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act, 2003 (P.L. 107–314)	111	111	0
Veterans Benefits Act of 2002 (P.L. 107–330)	1	1	0
An act amending title 10, United States Code, to make mineral leasing receipts available for environment restoration (P.L. 107–345)	2	0	0
An act to extend the periods of authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to implement certain construction projects (P.L. 107–375)	–2	–2	0
An act for the relief of Barbara Makuch (Pvt. L. 107–3)	1	1	0
An act for the relief of Eugene Makuch (Pvt. L. 107–4)	1	1	0
Total, enacted in the second session of the 107th Congress	380,284	265,169	–716
Enacted in the first session of the 108th Congress:			
An act to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (P.L. 108–1)	7,250	7,250	0

Total, enacted in the second session of the 107th Congress

Enacted in the first session of the 108th Congress:

An act to provide for a 5-month extension of the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002 (P.L. 108–1)

FISCAL YEAR 2003 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JANUARY 27, 2003—Continued
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Continuing Resolution:			
An act making further continuing appropriations, 2003 (P.L. 108-2) ...	355,245	195,163	— 25
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	288,455	286,690	0
Total Current Level ^{1,2,3}	1,769,984	1,756,173	1,535,583
Total Budget Resolution	1,784,073	1,765,225	1,531,893
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	3,690
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	— 14,089	— 9,052	0
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2003-2007:			
House Current Level	0	0	8,696,643
House Budget Resolution	0	0	8,671,656
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	0	0	24,987

¹ Section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that the House Budget Committee revise the budget resolution to reflect funding provided in bills reported by the House for emergency requirements. To date, the Budget Committee has increased the outlay allocation in the budget resolution by \$8,793 million for this purpose. Of this amount, \$400 million is not included in the current level because the funding has not yet been enacted.

² For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the House, the budget resolution does not include budget authority or outlays for Social Security administrative expenses. As a result, current level excludes these items.

³ For comparability purposes, current level budget authority excludes \$1,348 million for mass transit that is included in the continuing resolution total. The budget authority for mass transit, which is exempt from the allocations made for the discretionary categories pursuant to sections 302(a)(1) and 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act, is not included in H. Con. Res. 353. Total budget authority including mass transit is \$1,771,332 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: P.L. = Public Law.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, section 3(a)(4) of House Resolution 5 provides that House Concurrent Resolution 353 of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, as adopted by the House, shall have force and effect in the House as though the One Hundred Eighth Congress has adopted a concurrent resolution on the budget. That paragraph also directs me to submit for printing in the Congressional Record: (1) the allocations contemplated by section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget

Act of 1974 under a concurrent resolution on the budget; (2) accounts identified for advance appropriations, referred to in section 301(b) of House Concurrent Resolution 353 of the One Hundred Seventh Congress; and (3) an estimated unified surplus, referred to in section 211 of such concurrent resolution.

The attached tables, which I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as directed, provide the required information.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

[In millions of dollars]

	2003
General Purpose*:	
BA	747,174
OT	748,528

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES¹—APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2003
Highways*:	
BA	
OT	28,761
Mass Transit*:	
BA	
OT	6,030
Conservation*:	
BA	1,922
OT	1,872
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA	749,096
OT	785,191
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	350,116
OT	353,319

¹ Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Congress.

*Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY OF HOUSE COMMITTEES¹: COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

[By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total	2003-2007	2003-2012
Agriculture Committee:								
Current Law Base:								
BA	36,573	35,545	34,841	34,241	34,889	176,089	n.a.	n.a.
OT	33,247	33,726	32,788	32,283	32,885	164,929	n.a.	n.a.
Discretionary Action:								
BA	7,825	7,604	7,198	7,249	7,141	37,017	n.a.	n.a.
OT	7,271	7,019	6,688	6,727	6,774	34,479	n.a.	n.a.
Total:								
BA	44,398	43,149	42,039	41,490	42,030	213,106	n.a.	n.a.
OT	40,518	40,745	39,476	39,010	39,659	199,408	n.a.	n.a.
Armed Services Committee:								
Current Law Base:								
BA	76,090	78,358	80,609	83,134	85,779	403,970	n.a.	n.a.
OT	75,258	77,722	80,228	82,780	85,466	401,454	n.a.	n.a.
Discretionary Action:								
BA	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.	n.a.
OT	516	652	1,025	1,605	2,006	5,804	n.a.	n.a.
Total:								
BA	76,606	79,010	81,634	84,739	87,785	409,774	n.a.	n.a.
OT	75,774	78,374	81,253	84,385	87,472	407,258	n.a.	n.a.
Committee on Education and the Workforce—Current Law Base:								
BA	4,633	4,325	4,709	4,885	5,066	23,618	n.a.	n.a.
OT	3,264	3,172	3,475	3,604	3,744	17,259	n.a.	n.a.
Energy and Commerce Committee:								
Current Law Base:								
BA	10,248	10,017	11,164	11,498	12,503	55,430	n.a.	n.a.
OT	11,401	11,496	11,562	11,871	11,881	58,211	n.a.	n.a.
Discretionary Action:								
BA	95	285	606	801	922	2,709	n.a.	n.a.
OT	59	272	598	798	922	2,649	n.a.	n.a.
Total:								
BA	10,343	10,302	11,770	12,299	13,425	58,139	n.a.	n.a.
OT	11,460	11,768	12,160	12,669	12,803	60,860	n.a.	n.a.
Financial Services Committee—Current Law Base:								
BA	7,985	8,428	8,249	8,053	8,574	41,289	n.a.	n.a.
OT	2,696	1,578	541	—165	—344	4,306	n.a.	n.a.
Government Reform Committee—Current Law Base:								
BA	66,536	69,943	73,568	76,706	79,236	365,989	n.a.	n.a.
OT	65,527	68,971	72,573	75,714	78,253	361,038	n.a.	n.a.
Committee on House Administration—Current Law Base:								
BA	82	85	85	82	81	415	n.a.	n.a.
OT	37	161	18	14	14	244	n.a.	n.a.
International Relations Committee—Current Law Base:								
BA	10,069	10,390	10,705	10,952	11,287	53,403	n.a.	n.a.
OT	10,075	10,127	10,364	10,591	10,864	52,021	n.a.	n.a.
Judiciary Committee—Current Law Base:								
BA	6,404	5,133	5,116	5,092	5,112	26,857	n.a.	n.a.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY OF HOUSE COMMITTEES¹: COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
[By fiscal year in millions of dollars]

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	Total	
						2003–2007	2003–2012
OT	5,763	5,613	5,281	5,148	5,180	26,985	n.a.
Resources Committee:							
Current Law Base:							
BA	2,537	2,430	2,371	2,394	2,392	12,124	n.a.
OT	2,471	2,313	2,052	2,297	2,154	11,287	n.a.
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.
OT	0	113	498	89	0	700	n.a.
Total:							
BA	2,537	2,543	2,869	2,483	2,392	12,824	n.a.
OT	2,471	2,426	2,550	2,386	2,154	11,987	n.a.
Science Committee—Current Law Base:							
BA	143	20	17	17	18	215	n.a.
OT	147	102	56	29	24	358	n.a.
Small Business Committee—Current Law Base:							
BA	3	2	1	1	1	8	n.a.
OT	–238	–88	–32	–30	–28	–416	n.a.
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee:							
Current Law Base:							
BA	54,029	51,640	50,234	50,657	50,932	257,492	n.a.
OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.
Discretionary Action:							
BA	0	4,369	4,369	4,369	4,369	17,476	n.a.
OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	n.a.
Total:							
BA	54,029	56,009	54,603	55,026	55,301	274,968	n.a.
OT	14,910	12,014	10,429	10,651	10,774	58,778	n.a.
Veterans' Affairs Committee—Current Law Base:							
BA	1,629	2,055	2,543	3,082	3,633	12,942	n.a.
OT	1,570	1,999	2,590	3,065	3,431	12,655	n.a.
Ways and Means Committee:							
Current Law Base:							
BA	643,804	661,849	684,591	701,838	727,703	3,419,785	n.a.
OT	645,017	661,964	684,461	701,118	727,005	3,419,565	n.a.
Discretionary Action:							
BA	2,203	858	1,280	1,639	1,875	7,855	n.a.
OT	174	853	1,231	1,660	1,943	5,861	n.a.
Total:							
BA	646,007	662,707	685,871	703,477	729,578	3,427,640	n.a.
OT	645,191	662,817	685,692	702,778	728,948	3,425,426	n.a.
Current Law Base, Medicare:							
BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058
OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844
Discretionary Action:							
BA	4,650	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270
OT	4,575	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	347,270
Total:							
BA	174,977	180,768	193,068	197,062	211,086	n.a.	2,224,058
OT	174,843	181,045	192,994	196,851	211,379	n.a.	2,223,844
51,414	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	764,402	n.a.

MEMORANDUM: Estimated Unified Surplus Under Section 211

¹—Reflecting allocation adjustments through the end of the 107th Congress.
n.a. = not applicable.

STATEMENT OF FY 2004 ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS UNDER SECTION 301 OF H. CON. RES. 353 OF THE ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

Interior Subcommittee: Elk Hills (89 5428 02 271).

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee: Employment and Training Administration (16 0900 01 501); Education for the Disadvantaged (91 0900 01 501); School Improvement (91 1000 01 501); Children and Family Services [head start] (75 1536 01 506); Special Education (91 0300 01 501); Vocational and Adult Education (91 0400 01 501).

Transportation Subcommittee: Transportation (highways; transit; Farley Bldg.).

Treasury, General Government Subcommittee: Payment to Postal Service (18 1001 01 372).

Veterans, Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee: Section 8 Renewals (86 0319 01 604).

TRIBUTE TO GILDA K. "JILL" BEATTY

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute and to express profound appreciation to Gilda K. Beatty, my office manager of more than 33 years who took her retirement at the end of De-

cember last year. Gilda, best known to everyone who met her as "Jill," began her service in my office when I was administrative assistant to my predecessor, John Blatnik, in December 1969, where she started as a classical secretary: gifted, talented, skilled, energetic, hard-working. But the day before she started her service in the office, our first daughter was born. From that day forward, until after I was elected to this House in 1974, and especially following the death of my wife, Jo, Jill has been a surrogate mother to our four children, a partner in all that I undertook as administrative assistant and as Member of Congress, counselor, advisor, keeper of my time, managing my schedule in Washington and with my district staff, my travels in the district and travels elsewhere throughout the country. Jill's good humor, good spirit, and her can-do attitude, made our office a joy to work in.

I have always said of Jill Beatty that she had that exceptional ability to say no to people who could then leave saying "thank you," a person of whom in another context it should be said she could sell ice boxes to Eskimos. She was able to bring people together in our office, visitors from our district to Washington, and though herself a

Pennsylvanian, coming from the coal and steel country of Pennsylvania, she related to the iron ore mining area of the eighth district of Minnesota in a very special, unique way, so that folks always thought she was a Minnesotan, a northeastern Minnesotan, an iron ranger.

□ 1430

She is, in spirit, certainly that. What was more important to me than the friendship, the professional association, the work, the undying work ethic that she portrayed throughout those 33 years, was her ability to grow in her work and to move from skill to skill; to understand the broader needs of our office, and of the relationship of this office to the committees on which I served, and now the committee, the single Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; and to relate our Washington responsibilities to the Eighth District of Minnesota responsibilities so as to balance the time, the interest, the need, and put them all in appropriate proportion. That is an extraordinary balancing act and a challenge at which few succeed, but Jill succeeded in a very special way.

Perhaps her ability to understand the complexities of running a congressional office in the computer age, in the era of instant communications, compared to the time when she began, when first we did not even have fax machines; but when the first one came in, there was that old onion skin fax, and no multiple letter production capability; to transition from that era to the present takes a very special person of adaptability, the willingness and ability to adapt to change, to changing circumstances.

To embrace change and to move ahead of change, that is Jill's greatest skill and ability, and it gave me the greatest pleasure to see her grow through the stages of evolution of technology that are so important for us in the Congress to maintain communication with the people in our districts who we represent here in this House.

Personally, it is her ever-ready good humor; her ability to laugh, to laugh at herself, to laugh with others, and to make people feel so welcome. Every person who walked in our office, who met with or worked with Jill on whatever purpose it was felt as though he or she were the only person in the world, the only person in Washington, at that particular moment.

That is a rare and special gift for which I will always be grateful, because she made our office in Washington the home in Washington for the people from the Eighth District of Minnesota who came here to visit.

We all miss her terribly. We miss her good humor, her creativity, her willingness to move to the next horizon. I particularly have appreciated her sort of gentle tap on the wrist saying, you are doing too much. It is time to back off. You need a little more time. You can't do all these things at the same time. I know you would like to do all that, but it is not possible, and I am not going to let you do it. She was sort of an auntie who takes care of those who need supervision.

Jill, we are grateful to you for all that you have contributed and done, and I particularly, and I know the entire staff joins in, wish you all the very best of good health, happiness, and long life after Congress.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 107

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 107.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

PUBLICATION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES, 108TH CONGRESS

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

tleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, I am submitting the rules of the Committee on Rules for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On January 7, 2003, the Committee on Rules adopted by non-record vote, a quorum being present, the following committee rules.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

108TH CONGRESS

(Adopted January 7, 2003)

RULE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

(d) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

RULE 2—REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

REGULAR MEETINGS

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday of each week when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereafter in these rules referred to as the "Chair"), there is no need for a meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair.

NOTICE FOR REGULAR MEETINGS

(b) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting and shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least 24 hours before the time of each regular meeting.

(1) for each bill or resolution scheduled on the agenda for consideration of a rule, a copy of

(A) the bill or resolution,
(B) any committee reports thereon, and

(C) any letter requesting a rule for the bill or resolution; and

(2) For each other bill, resolution, report, or other matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the bill, resolution, report, or materials relating to the other matter in question; and

(B) any report on the bill, resolution, report, or any other matter made by any subcommittee on the Committee.

EMERGENCY MEETINGS

(c)(1) The Chair may call an emergency meeting of the Committee at any time on any measure of matter which the Chair determines to be of an emergency nature; provide, however, that the Chair has made an effort to consult the ranking minority mem-

ber, or, in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

(2) As soon as possible after calling an emergency meeting of the Committee, the Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the time and location of the meeting.

(3) To the extent feasible, the notice provided under paragraph (2) shall include the agenda for the emergency meeting and copies of available materials which would otherwise have been provided under subsection (b) if the emergency meeting was a regular meeting.

SPECIAL MEETINGS

(d) Special meetings shall be called and convened as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 3—MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES IN GENERAL

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair, or, in the Chair's absence, by the member designated by the Chair as the Vice Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair of the Committee, or by the ranking majority member of the Committee present as Acting Chair.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules).

(4) When a recommendation is made as to the kind of rule which should be granted by consideration of a bill or resolution a copy of the language recommended shall be furnished to each member of the Committee at the beginning of the Committee meeting at which the rules is to be considered or as soon thereafter as the proposed language becomes available.

QUORUM

(b)(1) For the purpose of hearing testimony on requests for rules, five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence on measures or matters of original jurisdiction before the Committee, three members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(3) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measures of matter, of authorizing a subpoena of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) or rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)), or of taking any other action.

VOTING

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or motion pending before the Committee unless a majority of the members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of any member.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) A record of the vote of each Member of the Committee on each record vote on any matter before the Committee all be available for public inspection at the offices of the Committee, and with respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, shall

be included in the report of the Committees showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members voting for and against.

HEARING PROCEDURES

(d)(1) With regard to hearings on matters of original jurisdiction, to the greatest extent practicable: (A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the committee at least 24 hours in advance of the appearance a statement of proposed testimony in written and electronic form and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to brief summary thereof; and (B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the statement of proposed testimony provided in written and electronic form a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) or any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years.

(2) The five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of each witness before the Committee until each member of the Committee has had an opportunity to question the witness.

(3) The provisions of clause 2(k) or rule XI of the Rules of the House shall apply to any hearing conducted by the committee.

SUBPOENAS AND OATHS

(e)(1) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of the rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

(2) The Chair, may authorize and issue subpoenas under such clause during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period of longer than three days.

(3) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(4) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

RULE 4—GENERAL OVERSIGHT AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) The Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of House rule X.

RULE 5—SUBCOMMITTEES

ESTABLISHMENT AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(a)(1) There shall be two subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to relations between the Congress and the Executive Branch.

(B) Subcommittee on Technology and the House, which shall have general responsibility for measures or matters related to the impact of technology on the process and procedures of the House, relations between the Congress and the Judiciary, and internal operations of the House.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

REFERRAL OF MEASURES AND MATTERS TO SUBCOMMITTEES

(b)(1) In view of the unique procedural responsibilities of the Committee, no special order providing for the consideration of any bill or resolution shall be referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

(2) The Chair shall refer to a subcommittee such measures or matters of original jurisdiction as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities.

(3) All other measures or matters or original jurisdiction shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(4) In referring any measure or matter of original jurisdiction to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(5) The Committee by motion may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

COMPOSITION OF SUBCOMMITTEES

(c) The size and ratio of each subcommittee shall be determined by the Committee and members shall be elected to each subcommittee, and to the positions of chairman and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the full committee shall designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it.

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the full Committee is being held.

(3) The chairman of each subcommittee shall schedule meetings and hearings of the subcommittee only after consultation with the Chair.

QUORUM

(e)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony, two members of the subcommittee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) For all other purposes, a quorum shall consist of a majority of the members of a subcommittee.

EFFECT OF A VACANCY

(f) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee.

RECORDS

(g) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

RULE 6—STAFF

IN GENERAL

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional, and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) The appointment of all professional staff shall be subject to the approval of the Committee as provided by, and subject to the provisions of, clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

ASSOCIATE STAFF

(b) Associate staff for members of the Committee may be appointed only at the discretion of the Chair (in consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party associate staff), after taking into account any staff ceilings and budgetary constraints in effect at the time, and any terms, limits, or conditions established by the Committee of House Administration under clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

SUBCOMMITTEE STAFF

(c) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available to each subcommittee to carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee, and, after consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee, that the minority party of the Committee is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

COMPENSATION OF STAFF

(d) The Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee, after consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party staff.

CERTIFICATION OF STAFF

(e)(1) To the extent any staff member of the Committee or any of its subcommittees does not work under the direct supervision and direction of the Chair, the Member of the Committee who supervises and directs the staff member's work shall file with the Chief of Staff of the Committee (not later than the tenth day of each month) a certification regarding the staff member's work for that member for the preceding calendar month.

(2) The certification required by paragraph (1) shall be in such form as the Chair may prescribe, shall identify each staff member by name, and shall state the work engaged in by the staff member and the duties assigned to the staff member for the member of the Committee with respect to the month in question met the requirements of clause 9 of rule X of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any certification of staff of the Committee, or any of its subcommittees, made by the Chair in compliance with any provision of law or regulation shall be made (A) on the basis of the certifications filed under paragraph (1) to the extent the staff is not under the Chair's supervision and direction, and (B) on his own responsibility to the extent the staff is under the Chair's direct supervision and direction.

RULE 7—BUDGET, TRAVEL, PAY OF WITNESSES

BUDGET

(a) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

TRAVEL

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or

subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

PAY OF WITNESSES

(c) Witnesses may be paid from funds made available to the Committee in its expense resolution subject to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

RULE 8—COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION REPORTING

(a) Whenever the Committee authorizes the favorable reporting of a bill or resolution from the Committee—

(1) the Chair or acting Chair shall report it to the House or designate a member of the Committee to do so, and

(2) in the case of a bill or resolution in which the Committee has original jurisdiction, the Chair shall allow, to the extent that the anticipated floor schedule permits, any member of the Committee a reasonable amount of time to submit views for inclusion in the Committee report on the bill or resolution.

Any such report shall contain all matters required by the rules of the House of Representatives (or by any provision of law enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House) and such other information as the Chair deems appropriate.

RECORDS

(b)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the Members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceeding, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in

accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

COMMITTEE PUBLICATIONS ON THE INTERNET

(c) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

CALENDARS

(d)(1) The Committee shall maintain a Committee Calendar, which shall include all bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to or reported by the Committee and all bills, resolutions, and other matters reported by any other committee on which a rule has been granted or formally requested, and such other matters as the Chair shall direct. The Calendar shall be published periodically, but in no case less often than once in each session of Congress.

(2) The staff of the Committee shall furnish each member of the Committee with a list of all bills or resolutions (A) reported from the Committee but not yet considered by the House, and (B) on which a rule has been formally requested but not yet granted. The list shall be updated each week when the House is in session.

(3) For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), a rule is considered as formally requested when the Chairman of a committee which has reported a bill or resolution (or a member of such committee authorized to act on the Chairman's behalf) (A) has requested, in writing to the Chair, that a hearing be scheduled on a rule for the consideration of the bill or resolution, and (B) has supplied the Committee with an adequate number of copies of the bill or resolution, as reported, together with the final printed committee report thereon.

OTHER PROCEDURES

(e) The Chair may establish such other Committee procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out these rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee and its subcommittees in a manner consistent with these rules.

RULE 9—AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee may be modified, amended or repealed, in the same manner and method as prescribed for the adoption of committee rules in clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House, but only if written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each such Member at least 48 hours before the time of the meeting at which the vote on the change occurs. Any such change in the rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after their approval.

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

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

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

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

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

tleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SERIOUS QUESTIONS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues that we have some very serious questions to answer on behalf of the American people. I want to pay special tribute to the hard work of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the Democratic leadership on trying to answer these questions for a broad and diverse range of Americans.

Earlier today I called out the specific jobs of beauticians, waitresses, bus drivers, teachers, mechanics, sort of the people in this Nation that do the heavy lifting. There are many other professions, jobs, that really turn the engine of this Nation.

As we are on the very day of the State of the Union, I think it is extremely important as the President speaks tonight that he not speak to the Members of the United States Congress, but he speak to these Americans

who create the engine of our economy. So I hope my words are taken in the manner in which they are offered, because in all of our districts we are finding deep and continuing pain, hurting families, individuals who have lost their jobs with no opportunities for further employment.

Right now we know nearly 6 percent of Americans are unemployed. In the African American community in particular, 17 percent are unemployed. I call that, Mr. Speaker, a crisis.

The Nation's health care system is in need of great reform. Just this last Saturday night I spoke to a group of physicians, private physicians and those who work in our public hospitals. Might I note to one of my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), I would thank him for generating 270 names, bipartisan names, on the question of addressing the Medicare crisis and ensuring that physicians and nurses and others who deal with our health care are provided the amount of payments that will allow them to keep their doors open.

The continuing resolution that we just passed, but more appropriately, the appropriations that we need to pass, has to address the fact that more than malpractice issues, our physicians are closing their doors. They are deenrolling and not enrolling individuals because their payments are not there.

I hope that the very first item that we will deal with as we come back to deal with the 108th Congress will be the idea of freezing or increasing the Medicare payments that are necessary to keep the doors of physicians open. My commitment to our local physicians in Houston, Harris County, is that I will continue to fight for those dollars for physicians, nurses, hospitals, nursing homes, home health services, and other health care providers. That is a key.

One of the other things we need to fight for is full funding of Medicaid, and also the changing of the formula so Texas is not disadvantaged. Right now, our State legislature and the Governor are dealing with a \$10 billion deficit. I hope the President will announce that he has discovered that the dividend discount tax cut helps no one; that he would much rather help the State of Texas, the State of Illinois, Ohio, New York; that he would much rather agree with the Democratic plan to provide block grants of monies to States that will help them in Medicaid funding, that will help them in education funding, and that will help them with special projects, education funding, that will put people to work.

I believe we can always reform. I believe the President can reform his message to address the working people of America.

Let me also say that there has been great concern. I have just filed House Concurrent Resolution 2, which repeals or asks the Congress for a sense of Congress resolution to repeal the October resolution on the Iraqi war.

Mr. Speaker, that vote was a vote of conscience. I challenge no Member in this House as to how they voted. But what I will say is that the Constitution is near and dear to me and many Members of Congress; in fact, all of us. Clearly, we have the right to declare war.

When we debated that resolution, Mr. Speaker, we viewed the words of the President as suggesting that we were under imminent attack, and that there was a nexus between Saddam Hussein, Iraq, and terrorism. Whatever might have occurred, we have more facts now, Mr. Speaker. We do understand, as I close, that there are more indications that we should look for a political resolution. The U.N. inspectors want more time. They need more time to look for nuclear weapons. North Korea is on our very horizon.

Mr. Speaker, people are hurting, and I believe the United States can do better than what we have done. I believe the President can cause us to reach to our higher angels by providing for the working people of America; and saying to the world that we stand on the side of peace; and saying to this Congress, come with me, rise to a new debate, discern and design a better policy about Iraq and North Korea, and then we can spend our dollars on building this Nation again, building jobs, and building peace.

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

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

THE PRESIDENT'S CREDIBILITY GAP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I took to the floor this morning during our morning hour debate to express my concern over what I call the President's credibility problem. I talked about a credibility problem in the context of not only what we expect to be in tonight's State of the Union Address, but also by reference to the State of the Union Address that the President made last year.

What I am talking about essentially when I mention a credibility problem is the fact that the President essentially makes promises about what he is going to do to solve the Nation's problems, particularly the economic downturn; but when we look at what he proposes, the action that he proposes to solve the problem, it does not really solve the problem.

So the promise is made essentially by the President that we are going to turn

around the economic downturn, but when we look at the proposals that he announces to accomplish that goal, there is no way that they could accomplish that goal, because they are not designed to accomplish that goal.

The credibility problem exists in so many areas. It is not only with regard to his economic plan, his so-called stimulus plan, it is also relative to the deficit. The President indicated last year that the deficit would be small, that it would be taken under control. Now we know that the deficit is likely to be at least \$300 billion, and I would venture to say that if the President were able to get his economic stimulus package, his promise to make his tax cuts from last year permanent, to follow through and pay for a potential war in Iraq, that we would probably end up with a deficit that could be upwards of \$2 trillion.

That credibility problem also exists with regard to a number of other issues; for example, health care. The President says that we are going to reform Medicare and we are going to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors in the context of Medicare. What we find out, and we will hear about tonight, supposedly, is a privatization plan for Medicare that does not guarantee a prescription drug benefit unless you leave traditional Medicare and you join an HMO or some other type of private insurance.

The list goes on. We are told that we are going to do things for veterans, and then we see cuts in money for veterans' health clinics. We are told that we are going to implement a situation where no child is going to be left behind in terms of public education. That is the President's theme. But then we find that there is a huge credibility gap, a huge difference between the rhetoric and the reality, because, in fact, money for education is being cut.

□ 1445

Affirmative action is another example. The President says he wants diversity, and he appears to give the impression that he is favorable to affirmative action. But then he asks the Justice Department to file a suit against the University of Michigan because of their affirmative action program. And I am not trying to imply the President is purposefully trying to deceive anyone, but I think the reality is that his ideas of what are going to accomplish the goals that he sets out to accomplish are very different from reality. And whether it is an economic plan, whether it is his idea of affirmative action, whether it is his idea of the deficit or his idea on health care, most of these ideas do not actually translate into any action that will accomplish the goals that the President commits himself to.

I guess the worst example in this respect right now and the one that I think is the most injurious is with regard to the economy. We know that the economy has taken a significant down-

turn. We know that some action needs to be taken here in Congress so it does not get worse. And yet if you look at what the President has proposed, it does not accomplish the goal. He calls it an economic stimulus package that is going to boost the economy. Well, let me go through some of the things that he claims he is going to do with regard to the economy and then talk about the reality of what would really happen with his proposal.

He claims that his plan will have an immediate boost to the economy. That is why he calls it a stimulus package. But the Bush plan fails on the most basic level by not delivering the immediate stimulus needed to help boost the economy in the short term. By the White House's own projection, less than 10 percent of the package's total spending comes this year in 2003 when the economy is weak and people are out of work; and as a consequence, even by his own estimates, the Bush plan will create only 190,000 jobs this year, only 11 percent of the jobs lost since President Bush took office.

Let me give you another claim. The President claims that his plan is fair and is going to provide 92 million taxpayers with an average tax cut of \$1,083. Unfortunately, as with the last tax cut that we had from the President in 2001, this one overwhelmingly benefits the wealthy. Once it is fully phased in, the Bush plan provides more than 40 percent of the tax breaks to the richest 1 percent, with less than 17 percent going to the vast majority of Americans.

I could go on and on. I see one of my colleagues is here, and I would like to yield time. I just want to mention the one thing, though, that is perhaps the most important in terms of what I call the "credibility gap" with regard to the President.

He talks about the fairness of his economic plan because it stops the double taxation of stock dividends. Well, first, double taxation of stock dividends is not a huge problem because much of corporate income is not taxed at all now. Corporations often make aggressive use of tax shelters to avoid paying any tax on profits. Take, for example, the CSX Corporation. Over the 4 years, 1998 to 2001, CSX had a cumulative net profit of \$934 million but received a net Federal income tax refund of \$164 million. And it paid dividends in every quarter.

I think if there is anything that is in his economic plan that has received the most attention in terms of its inability to accomplish the goal of giving the economy a boost is his effort to eliminate the taxation on dividends. Because, really, no economist that I know has suggested that somehow that is going to accomplish the goal. And it has gotten so bad that even a significant amount of Republicans oppose his dividend tax cut. In fact, today, most significantly the House Committee on Ways and Means chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS),

Republican, had said that he had serious questions about the dividend tax cuts. It is an article that is in today's Washington Post. And we will develop this a little more. But I just want to stress over and over again how important it is to look at the President's actions and what he proposes, not his rhetoric about what he is going to accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Tonight the President will deliver his State of the Union address setting out the challenges facing America in the war on terrorism and his plans for economic recovery. From my seat in this Chamber, I will be listening for one word in particular, "sacrifice."

The word sacrifice should be a natural for a State of the Union address given at a time when the Nation is at war, when we are confronted with the need to defend against new and varied threats to our security, everything from small pox to shoulder-launched missiles that can shoot down commercial aircraft.

Our men and women in uniform are certainly sacrificing. Tens of thousands have been called up, leaving their jobs, their families, often on very short notice and at great financial and personal costs. But what about the average American who is not on active duty or in the reserves? How will we be called upon to make our own contribution to the security and prosperity to the United States?

The centerpiece of the administration's new agenda, and likely his speech tonight, is a \$674 billion tax cut weighted heavily towards America's wealthiest families. Can this be the sacrifice that we will be called upon to make with our most prosperous families being asked to make the largest sacrifice by suffering their taxes to be cut the most? In every conflict since the Civil War, the Commander in Chief has called for an increase in revenues to meet the national defense. Can we have more butter, more guns and no sacrifice? Apparently not.

Senate appropriators just cut \$8 billion for increased security at our ports, cut \$362 million for border security, cut \$500 million for police and fire departments who will be first on the scene of any terrorist disaster, cut \$534 from job training, cut \$1 billion from our schools, underfunding the President's own education initiative. The President's proposal also does nothing to alleviate the States' own budget crises and their correspondingly massive cuts in health care, education and welfare.

Ending the taxation, the double taxation of dividends might be good policy in a vacuum, taking some of the vast fluctuations out of the market. Coupled with reforms that end the no-taxation of other corporate earnings, the provision could be made revenue-neutral; but the administration's proposal

is not coupled with other reforms and at a cost of \$364 billion is far from revenue-neutral. Because the plan would have little effect on current spending and is permanent, it would also do little to boost our sagging economy, while doing a lot to increase our long-term national debt.

But most importantly, the President's proposal is not made in a vacuum. We have so much work to be done to protect the homeland, and we still suffer the lingering effects of a recession. We have lost almost 2 million jobs in the last 2 years and cannot afford tax cuts that would neither stimulate the economy nor help those most in need. Many of us that supported tax cuts when we were at peace and enjoying historic surpluses must vigorously oppose them now that we are at war and in debt.

As the President's own economic advisors will be the first to admit, small business is the driving force for economic growth and the government's ability to positively impact the economy through fiscal policy is limited.

Probably the most significant contribution the Federal Government made to the prosperity of the 1990s was the difficult decision to balance the budget and keep interest rates low. But now we are back to the days of deficits as far as the eye can see. White House budget director Mitch Daniels can only say that the new red ink is nothing to hyperventilate about, which raises the question, where have the fiscal conservatives gone?

Americans are a proud and generous people who are more than willing to sacrifice in a worthy cause. If, instead, we are to give ourselves a gift no other war generation has given itself, we will denude our ability to defend the homeland or, at best, shift to our children responsibility to pay for our economic health and safety.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and I want to, in particular, mention two things that he stressed which I think fit into this concern that I have about what I call the credibility gap: the fact that the President makes certain commitments about how he is going to deal or solve the problems we have, but then he does not follow through with his actions.

One thing the gentleman made a very good point about was the homeland security. What is really in many people's minds, the most important issue right now, is homeland security, worried about another attack by terrorists. The President made much of the fact that he was creating a new homeland security department and that this was going to be a priority. And, yet, as the gentleman said, when we go back to our districts, literally, a week does not go by when one town or someone who is from a civil defense program or a fire department or a mayor or a State legislator complains to me about how the funds have not come back to the counties or to the municipalities to deal

with homeland security issues. These are basic things. You need money for certain purposes if you are going to make us more secure.

In my case in New Jersey in the counties I represent, we had over 200 people die at the World Trade Center. I remember during that whole incident one of the things that a lot of the local defense people talked about is the need to upgrade communication systems, and they were looking for Federal funds for that.

The President makes a big to-do about homeland security, and I am sure he will mention it tonight in his State of the Union address, but does not follow through with the funding so that we can improve communication, for example, in New Jersey for homeland security purposes. Then again he is not making good on his commitment.

The gentleman also mentioned the issue with regard to State aid which I think is so crucial. The Democrats have said that as part of an economic stimulus package we will give a significant amount of money back to the States. I think it is \$30 to \$40 billion, or something like that, because we know that they face a huge fiscal crisis. But not only is he not providing for any money to go back to the States for any kind of significant purpose, but as I understand it with this tax dividend, elimination of the tax dividend, it actually makes the States' fiscal crises even worse.

The way it does this is, first, the Bush plan to eliminate Federal taxes on corporate dividends will lead to a drop in State revenues; since State income tax laws are tied to the Federal law, the States will also generally stop taxing dividends. And his proposal to end taxation of dividends will cost State governments \$4 billion this year and \$45 billion to \$50 billion over the next decade according to Harley Duncan, executive director of the Federation of Tax Administrators.

So he will make the situation of the State even worse, and I am glad that the gentleman pointed that out among the other things he did.

Mr. Speaker, I see our new colleague from Maine is here. I just wanted to say, I know this is not necessarily on point, although I think it is related to what we are talking about, I just wanted the gentleman to know I admire him greatly for his role with the prescription drug plan in Maine, and what he and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and others have tried to do as Democrats to improve the situation with regard to the costs of prescription drugs.

Once again tonight we understand that the President is going to talk about Medicare reform, but again his promise of Medicare reform falls flat because he is talking about a prescription drug benefit that you would only get if you go outside of Medicare and buy a private plan. I remember the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN)

talking about the problem. I do not know if this gentleman has any HMOs that take Medicare in Maine anymore, but these gentlemen are doing a good job trying to deal with that issue, and I think the President is just coming up with smoke and mirrors.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the day when President Bush will deliver his State of the Union address to America. I can tell you that in Maine we are proud of America and hopeful about the future. But we are also concerned about where we are today. We are concerned because Maine's rate of unemployment keeps rising, in some counties as high as 9 percent, and in some labor-market areas as high as 32 percent unemployment. We are concerned because we have lost over 23,000 manufacturing jobs in the last 8 years. And we are concerned because just 3 weeks ago we received devastating news that Great Northern Paper Company, where I worked for 29 years and one of the largest employers in my district, has filed Chapter 11, and both mills have been shut down since December 26.

I know that across the country people are hurting and they need our help. Unfortunately, I do not believe that the plan the President will discuss tonight will bring that help.

□ 1500

The so-called economic stimulus package is based on tax cuts that go primarily to the wealthiest Americans. It does nothing to create jobs or fuel the economic activity that would help folks back home at Great Northern Paper Company.

Mr. Speaker, there is another way. Today I ask the President along with my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle to at least consider the Democratic stimulus plan. This plan means targeted tax relief for working families, 1 million new jobs, money in the pockets of average Americans, a boost for consumer demand and business investment.

The Democratic plan does all this, and it does it living within our means. It is fiscally sound. It does not borrow from our children or our grandchildren, burying them with debt and taxing them with interest on that debt.

Mr. Speaker, we all have to work together on this because today Americans' number one worry is the economy. Americans are worried about whether their jobs will be there tomorrow. Americans are worried about earning a decent wage, and Americans are worried about being able to afford the same medicines as everyone else. That is why making prescription drugs affordable for all Americans should be a central part of our economic plan.

In Maine we created a law that allows the State to negotiate with drug companies that uses the free market to get a better deal for consumers. We called it the Maine Rx program. In the coming weeks I will introduce legislation in this House to bring that his-

toric innovation to the rest of the Nation. It is called America's Rx because all Americans deserve to have their government work on their behalf and using the free market system to get them affordable medicines.

This means a lot to real people. A friend of mine, a man who worked next to me at the paper mill for almost three decades, has cancer. He cannot retire. He would have no health benefits if he does, and he cannot afford his medicine on his own. He has to keep working while he is sick, but now, with the company in bankruptcy, he does not know what he is going to do.

These are the kind of people we need to help. This is why the cost of prescription drugs is so important, and this is why keeping people working in their jobs is so important, and this is why the health of our economy is so very important.

I look forward to working with my colleagues here in Congress to create a real economic stimulus package, and to create real job security, and to create real health policies that works for all the people.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, again, I want to thank my colleague from Maine for his comments, and let me say, first of all, that when he introduces his America's Rx bill, I would be glad to be one of the cosponsors because I looked at it, I read about it, and I think it is a very good and needed legislation. He points out very effectively again why it is important for us to speak out on the Medicare issue and on the prescription drug issue.

And again, I sound like I am just being critical of the President, but I think on this one, it is just a perfect example of where he is going to be giving the impression tonight that somehow he is going to reform Medicare, he is going to provide a prescription drug program, but then when we look at the data, it is just not there.

It is essentially a privatization of Medicare. It essentially says if a person is willing to join an HMO or if they are willing to take Federal dollars and get into some other kind of private program, we will provide them with a prescription drugs benefit, but for the vast majority of the Americans who either will not want to get out of traditional Medicare or will not even have the option, because in a lot of States, particularly more rural States, they do not even have the option of an HMO, it is not going to be meaningful.

We have worked for a couple of years now, and we know that there are very simple ways of addressing this problem. One of the ways to deal with the costs is our colleague from Maine's proposal, we call it the Allen bill, that would basically limit how much prescription drugs can be charged for, and I have been a cosponsor of that, but we also have a Democratic plan for a benefit package that would simply expand Medicare, create a new Part C or D, which is very much like what we do now for Part B with the doctor bills. A

person pays \$25 a month, they get 80 percent of the cost of their prescription drugs paid for by the Federal Government. They have a \$100 deductible, and it is guaranteed to everybody. Everybody who wants it under Medicare gets it. They do not have to join an HMO. They do not have to go outside of traditional Medicare to get it, and that is the only way or the most effective way that we are going to accomplish the goal of guaranteeing a prescription drug benefit.

The President not only does not do that, but he is looking to basically revamp Medicare itself and privatize it because he says there is not enough money, and I just hope that the public understands that we need to keep the drumbeat going so they understand what he is really doing, that he is really not credible on this issue. And I appreciate the fact that my colleague is here, and I will make sure that I co-sponsor that bill when he is about to introduce it.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, who was already here this evening talking about the problems with the Bush economic stimulus plan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) knows, I was here earlier, and I just wanted to add two or three points to the discussion that I think are very important.

One of the points that I did not get a chance to make is to report some of the numbers that we are entertaining as relates to this whole idea of war. We made it very, very clear that as it relates to fighting terrorism, there is clearly no divide, and for some reason or another, there seems to be a media block, a mental block or some transnational block that in this Congress no one disagrees on the fight against terrorism. In fact, right now we are spending \$1 billion a month in Afghanistan, where most of us joined in the vote to give the President the authority to do so, and, of course, the expenditures to do so.

The real issue is making choices. Right now we can make a choice as relates, of course, to the Iraqi war. That is looking to cost at least \$100 billion or maybe upwards to a trillion dollars. So when we talk about these choices, my colleague's legislation from Maine that I hope to join as well, we are talking about making the political solution or looking to the political solution as relates to Iraq so that we can put the dollars in to fight terrorism, to build up the Homeland Security Department, to do what the motion to recommit just offered to do, which is to pay more dollars for the first responders.

I am particularly concerned of getting dollars to the city. The U.S. Congress and mayors just met recently talking about the devastation they are facing. I just mentioned that the State of Texas has billions of dollars in debt, and I would like to see us get block grants to the State, but, more specifically, dollars to the city, so that

money for first responders, paramedics, firefighters, police, that can really address the question of terrorism in all segments of cities.

Cities have inner cities. They have housing developments. They have high stock housing. They have low stock housing. They have neighborhoods that are better off than others, but all of those people will have to be protected if we are under attack in terms of a terrorist attack, and clearly those cities who need resources to rebuild, to fight off a bioterrorist attack, to do the various immunizations that may be necessary, and we do not have the necessary funds.

Secretary Ridge will need the dollars to, in fact, put his Department together, even though many people say 170,000, they will just be moving over. There is a lot of logistical dollars that have to be utilized in order to make it work. So I wanted to lay the choice on the table that we have to make, and if we made the choice to completely fund a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit, we would not have to worry about an HMO plan. We would not have to worry about what happened to me in my community just about 2 years ago where six HMOs abruptly left HMO-Medicare, left the community, which left seniors with no HMO to provide them coverage.

So I have seen what happens when HMOs leave a market and say the reason why we are leaving it is because we cannot make any money. It is far better to address specifically the Medicare prescription drug benefit, but let me also say it is far better to address the whole concept of health care in America to the extent that we have so many uninsured, and we need to respond to that as quickly as we can.

I believe that we can use the moneys that are now being used for war for expanded unemployment benefits to 52 weeks; to increase the minimum wage, which we have not talked about for a long period of time; full funding of Head Start; and then, of course, the full funding of Medicaid for public hospitals; and, of course, the Medicare fix that I think we need that our letter suggests should go forward, and that is to make sure physicians' money are either frozen or increased. I wanted to just overemphasize that.

And let me close by saying, I have always offered these words. These are frightening words because for some reason or another we have taken to believing a country that was built on immigrants now at the fault, that we have a problem that we have because of immigration. I think not. I think that we can be secure in homeland security by strong funding, but I think that as well we need to look at some of the issues that require enhanced funding of the INS so they can do their job of enforcement, but also do their job of allowing people to access legalization, like a bill that many of us supported, Republicans and Democrats, the re-statement or the reinstatement of

245(i) to allow families to be reunited. That takes dollars in order to work.

We need to pass the legislation, but in order to implement it, these are the kinds of values and legislative initiatives that I would hope that we would hear about. But more importantly, I would hope that we would energize the Congress by passing this kind of approach to governing America's business, a stimulus that is long term, Medicare guaranteed drug benefit that answers the cries of seniors for about 6 years, and other legislative initiatives that I have just mentioned that truly help to rebuild the country and ease the pain of so many Americans now that are suffering under this economic crisis that we are in.

I thank the gentleman very much and for his leadership on some of these issues. I hope we will get to work in the 108th Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, absolutely, and again, particular statements the gentlewoman made about homeland security and the potential war, it goes back to what I was talking about, this whole idea of, I call it the State of the Union credibility gap. In other words, the President promises to accomplish a goal, but no action is taken that would achieve that goal, and I think it is very true with the homeland security issue.

In other words, we get up and talk about how we are going to protect the homeland, but then when the money comes for the first responders back at home in our towns or counties, money has not been there; and even the war in terms of a potential war in Iraq, the budget does not include, the President's budget does not include the cost of fighting the war. So when we talk about this deficit, which we estimate to be about \$300 billion at this point, it does not include the cost of the war, which could be 2-, 300-, maybe as much, and put us in deficit to \$600 billion, and I think that is the problem.

We are getting a lot of rhetoric from the President, but we are not getting the action that goes along with it, and I know I have my colleague here from Ohio who is going to talk about that also in the sense of the veterans' benefits. I had said earlier, and I know he is going to get into this in more detail, but the President gets up here and talks about how he is a champion of the veterans, but then the White House cuts funding for VA health clinics, forcing 164,000 veterans to be turned away, and I am hearing this all the time in my district about how the money is not there.

I appreciate the gentleman coming down here, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

In just literally a few hours the President is going to walk into this Chamber. It is going to be filled with all of the Representatives and Senators and President's Cabinet, members of the Supreme Court, some members of

the diplomatic corps. The press is going in the balcony. It is going to be one of those great occasions, and the President is going to stand and deliver the State of the Union Address, and he is going to talk about priorities, and he is going to use a lot of words.

And I have been here long enough to know that talk is easy, action is sometimes difficult, and I want to speak specifically about the priorities that this administration is pursuing.

At a time when we are on the brink of war, hundreds of thousands of our young men and women sent across the sea, possibly to engage in a conflict that could cost them their lives, what message are we sending to those who have already fought the battle, who have fought in past wars, who have paid with their health, sometimes their limbs? What message are we sending when we start nickel and diming the veterans of this country?

I have an older gentleman who is coming into this chamber tonight as my guest from Woodsfield, Ohio, a little town along the Ohio River. His name is Herman Zerger.

□ 1515

Herman is a World War II veteran. He voted for the very first time crouched in a foxhole in France. And he said a runner brought a ballot by and he was able to mark his ballot for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Herman has not missed voting in an election since that very first time that he voted.

I asked him to come here tonight because he is a World War II veteran. He is a treasure. He is a treasure to me and to my district. He is the kind of person that this country ought to be honoring and showing respect for and gratitude toward. But what is this administration doing to the Herman Zergers across this country? Let me tell my colleagues what they are doing.

About a year ago, the VA made a decision to increase the copayment for the cost of a prescription drug that our veterans must pay from \$2 a prescription to \$7 a prescription. Many veterans that I represent get 10 or more prescriptions a month. That is \$70 a month. And then they get a 3-month supply at a time through the VA, which is \$210 for a veteran who may be on a fixed income. Think about it. At a time when we are contemplating giving over \$600 billion in a tax cut to the richest 5 percent of the people who live in this country, we are increasing the cost of medicine for our veterans.

Let me talk about another decision the Veterans Administration has made. Last August, they sent out a memo to all of their health care providers; and they said to their health care providers, too many veterans, and I am paraphrasing obviously, but this is what they said, too many veterans are coming in for services. We do not have enough money to provide those services, and so this is how we are going to deal with it. As a health care provider, you are no longer able to participate in

a community health fair to tell veterans what services they are entitled to. You cannot send out newsletters telling veterans what services they are entitled to. You cannot make public service announcements telling veterans what services they are entitled to.

It is a gag rule on the VA health providers, an absolute gag rule. I call it the “If they do not ask, we will not tell policy.” We are saying to the veterans, if you do not ask what you are entitled to, we will not tell you what you are legally entitled to receive. It is a shameful policy.

And then the VA made a more recent decision, which my colleague referred to briefly. There are seven priority groupings within the veterans system. The VA system took group seven, priority group seven, and divided it and made a new priority group, priority group eight they call it. And then they told these priority group eight veterans, and these are people who have served our country honorably, they told them they can no longer participate in the VA health care system. Now, if they are already in there, they will not kick them out. But if they need to enroll, they cannot.

How much money does a veteran have to make to be in a priority eight group? Well, it depends on where they live in the country, but somewhere between \$26,000 and \$30,000 a year. So if a veteran makes more than that, the VA says, no, no, you cannot enroll in our health care system. You may have high prescription drug costs, you may have serious health conditions, but we cannot afford to provide you care.

Now, think about it. We are raising the prescription drug costs for our veterans, we are placing a gag order on our VA health care providers, telling them they cannot tell veterans about the services that they are entitled to, and then we take an entire group of veterans and we just say, you make too much money.

I want to tell my colleague what a veteran said to me a couple of days ago. He said, “Congressman Strickland, when they drafted me into the Armed Services and asked me to go fight for my country, they never asked me how much money I made then. But now they are saying, well, if you make \$30,000, that is too much money; we cannot afford to provide you with VA health care.”

Let me mention just one more thing in closing. I visited a group of veterans in Steubenville, Ohio, about 4 days ago, and they told me about a health fair that they conduct in this little county, Jefferson County, Ohio. They do it every year at the local high school. They do it on a Saturday, using all volunteers. The nurses and the doctors that participate in this health fair give of their own time on a Saturday. They average annually about 500 veterans coming to that health fair. Last summer, they were able to detect four cases of mouth cancer. Four cases. And

those people are now getting treatment.

Under this rule that the VA has imposed, this gag order, that group of veterans can no longer conduct this annual health fair. Think about that. Think about that. What have we become if in our country, as rich as we are, we are willing to take over \$600 billion and give it to the wealthiest among us and yet we are cutting back on the services that we are providing to those who have served this country in the military? It is a shameful set of circumstances.

I hope the President talks about veterans tonight. And when he talks about veterans, I hope he remembers what this administration is doing and that he reverses course. I would love for the President to announce tonight that he is removing the gag order on the veterans health care providers. I would like for the President to say we are reversing the decision to increase the cost of prescription drugs for veterans. I would like for the President to say priority eight veterans are welcome into the VA health care system because they served our country and we owe them.

So I thank the gentleman for giving me a chance to talk about this issue. It is one that really troubles me because I think it says something about the values that our country is embracing at this point in our historical time period. I believe we need to change course, to reverse course and start treating our veterans with the respect and the honor due them.

So I thank the gentleman for giving me a chance to speak to that issue, and I look forward to hearing from others of our colleagues as we talk about the economic circumstances facing this country.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. Speaker. I know that he has always been a champion for veterans. And that gag rule, I read about it in the paper; and it upset me a great deal.

In fact, in the last 2 weeks something similar happened with Medicare providers. They sent out to the contractors who run the Medicare program a memo essentially saying the same thing, that we do not want you to go out and do any kind of outreach to tell people about what services are available under Medicare. The sad thing about it is that we are often dealing with frail people. We are dealing with a lot of elderly people with Medicare and also with these veterans benefits. As the gentleman mentioned, in some small towns they may not have the normal means of finding out about what is available.

So it is really unfortunate, and again it goes back to this credibility gap I keep talking about. The President gives the impression, I am sure he will do it again tonight, about how he wants to provide Medicare coverage and expand for prescription drugs and all these great things in the health

care sphere, but in reality we find these memos telling the departments not to tell anybody what is even available now, let alone expand the program. It is totally inconsistent.

Mr. STRICKLAND. If my colleague will yield, I believe the VA has broken the law when they imposed this gag order. I have asked the General Accounting Office to make a determination regarding whether or not the law was broken.

It is my understanding that before such a policy change can be made, that any agency of the Federal Government must bring that policy change back to this Congress for approval or disapproval. The VA has failed to do that. So I am looking forward to getting a determination, perhaps within the next few days; and I believe I am correct in my assumption that the law has not been followed and that the VA is in violation of a law that was passed by this House and by the Senate requiring them to inform the Congress whenever such a policy change occurs. They did not do that in this case.

Mr. PALLONE. Well, I appreciate what the gentleman has said; and I thank him for coming down here, as he often does.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield now to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for organizing this very important Special Order talking about the State of health care in our country. And before the gentleman from Ohio leaves the well, I want to commend him too for all the work that he has done in regards to veterans issue and also for highlighting for a few minutes this afternoon before the State of the Union address the current state of affairs in regards to health care funding for our veterans in this country generally.

Another very important topic that the gentleman did not address this afternoon is the whole concurrent pay issue, and it is something we have all supported, dealing with veterans benefits and disability payments which are currently offset, and that we are trying to correct; but the administration has refused to fund that.

Now, in a few hours, as my colleagues have indicated, the President will be here in the well addressing the Nation, and really the world, in giving us his speech on the State of the Union. We will hear a lot of discussion in regards to Iraq this evening, in regards to probably some of the other international crises which are currently confronting the world and this Nation. Not just Iraq, but the situation in North Korea, the conflict in the Middle East, the situation down in Venezuela, all are very serious. But we have an obligation in this Congress to do all that we possibly can to ensure the safety and the security of our citizens, and we will move forward as a Nation in addressing those concerns.

One of the things I continuously hear from folks back home in my Third Con-

gressional District in western Wisconsin is they also expect us to walk and chew gum at the same time; to not just deal with the national security threats that exist against us, but also deal with the domestic challenges that now confront us.

As I travel around my congressional district, and I am sure it is true for my friend from New Jersey as well, one of the paramount issues that people want to talk about, because they are so concerned about it, is the State of our health care system and the deficiency that they are currently seeing; the fact we have so many people on the uninsured rolls in this country, close to 44 million this year alone; the fact there is a lot of cost shifting going on by our providers because of the inadequacy of reimbursements rates and the impact that has on double-digit premium increases on insurance policies that large and small employers are offering their employees.

This is killing the backbone of our economy, and small business owners in particular. We need to think of bold and creative solutions to the health care crisis that we are facing, not to mention the inadequacy of the current Medicare program and the lack of a prescription drug program, which is long overdue. That is as key and important a part of modern health care today, prescription drugs and access and the affordability of prescription drugs, as hospital beds were back in the mid-1960s when the Medicare program was first created.

One of my chief concerns as we move forward in this 108th Congress is really the economic plan being pursued by the administration. It is one being pursued with fiscal reckless abandon. They are currently projecting close to a \$300 billion deficit this year, which would set a record, an all-time record, in budget deficits for our country. If the economic plan that is currently being pursued with large new spending increases and large new tax cuts continue to be pursued, we will be looking at massive budget deficits throughout the remainder of this decade and perhaps beyond.

This is all occurring at exactly the wrong moment, when we have an aging population, close to 80 million baby boomers all marching in lockstep to their retirement, which is going to start in a few short years. We are not making the type of decisions that we need to make today in order to prepare our country for that inevitability, which is just around the corner.

It is kind of the 800-pound gorilla in this Chamber. Everyone knows about it, but nobody really wants to talk about it or address it. I would hope tonight that during the President's State of the Union address he will touch upon the concerns that the health care industry has, that our providers have in regards to the inadequacy of reimbursements rates, but also what plan he has to turn the budget around so we can get back to balance; so we can exercise some fiscal discipline again in

our budgetary decisions; so we can prepare the next generation of Americans, our children and grandchildren, to deal with the challenges that they will face in their lifetime.

One of my greatest fears, as the father of two little boys who are only 4 and 6, is that we are setting them up for failure.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the future generation of Americans who we are going to leave a legacy of massive debt to, and at the same time ask them to afford the programs for this massive baby boom retirement which is going to start in a few short years.

Those are some of the issues that hopefully the President will also delve into given the limited amount of time that he will have in the State of the Union Address. I think these are crucial issues to the people back in my district who are wondering how are we going to deal with the massive budget deficits which jeopardize the long-term economic security of our Nation, while also being able to make the crucial investments that need to be made in the health care system, in our education systems so our kids can stay competitive, and also in preserving and conserving our natural resources in this country.

We need to walk and chew gum at the same time. We need to do this together. Hopefully we will have an atmosphere of bipartisanship as we move forward on these important issues in the weeks and months ahead.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman brought up this issue of the debt. I would like to end this Special Order with that issue because I think it is so important.

I remember when I was first elected, which was about 15 years ago now, and a Member used to come down every afternoon or evening during this time of Special Orders with a huge sort of digital clock that ran the length of this podium here that had the amount of the debt and how it was increasing every minute or 15 minutes, and the Republican Party were in the minority then, and they made that a basic premise. We had to get rid of this Federal deficit.

Finally when we did under President Clinton, the last couple of years we had a surplus, that is when the economy was in the boom times. We all know if we create a surplus, it helps the economy. The Federal Government is not taking away money that private industry uses to create new jobs and new production.

Even in the President's State of the Union Address last year, the President said that he wanted to control the debt. If there was any debt, it would be short-term, it would not continue to grow. Now all of a sudden silence as if it does not matter anymore.

I have one statistic. It was in the New York Times January 16 when the OMB Director Daniels suggested that

the budget is not likely to be in surplus in the next 10 years. I do not want to say that Republicans do not care, but they seem to be really downplaying this as if it does not matter. The gentleman from Wisconsin is right, this is essentially an inheritance tax on our children. They are going to have to pay it back.

I wish we would hear something from the President about how he is going to deal with this deficit because from what I can understand, if we were able to implement his economic stimulus package, if we then made the tax cuts that were passed last year permanent, and then add the cost of the war in Iraq, which might be 2- to \$300 billion, if that happens, we could be talking about a couple-trillion-dollar deficit. I do not understand how, and again it goes back to the credibility gap. He makes commitments how we are going to keep the deficit under control, and then we find out it is very much the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I believe now is as good a time as any for the baby boom generation, this massive demographic bubble that is working its way through our society and aging ever so gracefully, to step into this political debate. I think the message is being delivered to them that they can have it all, that they can have massive tax cuts today and retirement security tomorrow, when it is really their generation and the challenge that their generation poses that we need to come to grips with.

I have to believe that the President is a good son, loyal and dutiful and listens to his mom and dad. I think it would be wise if the President were to listen to what his father said when it was proposed, this type of economic plan was proposed to him back in the early 1980s, where they would have huge increases in spending, coupled with large tax cuts, which would lead to large budget deficits, which did occur during the decade of the 1980s and the early 1990s. The first President Bush called it voodoo economics because he knew what would transpire.

It is like *deja vu* all over again, the economic policies coming out of this White House: Huge increases in spending, although they want to claim to be the party of fiscal constraint. We had a 10 percent growth in government spending last fiscal year alone. On the current track, we are going to be pretty close to that this fiscal year. Double that with the large tax cuts which have been enacted, with the increased spending and the reduction in revenue, we are going to have massive budget deficits forming. That is why the Office of Management and Budget, their own economic analysts are saying \$300 billion in projected deficits this year alone without even counting a military obligation in Iraq, which could blow the lid off everything else.

I feel there is time to recover. We have not slid too far down that road

yet where, without further budgetary discipline, we could not turn this ship of state around in the nick of time. Unlike the decade of the 1980s and the early 1990s when these huge deficits accumulated, we do not have the luxury of a decade of the 1990s to reduce the deficit and start running some surpluses again in time for this massive retirement that is about to begin with the baby boom generation.

We have a lot of work cut out for us this year, and hopefully some people are starting to pay attention to the looming economic crisis that budget deficits most assuredly will bring, and we will act accordingly.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. The whole goal of this Special Order is to say do not mislead us. If we have a State of the Union Address tonight, be honest where we are going, what we are going to accomplish and what it is going to cost. We are not going to be able to do it all, and the President basically has to confront that issue, and I hope he does.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight on the eve of the historic State of the Union the President is going to provide to the American people to discuss the role that Congress has played in a very constructive way, in a very bipartisan way in assisting this President in some of the most difficult foreign policy decisions that have ever confronted this Nation.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric about the partisan politics of this President not doing what he said he would do and this President wanting to go into war and jump ahead of events and threaten the lives of the American people, and we all know that is just rhetoric. This President, to his core, does not want war. This Congress does not want war. This Congress and this President do not want conflict. So when Members on either side get up and spew out rhetoric that makes it appear that this President is bent on creating conflict with Iraq or North Korea, it is untrue.

I want to analyze some of the events that occurred over the recent recess, the role of Congress in a constructive way to assist this President on foreign policy. I want to lay the groundwork for what I think will be the President's comments tonight about some of the most difficult crises that we face today.

Much of the President's speech tonight will focus on domestic issues, and I look forward to that because we have to have a blueprint to restart this economy. He will talk about education, about health care and prescription drugs, and those are issues that we

have to continue to address, and this President has a plan for those issues. He has a national energy strategy that we passed in the House that got hung up in the Senate last year. We passed a prescription drug bill which could not get through the Senate. The President tonight will challenge us to complete the work domestically that he has outlined for us in the past, and he will outline a new vision in terms of jump-starting the economy.

But the real focus has to do with our national security, because as we all know, Article I, section 8 of our Constitution, which defines the role of the Congress, does not mention health care as a key priority. It does not mention the environment as a key priority. In fact, it does not mention education. But Article I, section 8 mentions the responsibility of the Congress. In five specific instances it mentions this: To provide for the common defense of the American people. That is our ultimate responsibility, because without a strong defense, we cannot have an education system, quality health care, or a decent environment. A national security provides that underpinning.

It is amazing to me when I hear the candidates who have announced they are running for the President 2 years down the road get up and spew out this rhetoric about how this President has caused all of these hostile relations with Saddam Hussein and other leaders around the world.

I would remind Members, it was over the past 10 years that when we as a Nation did not enforce the arms control agreements already on the books that technologies were transferred out of Russia and China 38 times. In fact, I had the Congressional Research Service document those 38 instances. Thirty-eight times during the 1990s we had solid evidence of technology being leaked, illegally sold and transferred out of Russia and China to five countries. Those five countries were Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya and North Korea. What were those technologies? They were chemical and biological precursors that would allow Saddam Hussein to build chemical and biological weapons. They were missile components to allow Iraq and Iran to build their medium-range missile systems that they now have today. They were nuclear components to allow these countries to develop nuclear weapons capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, all that occurred during the 1990s, and the documentation showed it occurred 38 times. Of those 38 instances, we imposed the required sanctions of the treaties less than 10 times. The other 28 times we pretended we did not see it, partly because our policy towards Russia during the 1990s was to keep Yeltsin in power; and, therefore, we did not want to raise any concerns that might embarrass Yeltsin back to Moscow. So even though we knew this technology was flowing, we pretended we did not see it.

I remember very vividly a meeting in Moscow in May 1997 in the office of

General Alexander Lebed. He was a retired two-star general, and had just left Yeltsin's side as his defense adviser.

My bipartisan delegation said, "General, tell us about your military."

He said, "Congressman, our military is in total disarray. Our best warfighters, our best Soviet generals and admirals have left the service of the country because of a lack of pay, because of indecent housing, and because of morale problems beyond their control."

He went on to say that they feel betrayed by the motherland, and they are selling off the technology that we built to use against the United States during the Cold War, and they are selling it to your enemies. General Lebed went on to say to our bipartisan delegation, "Our problem today is your problem tomorrow." How right General Lebed was.

Mr. Speaker, that was in May 1997 at the height of the time when many of us in the Congress in both parties were screaming for enforcement of arms control regimes, because if we had taken steps back then, Saddam Hussein and bin Laden and the rest of these terrorist cells would not have this technology that we are now having to allocate billions of dollars to defend against because Iraq and Iran could not themselves build chemical and biological agents. They got that technology from Russia, a destabilized Russia. North Korea did not have the technology for long-range missiles. They got that technology from China and also from Russia.

So when I hear our colleagues, primarily on the other side of the aisle, taking shots at the President, saying he created all of this, it makes me sad because the facts do not support that conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, we are paying the price today for the inaction of all of us during the 1990s. Since I was a Member of this body at that time, I include myself. We could have and we should have done more to reinforce the transparency and the control mechanisms that were in place to prevent these kinds of technologies from being leaked into the hands of unstable players.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we are where we are today, and the fact is that Iraq has chemical and biological and nuclear weapons. As a senior member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have sat through hundreds of briefings. I have gone to classified intelligence sessions. While I cannot talk about what I have seen publicly, there is no doubt in my mind, there is no doubt in the mind of anyone who follows these issues, that Saddam Hussein has the worst weapons imaginable.

Mr. Speaker, in Ken Pollack's recent book, talking about the ultimate activity that we are now in against Saddam Hussein, he quotes some U.N. special documents that compare the atrocities of Saddam Hussein's regime to those of Adolph Hitler before World War II.

What is amazing to me is those candidates running for the Presidency on the Democratic side who have criticized President Bush, I did not hear their rhetoric spewing out when President Clinton went to invade Yugoslavia. And as bad as Slobodan Milosevic was and is, and thank goodness he is being tried for war crimes today, even the actions of Slobodan Milosevic do not compare to what Saddam Hussein has committed on his own people.

□ 1545

We know that he has used chemical weapons on his own people. In fact, we had one instance where 15,000 people were killed by the actions of Saddam Hussein.

We know Saddam has a biological weapons program. In fact, in 1992 when Saddam Hussein was driven out of Kuwait, he signed a document pledging to the world community, not just the U.S., pledging to the world community that he would disarm, he would destroy all of his weapons of mass destruction. So the inspectors from the U.N. went into his country. We knew at the time he had chemical, biological weapons. We knew they were there. We saw them. We knew they could be accounted for, and we knew he was developing a nuclear capability.

And yet in the mid-1990's, Saddam kicked out those U.N. inspectors, and we did nothing about it. In 1998 everything was gone out of Iraq while Saddam continued to do exactly what the world community told him not to do and which he agreed not to do in 1992. When President Bush came in in 2000, he said in his very simple analysis we cannot allow this to continue. We are allowing a man who will use weapons of mass destruction against us to build additional capability, and that is why the actions that we are leading up to today through the U.N. and with the President are so essential to be supported by all of us.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I met with some of my Russian friends recently and they said, You know, the problem, Curt, in your country is you get out front and you have all these people taking shots at your President and Saddam Hussein reads that as weakness, he reads that as an inconsistent policy towards him and if he just holds out long enough, the antagonism in America will go away. So in effect those people in some cases crying most loudly for peace are the very ones that might lead us to war. If we as a Nation would get behind this President and show solid bipartisan support that Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction that the world has acknowledged, that need to be destroyed, then Saddam Hussein would get the message that it does not matter how long he can prolong this effort and deny the U.N. inspectors; he must open up and let us see these weapons that we know he has.

Colin Powell yesterday said it best, Mr. Speaker. He asked some very fun-

damental questions: Where are the chemical weapons? Where are the mobile vans? Where are the biological agents that we know we had in the past that all of a sudden have disappeared? And my colleagues would do well in challenging this President to repeat the fact that all we want is Saddam to publicly acknowledge and then allow the destruction of those weapons to take place. Who can be against that, Mr. Speaker? No one. And if he does not do that, then we have to face the possibility of using force to accomplish the security that our Nation deserves.

And some would say the polls do not support the President. Mr. Speaker, no decent President in American history has governed by polls. We do not elect a President to put his finger in the air to read the way the winds are blowing. We elect a President to exert leadership, to be out front where others think perhaps he is going wrong. And this President has showed that leadership time and again. Mr. Speaker, it was this President who moved us out of the ABM treaty.

I would remind my colleagues on both sides, remember what we heard from the liberal left in this city. The world was going to end, a nuclear race would start, Russia and China would go off the deep end. We pulled out of the ABM treaty because of the President's desire to protect our own people, and there was a giant yawn around the world. Ironically today we are looking to do more missile defense cooperation with Russia than ever before. In fact, in a recent visit with the chairman of one of Russia's largest space institutes, Kurchatov, they showed me a document and asked me to support it; but I could not talk about it until the ABM treaty had expired because it would violate the terms of the treaty, allowing Russia and America to work together for the common defense of our people.

George Bush showed leadership. In spite of what the polls said, in spite of what our colleagues said in this body and the other body, George Bush stood up for what was right for America, and history has proven that he made the right decision.

The same thing is applicable now, Mr. Speaker. We have some extremely tough challenges. We have never had a more complicated foreign policy situation than we have today. Thank goodness we have a President who understands people who can lead. Thank goodness we have a President who put Colin Powell in the position of power, who has integrity, who has respect around the world perhaps unlike any other Secretary of State in the history of this Nation. Thank goodness we have a President who put Condoleezza Rice as the head of the National Security Council, his top advisor on security, someone who is not a politician but someone who understands geopolitical issues and is there at the side of the President advising him on policy direction and on procedures to deal

with other nations. And thank goodness we have Don Rumsfeld as the Secretary of Defense, someone who to his core will make sure that our military is the best prepared and the best equipped not to fight a war but to deter aggression. The reason we have a strong military is to deter aggression from those enemies and those adversaries who would want to take us down or who would want to harm our allies and our friends. And Don Rumsfeld plays that role extremely well.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this administration; and I am proud of this President, and I am also proud of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked together for bipartisan support of some very difficult issues.

Mr. Speaker, in December I led a delegation that started out in the former Soviet Republic of Georgia. We went to Georgia for several reasons. First of all, to meet with President Shevardnadze to assure him that we are a key ally that he could count on to help Georgia in rebuilding their Nation, their economy, and this new democracy. We went up and got the briefings on the Pankisi Gorge when we went to Moscow, we could reassure the Russians that the Georgians were doing everything possible along with American assistance to drive out the terrorist cells that had been in the Pankisi Gorge in the past that posed such a threat to the people of Russia.

But perhaps the most important reason we went to Georgia, Mr. Speaker, was our concern that last winter the gas supplies for the Georgian people to heat their homes was cut off. In the middle of the winter they had no heat, and so I invited to meet us in Georgia the president of the primary gas supplier for that Nation. President Igor Makarov of the Itera Corporation met us in Georgia at my request, and I asked him to make a public statement, which he did; and that public statement at our suggestion was to guarantee the people of Georgia that no gas supplies would be shut off this winter so they in fact could not be dangled by anyone using energy, using heat as a source of manipulation. The Congress played an extremely constructive role in that visit, and I thank my colleagues for their support in that effort.

We then moved on to Belarus. Belarus has not been a friend to the United States in recent years. President Lukashenko has drifted aside. He has unfortunately manipulated the Parliament and has caused problems in our relationship. In fact, just before we arrived in Minsk, the capital of that country, he kicked out the OSCE inspectors that were there to monitor human rights, free and fair elections, and the oversight of the OSCE responsibilities that all 55 member nations agree upon.

When I arrived in Minsk, our ambassador, who is a very capable man, said, "Congressman, President Lukashenko is not going to meet with you. He

meets with no one from the West nor from America." I said, "Ambassador, I would not be here if I had not received a personal invitation from President Lukashenko." At five o'clock on the afternoon of the evening we arrived, the foreign ministry from Belarus contacted us at the hotel and said that we were in fact invited to President Lukashenko's home for a private dinner meeting, which I attended along with my colleague from the Senate, Senator CONRAD BURNS, and our colleague from the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

We spent 5 hours, 5 hours in the home of President Lukashenko, with the President and two other individuals, one of whom was a good friend of mine. We sat around a table and for the first hour we talked about ice hockey because that is a passion of the President, and Belarus was the Cinderella team in the Olympics in America just a few years ago. And then we turned to more serious issues, and I conveyed to President Lukashenko that we wish his people no ill will, that President Bush does not want to have sour relations with Belarus, but there were certain parameters that Belarus had to get back to so that we in the Congress could support an agenda to assist the people of Belarus in dealing with their economic problems, their health care problems. And those issues deal with free and fair elections, a legitimate Parliament. Those issues deal with the concerns that we have over proliferation coming out of Belarus, and those issues deal with restoring the OSCE representatives back into Minsk.

After 5 hours of discussion, President Lukashenko agreed with our assessment. We shook hands and we thought we had reached an agreement that would last and change a direction of our relationship with this nation that some have called one of the most untrustworthy in all of Europe. Unfortunately, the next day the foreign ministry of Belarus misinterpreted what we had said, and we had to come back publicly and make some very strong statements against the President of Belarus.

A week later, I was contacted by my friend who is a personal friend of Lukashenko, and he said, "Congressman WELDON, President Lukashenko understands that perhaps things were not conducted the way they should have been, the way it was discussed with you and your colleagues." The bottom line is, Mr. Speaker, that 1 month later President Lukashenko in Vienna announced that all six OSCE reps would be restored to their positions in Minsk. Congress again played a constructive role in supporting our President in moving toward a stable relationship with this nation.

We moved on to Moscow, Mr. Speaker, and there we signed a historic document. Members of the United States House, the United States Senate, the Russian Duma, and the Russian Federation Council met together in one

room to agree to a document that we all signed, supported by almost 100 members of our Congress, House and Senate, and the Russian Parliament, Duma and Federation Council. These identical pieces of legislation that we drafted back in the fall call for a new energy strategy that the U.S. should rely on Russian energy sources and move away from the troubled resources of the Middle East. The documents that we signed, which I will present to Speaker HASTERT and President Bush this week, signify a new time in our relationship where the four parliaments understand a new strategic opportunity to move together, to help America move away from Middle Eastern crude, to help Russia realize the financial resources they need to help their economy by selling America her energy capabilities. While in Moscow we also met with the senior leaders of the Russian Government and the Duma and the Federation Council. We talked about arms control and proliferation, and we talked about our strategy for a new relationship, a document that one third of this Congress signed on to a year and a half ago before the first summit.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of our colleagues in this body because prior to the first presidential summits, a group of our colleagues who have traveled to Russia, Democrats and Republicans together united, working with those think tanks to focus on Russian-American relations, we produced a 40-some page document with 108 recommendations in 11 key areas to say to our two Presidents that it was time that America and Russia moved together as they had announced publicly in speeches they had given. These 11 areas included agriculture, health care, education, science and technology, energy, the environment, local government, judicial systems, and defense and security. These 108 recommendations, Mr. Speaker, were endorsed by one third of this body and in the other body by our colleagues, Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator CARL LEVIN, and Senator DICK LUGAR, so that when President Bush and President Putin were hand delivered these documents, they both knew that Congress was ready to move our relationship into a new direction.

□ 1600

That was a year and a half ago, Mr. Speaker. In May of last year, when I led a delegation of 13 colleagues to Moscow on the last day of the Moscow summit, we had a luncheon in the Presidential Hotel in downtown Moscow with Members of our Senate, our House, the Russian Duma and Federation Council. One of the former candidates for the Presidency of Russia, Grigor Lavinsky, stood up to give a speech. Mr. Speaker, he held up this document and he said this was the basis of the Russian approach to both summits.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when the Congress unites and takes away the partisan rhetoric, we can accomplish great

things, and we can do it together, with our President, to move us in a new direction, as we have done with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, on our trip to Moscow in early December, I was overwhelmed with what occurred when we went to the Russian Academy of Sciences. In the former Soviet States their Academy of Sciences are the ultimate, the elite, those who really are the most respected people in those Soviet societies.

In Russia, its Academy of Sciences is the ultimate body. It is even a part of the government. Irregardless of who the President is, the Academy is part of the government as advisors.

I had been asked to speak to the Academy of Sciences, so we scheduled a visit. I walked in the room, and there before me were 300 academicians from all over the country. At the head table up front was former Presidential candidate and Communist Party leader Zyuganov, the former Foreign Minister and a whole host of former Russian leaders from all factions.

The Chairman of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mr. Osipov, was seated at the center of the head table. He brought me to the front and sat me down and said, Congressman, we are asking you to speak about this document for this new relationship which your Congress produced. I said, I will be happy to. He said, following your speech, we will open it up for questions.

I spoke for 25 minutes with our colleagues in the audience before 300 academicians. When I finished, Chairman Osipov asked them to ask us questions, which they did. Some were tough; most were positive.

But, Mr. Speaker, something then very strange happened. Chairman Osipov asked me to stand up and brought out a black cap and black gown, and they asked me to put it on. And then probably the most rewarding event that I have had in all of my years in public office, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the social science network, made me the first American member of their Academy. What an honor was bestowed upon me and all of my colleagues, because it was a process that involved members of both parties.

Following that ceremony, something extremely unusual happened that I wish I could share with every colleague in this body and the other Chamber. The Russian Academy of Sciences voted unanimously to make this document their document; to make our document, *A New Time, A New Beginning*, the official document of the Russian Academy of Social Sciences and to distribute it to every member of the Russian Duma and Federation Council.

Mr. Speaker, when members of both parties come together on foreign policy, we can achieve unbelievable results. We can shape the system, we can open new doors, and our colleagues from both parties deserve the praise that should be lavished on everyone for this new relationship that we have achieved with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, following our trip to Moscow in December, I went back to Moscow a second time in January for another very special purpose. Igor Kurchatov is the founder of the Soviet nuclear bomb. Much like those in America that were nuclear scientists who did not want their careers to focus on killing people, but rather wanted peaceful use of atomic energy, Igor Kurchatov was told by Stalin to build a nuclear bomb to respond to the American program for nuclear weapons following World War II. Igor Kurchatov built the Soviet nuclear weapons program. During the Cold War, it was Kurchatov's work and the work being done at our labs that allowed the two nations to build all of these nuclear weapons.

January 8, 2003, was the 100th anniversary of Igor Kurchatov's birth, the celebration at the institute named after him that day. It is the largest nuclear institute in Russia, with thousands of scientists.

Mr. Speaker, I was given the honor of speaking as a keynote speaker, along with the Japanese Prime Minister and the former Foreign Minister of Russia, to talk about this new relationship and about this laboratory that was built and designed for production of nuclear weapons, but now was being transformed for peaceful purposes.

The director of that lab, Dr. Evgeny Velikhov, is one of my best friends. He is a real scholar and a real leader for all of humanity. He has taken an agency in Russia that was designed to develop nuclear weapons and has transformed it into peaceful projects with our nuclear agencies and labs in America.

I would include at the end of the speech, Mr. Speaker, my speech at Kurchatov entitled *A New Millennium*. That speech outlines a new relationship between the U.S. and Russia to take apart our nuclear weapons, to dismantle our chemical and biological weapons, to follow through on the recommendations in our document to allow the U.S. and Russia to work together.

That speech, Mr. Speaker, was extremely well received on the Russian side, and I challenged them to build a new network of interaction between our labs and the Russian labs.

Following that speech we cut the ribbon on a brand new training facility that is retraining 600 Russian nuclear physicists who used to work on bombs to do software engineering for Russian IT companies working with American IT companies.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way. The new relationship with Russia just did not happen. It happened because the Congress, Democrats and Republicans, worked together, following the leadership of Presidents Bush and Putin, who set the vision for our nations, who talked about a new time and a new era of cooperation and support. Amazing things can happen, Mr. Speaker, when this Congress comes to-

gether and realizes that foreign policy challenges require us to act as a common body.

Yes, we can disagree in the process, but not to the point where we undermine our strategic leadership needs as best put forth by Colin Powell and President George Bush.

Mr. Speaker, we want to expand those programs, those nuclear nonproliferation programs, those cooperative threat reduction programs. But let me issue a word of caution to some of my colleagues in both bodies, because some have put out some misinformation that perhaps we in the House do not want these programs to move forward.

Nothing could be further from the truth. To those who have said publicly that the House is trying to handicap cooperation with Russia and dismantling chemical and biological and nuclear weapons, I say hogwash. What we did do last year, Mr. Speaker, as the stewards of the American taxpayer dollars, is to say that every dollar we spend in Russia, we must hold them accountable for how those dollars are ultimately given out.

Why is transparency and integrity and fiscal responsibility so critical here, Mr. Speaker? Well, for one reason, last year there was an audit done by the Department of Defense inspector general, who found \$95 million misused by some unscrupulous people inside of Russia. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable. As much as I want to take apart chemical and biological weapons and reduce Russia's nuclear stockpile, I do not want \$95 million siphoned off for some other purpose, and neither does any other taxpayer in this Nation.

For my colleagues in both bodies to stand up and to say in op-eds and public speeches that somehow this body wants to stop those programs is absolutely false and is an outrageous misstatement. All we want in expanding these programs is transparency. All we want are some basic conditions that show the Russian side and the American contractors doing this work in Russia that we want accountability for every dollar spent. We should seek no less for the taxpayers, because it is their money that we are spending.

As the chairman of the subcommittee that oversees much of our defense procurement, I can imagine the outrage if one of our defense contractors could not account for \$95 million of taxpayer money. It would be a national scandal. But there are those in this body and the other body who want to pretend that is not a problem.

This year we in the House will continue to support expansion of programs for nuclear nonproliferation, for cooperative threat reduction. In fact, I am preparing a new package of legislation at this very moment. But in the end we will also guarantee that every dime of money that we spend is accounted for and is not being abused by anyone.

Mr. Speaker, following our trip to Moscow, we went on to Belgrade. We

met with the Prime Minister of Serbia, the leadership of the Parliament there, and we got an update on the progress that Yugoslavia is making following the war of just a few short years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you, I was disappointed. We bombed Belgrade, we bombed Yugoslavia, and we promised after the bombing as a Nation and as a group of nations that we would help them rebuild if they followed certain conditions. Mr. Speaker, they have followed those conditions. Our embassy in Belgrade certified to us that they are making progress, yet we, Mr. Speaker, and our allies have not taken the steps to properly support the rebuilding of Yugoslavia, and that is an outrage.

So I come back tonight and I plead to our colleagues in both bodies to work to live up to the promises that we made to the people of Yugoslavia, that they, in fact, can rebuild their country which we bombed just a few short years ago to rid them of the scourge of Milosevic.

Our last stop on that trip, Mr. Speaker, was in Vienna. The trip to Vienna had two purposes, to receive at the IAEA the most recent briefing on nuclear weapons in both North Korea and Iraq. For 2 hours we sat at their headquarters, and they walked us through this Agency's assessment of the nuclear capability and potential of Iraq and the nuclear capability and potential of North Korea.

I would tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, it was not a pretty briefing. In fact, I invited the IAEA to come to Washington, which they accepted, where they will allow for every Member of Congress to receive the same briefing, the briefing as to the capabilities of both North Korea and Iraq with nuclear weapons and nuclear facilities such as the reactors that are being built in North Korea, the reactor being built in Iraq, and the potential for that material to be used illegally by either or both nations.

Mr. Speaker, we also in Vienna visited the OSCE, hosted by our very capable Ambassador Steve Minikes. At the OSCE headquarters I had the privilege to speak to 10 of the major nations' ambassadors, including Russia, about America and our policies relative to the OSCE. Ambassador Minikes and the OSCE team is doing a fantastic job. Again, it is because of the bipartisan support of people like the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and those people who involve themselves in the inter-parliamentary dialogue that is a part of the OSCE process.

So, Mr. Speaker, I come full circle, and I come full circle because tonight in a few short hours the President will stand behind us and give a speech, and a major part of his speech will focus on foreign policy. I say to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, we have proven time and again that we can take on any challenge the Nation has and win if we stick together, if we take apart the

partisan rhetoric and get down to the substance of what America needs to do.

□ 1615

None of us want war. None of us want conflict. None of us want to see Americans go overseas and shed any blood. Now is the time for us to stand together, at the most difficult point in the recent history of this Nation. We face the scourge of terrorism. We face uncertainty in the Middle East. We face China and Taiwan, North and South Korea, India and Pakistan, all of which require us as a Nation to act together; to disagree on the way we approach these solutions, but to do it in a civil way, to show these countries that, in the end, we are united. I would just caution our colleagues in both bodies in both parties to understand the importance of that approach to these very difficult foreign policy challenges.

Mr. Speaker, one final word. Over the recess, as it was for the past year, we have tried to take a bipartisan delegation into North Korea, to DPRK. In May of last year, 13 of our colleagues were together. We went to Moscow, we went to Beijing and Seoul, being promised all along we would get visas to go into North Korea to open some dialogue with Kim Jong-il and the North Korean Supreme People's Congress. We were denied that ability; even though we had been promised, we were not given the ability to travel in there to open doors.

In August we received an e-mail from the North Korean Government to try again. I went back up to the U.N. two more times and met with the DPRK ambassador, Ambassador Han, and pleaded with him to allow us to bring a delegation in. In January of this year, with his support, I reissued a letter asking for support for our delegation to visit, equal Members of Democrat and Republican from this body. With the support of President Jiang Zemin in China, which we received in May of last year personally, and with the support of Kofi Annan who called me at home a week ago and said Congressman, we are behind your effort; with the support of his chief interlocutor who has been working the DPRK issue for the U.N., Maurice Strand; with the support, quietly, of our own government, aware of what we were doing and not telling us to oppose it, the North Korean Government again has consistently opposed an effort, an honest effort by Democrats and Republicans, to open a new dialogue.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleagues in both parties who have stood together and said, we will go back to Pyongyang, we will take a delegation in, we will have a discussion, we will tell Kim Jong-il and the North Korean people that we wish them no ill will, we do not want a war with them, we want to encourage the south in its effort to establish a peaceful relationship, but there are certain things that the DPRK must do, as outlined by our

President and Secretary of State. They must return to their commitment to a safe policy of relationships with our neighbors. They must end their program of developing highly enriched uranium which will lead to nuclear weapons; and if they take those steps, then we can peacefully cooperate with them. We can become a trading partner, and we in this body can open new doors and new opportunities as we have done with Russia, as we have done with other nations around the world.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I encourage our colleagues tonight who have done so much, so much good with so much foreign policy challenge existing around the world, Democrats and Republicans have consistently united; and I encourage my colleagues to look for that opportunity again, so that following the State of the Union tonight we can come out with one voice, with one Nation and say that we all want to avoid war. But we must continue to exert the pressure that was required by the U.N. resolutions in 1992, that was required by the arms control agreements that North Korea has now opted out of, and if they come back to the normalcy that they were once a part of, that, in fact, we can have peaceful coexistence without conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation. I will insert the speech, "A New Millennium," that I presented to the institute as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

A NEW MILLENIUM

To stand before you today—as an American, as a member of the United States House of Representatives—and deliver the keynote address in celebration of the 100th birthday of Igor Kurchatov, is an astonishing privilege. An invitation to attend this important occasion would have been honor enough. That I stand here as a principal speaker is so much more than I could have ever imagined. It is truly a humbling experience.

How far we—the United States and Russia—have come! From adversaries to friends, from competitors to partners—we have moved huge distances from the world of our youth. The cold war is over, finished forever. Today, Russians and Americans are called to be the instruments of a new and, hopefully, more peaceful, prosperous, and democratic world in which each and every human being on this globe will live in peace and dignity.

I have had a lifelong interest in Russia. I have studied Russian language, history and culture. Over time, I have been blessed with many opportunities to travel to this great country. I have learned that the Russians are a proud people, historically aware, and mindful of Russia's unique global role.

I also have a passion for science and the good things it can accomplish. My home city of Philadelphia was the home of a famous American, Benjamin Franklin. As a child I was told of the wonderful discoveries and practical application of science by Mr. Franklin, who is one of the founders of our nation. I have since been interested in what science can do for mankind. Russia and science make such a wonderful combination, a combination that could springboard to a wonderful and prosperous future.

One hundred years ago—on January 8, 1903—Igor Kurchatov, son of a nobleman who was himself the grandson of a serf, was born

to a life of great destiny. Igor Kurchatov was one of those central persons of 20th century Russia, who helped to define Russia's role in the modern world. He was a remarkable man who left his mark and legacy on Russia forever.

We gather here today more than 40 years after his death to pay tribute not only to him, but the institute that bears his name. Indeed, the occasion of Igor Kurchatov's 100th birthday provides us with an opportunity to salute the entire Russian scientific community, especially the nuclear science community. For it is my firm belief that the emerging future of a prosperous, democratic Russia will rely on the hard work and talent of Russia's scientific and engineering community—a community that Igor Kurchatov was instrumental in establishing.

As I briefly trace some of Igor Kurchatov's accomplishments, I want to begin at the end of his life—in 1958, more than 40 years ago. In his last public address, Kurchatov said, "I'm glad that I have dedicated my life to Soviet nuclear science. I believe that our people and government will use science only for the good of mankind."

Today, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, I believe Kurchatov's final wish is coming true. From my position in the United States, I have had the opportunity over the past decade of seeing the Russian scientific community emerge from the shadows of the cold war and turn their formidable talents toward peaceful contributions to Russia and to the world. Even as I speak here today, the men and women in the institute that bears his name are hard at work, beating their swords into plowshares. And they are not alone in this great task—as scientists and engineers at other Russian institutes also turn to science to serve—rather than destroy—humanity.

Igor Kurchatov was both a world-class scientist and a loyal citizen of the Soviet Union. He was the father of the Soviet Union's atomic bomb. His country depended on him to create and provide its nuclear deterrent during the cold war. He succeeded in this demanding task under very difficult circumstances, despite the tyranny of his bosses: Joseph Stalin and Lavrenti Beria. He succeeded very well. The Soviet nuclear arsenal became and remained a serious worry of the United States throughout the cold war.

In retrospect, I can say that the nuclear deterrence of the United States and the Soviet Union provided the basis for stability during dangerous times of enmity and opposition. These weapons kept us from ever firing a shot in war or anger against one another. However we might think about that 50-year era and whether nuclear weapons and the threat of mutual assured destruction through their use was moral or wise, deterrence worked. Both countries—indeed the entire world—escaped the devastation of nuclear weapons because both countries had them and both recognized the consequences of their use.

The scientific infrastructure that Igor Kurchatov created to bring this about is, and will remain his enduring legacy, long after the days of the nuclear deterrence created by the capability of mutually assured destruction fades from our collective memory. What Kurchatov created goes well beyond nuclear weapons and encompasses the entire range of peaceful uses of the atom. No one can dispute the world-class capabilities of Russia's present nuclear science network. It is your inheritance from him.

The later part of Kurchatov's career was spent increasingly on peaceful uses of nuclear strategy. He oversaw the construction of particle accelerators and research in fusion. This new focus occupied him as his

health gradually deteriorated. Like his fellow scientist Sakharov, he called for an end to nuclear testing.

Kurchatov died in February 1960 of a blood clot in the brain. His last public appearance was to attend a performance of Mozart's Requiem. The haunting refrain of *dona eis requiem* (grant them peace) must have rung in his ears as he returned home from the concert hall moments before he died. I repeat that refrain now: *dona eis requiem, grant the world peace, grant him*—Igor Kurchatov—the peace that belongs to a man of peace.

You—the scientists and citizens of Russia—carry his torch into tomorrow. You are carrying it into an uncertain future. The future is always uncertain, no matter how hard we try to prepare for it. Your work will delineate the tomorrows for your children and grandchildren. It will define the future and improve it for Russia and the world. You—the scientists and engineers of Russia—have already begun the next phase of scientific endeavors for your country, and you have done it in the most difficult and troubling of times, and in the face of grave uncertainty.

I stand here today and tell you that you are not alone in this quest. The United States of America will stand with you as you build a new prosperous and democratic Russia. I am proud that the United States has been a partner with Russia and its scientists in so many ways since the end of the Soviet Union. I, as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, have supported all of the efforts of our U.S.-Russian partnership—whether through the International Science and Technology Center, the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention, or the Nuclear Cities Initiative. I have supported the joint U.S.-Russian work on nuclear materials—the conversion of Weapons-grade highly-enriched uranium (HEU) into Low-enriched uranium (LEU) for use in peaceful power reactors, the transformation of Weapons Plutonium into MOX fuel, also for peaceful use in reactors, and the safeguarding of nuclear material through the joint Materials Protection Control and Accounting (MPC&A) program.

The list of our partner projects goes on and on. I expect that we shall walk hand-in-hand in the scientific community's efforts against terrorism. These programs are also a key to Russia's and the United States' joint efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I am particularly interested in how you, the scientists and engineers of Russia, can transform your nation through the commercialization of Russian science, often in cooperation with U.S. companies. I see such commercialization as a key to future Russian prosperity.

Last month, I attended and addressed the annual meeting of the United States Industry Coalition, a group of more than 140 companies working with Russia and other former Soviet republics in cooperative scientific commercial ventures. These private companies have put aside all vestiges of cold war thinking. They are committed to and see the importance of creating jobs and viable business in Russia as their contribution to peace. I believe that such cooperation with the U.S. will help create, if not become, the locomotive of a new and prosperous Russian economy that takes full advantage of your greatest strengths—the thousands of excellent scientists, engineers, and technicians.

The institute that bears Igor Kurchatov's name plays a major role in all of these efforts. Its leaders, Academicians Evgeny Velikhov and Nicholai Nicholaiavitch Ponomarev-Stepnoi, have shown an aggressiveness and entrepreneurial spirit that should be emulated by all the science institutes of Russia. They see the future of Rus-

sia in high tech industries. One of the most foresighted efforts in this area is their participation with the United States Industry Coalition to create a sister organization, the National Industry Coalition here in Moscow, to encourage Russian companies to take advantage of Russia's technical expertise in new business ventures.

The Kurchatov Institute is not just standing still, waiting for tomorrow, but it creating the future. I urge all the scientific institutions of Russia to emulate the endeavors of those who are creating a new high tech commercial community in Russia. This need not just be an effort on behalf of weapons scientists.

We have the opportunity to accomplish so many things in our new U.S.-Russian partnership. We are already doing so against the horrors of terrorism and will do much more in that critical area. In fact, there are few areas where the United States and Russia cannot work together.

Last year I put together a blueprint for a U.S.-Russian partnership. This document was endorsed by one-third of the United States Congress. I called it *A New Time, A New Beginning*. In this document I present a new vision for U.S.-Russian relations. I wrote in because I believed then, and even more so today, that now is the time, with Vladimir Putin and George Bush as presidents of our two countries, to improve our relationship for the long-term. It is time to stop the roller coaster ride of the past decade and settle down into a steady forward path. Our route must continue to take full account of defense and security issues, even when they collide. However, it is now time to move beyond these issues as we step into the new millennium. It is time to take a holistic approach to cooperation—one that takes into account Russia's myriad concerns and needs as well as those of the United States.

I would like to describe the series of initiatives that I have proposed. These initiatives take a comprehensive view of what might be accomplished if we—the United States of America and the Russian Federation—set our minds and hearts on them. They deal with initiatives in environment, energy, economic development, and health care—as well as defense and security. Let me describe what I believe can be accomplished if we have the will and perseverance to stay the course.

It is time for greater cooperation on agricultural development. This means not only improving production, but expanding private-sector investment.

We must facilitate Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its acceptance of all WTO agreements. In addition, we should increase funding for OPIC and the U.S. Export-Import Bank projects here in Russia. Also essential for economic development is improvement of intellectual property rights so that companies will invest here.

Energy and natural resources are one of the great strengths of Russia. We should cooperate in oil and gas exploration, for example in Timan Pechora. Success in joint cooperation on energy will hinge on eliminating bureaucratic obstacles on both sides of the oceans. Our collaboration should investigate the energy security implications in this new environment of sub-national terrorism and the efforts of both our nations to snuff out such terrorism.

Of course, I consider cooperation in science and technology to be a linchpin of our future relationship. Our future economies will rest most assuredly on the ability to capitalize on new science and technology and create new businesses that meets the world's needs.

This cooperation includes cooperation in the area of nuclear fuel cycles. We must put

to rest public concern about the safety, environmental, and proliferation concerns associated with nuclear power. Over the long-term fusion may be the key to the world's energy needs. Therefore, we must cooperate more on fusion research.

We should also cooperate in the embryonic nanotechnology industry.

We have the opportunity to perform joint cutting-edge research in medical technology and treatments. The Department of Energy and Institutes such as MINATOM can collaborate on breakthrough technologies such as radiopharmaceuticals and advanced medical diagnostic and treatment equipment. We can also encourage research on devastating chronic illnesses such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes between the U.S. National Institutes of Health and appropriate Russian Research institutes. Our cooperation would include a more extensive exchange of physicians and scientists.

Scientists would also cooperate in Space and Aeronautics on projects like space solar power, propulsion technology and weather satellites. They would also expand cooperation on marine science research and on developing Russian technologies for environmental protection and remediation.

I would like to see creation of a fund from Russian foreign debt transferal that would be the economic engine for many of these initiatives. For example, commercial success in technology could lead to repayment of loans or grants from the fund. Such repayments could then be the basis for new investments in these programs.

Of course there are many other ways in which we should become partners. I propose to also include cultural and educational development, improvement of the Russian judicial and legal systems in order to firmly establish the "rule of law," as well as assistance to local Russian governments so that they can provide necessary services to the public and also encourage democracy at the grass roots level.

This is a very ambitious agenda that I propose. I put it forward because I happen to believe that there is no limit to what we can achieve in our partnership. After all, it is a new time. And new times call for new beginnings.

Much has happened in the one hundred years since the birth of Igor Kurchatov. The vast scientific and technical complex that is his legacy has done much to advance knowledge and technology. It will do much more if we set our minds to it.

Before leaving Washington to travel to Russia and Kurchatov, I sought the personal feelings and thoughts of another great leader in the world of nuclear physics—a man who met Igor Kurchatov and professionally respected the work of this great man. Born in the same decade as Igor Kurchatov, Edward Teller was a key architect of the early nuclear work of the United States. Now in his 90's, living in California, Edward Teller wanted me to relay his personal feeling on this great occasion.

He said, "like Igor Kurchatov, I long for peace far more than I oppose war." He went on to say that "cooperation between scientists is the most important aspect of the United States and Russia working together—it is a splendid foundation for future progress when former adversaries work together."

One hundred years after the birth of two men who devoted their lives to nuclear research and whose lives and thoughts were focused on peace while their countries used their work for security—it is appropriate that we look to move to a new level of cooperation in nuclear science that forges a 21st century U.S./Russian alliance that builds on and rededicates our two great na-

tions to the peaceful use of nuclear energy for the improvement of the quality of life for all human beings on the face of the Earth.

I propose that we create the Kurchatov-Teller Alliance for Peace that brings together in a formal way Kurchatov Institute and the labs of the Ministry of Atomic Energy with Lawrence Livermore Laboratory (Teller's base of operation today) with Oak Ridge, Argonne, Los Alamos and the labs of our Department of Energy for the specific purpose of enhancing the use of nuclear power worldwide while controlling proliferation. Projects like Thorium Power (that offer so much promise in stopping weapons production and eliminating environmental problems) and cutting edge research by scientists in both nations can be brought together within one new bi-lateral entity that truly moves us into a "New Time and New Beginning."

We are still at the beginning of the 21st Century. Much as Kurchatov set out to do in the last century, we have the opportunity to solve the problems and challenges of the next 100 years. The scientists and engineers of our countries—together with the businessmen and entrepreneurs in both countries—could solve nagging problems of safe, environmentally friendly, and plentiful energy sources. They can solve difficult and complicated medical issues and use science to increase agricultural production. We have an almost limitless horizon before us.

Our task ahead is daunting—some might say impossible. But I am the eternal optimist—perhaps born out of being the youngest of nine children in a poor family. My parents never completed high school, yet they were the smartest people that I have ever met—they had common sense and moral decency.

My father, who only went to the 8th grade, gave me some advice as a youngster that is just as fitting to our challenge. He said in life you can accomplish almost anything that you can dream. He used to say "Your only limitations in life will be those that you self-impose." And that applies to us today.

Together, following in the footsteps of the great scientific leaders of our past, like Igor Kurchatov, our two great nations can solve any problem, overcome any challenge and rise to any occasion for the good of mankind—if we work together as one.

And so, I shall end where I began, by expressing my profound gratitude for the honor you have bestowed on me by inviting me to make this address. I am your friend and I will continue to work for our joint U.S.-Russian interests. Let us work together. Let us clear out the underbrush, let us do away with petty bureaucratic obstacles on both sides of the Atlantic. Both governments have to commit themselves to making cooperation easier, and not filled with time-consuming procedures. You can be assured that this U.S. Congressman will work tirelessly toward this goal.

Again, I thank you for inviting me. I wish you all well. God bless the United States and Russia.

ELECTION OF MINORITY MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 35) electing Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners to standing

committees of the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 35

Resolved, That the following named Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners be and are hereby elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Mr. Peterson of Minnesota, Mr. Dooley of California, Mr. Holden, Mr. Thompson of Mississippi, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Etheridge, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. Hill, Mr. Baca, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Ross, Mr. Acevedo-Vilá.

(2) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Murtha, Mr. Dicks, Mr. Sabo, Mr. Hoyer, Mr. Mollohan, Ms. Kaptur, Mr. Visclosky, Mrs. Lowey, Mr. Serrano, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Moran of Virginia, Mr. Olver, Mr. Pastor, Mr. Price of North Carolina, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Kennedy of Rhode Island, Mr. Clyburn, Mr. Hinchey, Ms. Roybal-Allard, Mr. Farr, Mr. Jackson of Illinois, Ms. Kilpatrick, Mr. Boyd, Mr. Fattah, Mr. Rothman, Mr. Bishop of Georgia, Mr. Berry.

(3) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Spratt, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Evans, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Reyes, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Loretta Sanchez, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Rodriguez, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Andrews, Mr. Hill, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mrs. Davis of California, Mr. Langevin.

(4) COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Moran of Virginia, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Moore, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Ms. DeLauro, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Ford, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Baird, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Meek of Florida, Mr. Emanuel, Mr. Davis of Alabama.

(5) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE: Mr. Kildee, Mr. Owens, Mr. Payne, Mr. Andrews, Ms. Woolsey, Mr. Hinojosa, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Kind, Ms. Loretta Sanchez, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Wu, Mr. Holt, Mrs. Davis of California, Ms. McCollum.

(6) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE: Mr. Waxman, Mr. Markey, Mr. Hall, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Towns, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Deutsch, Mr. Rush, Ms. Eshoo, Mr. Stupak, Mr. Engel, Mr. Wynn, Mr. Green of Texas, Ms. McCarthy of Missouri, Mr. Strickland, Ms. DeGette, Mrs. Capps, Mr. Doyle, Mr. John, Mr. Allen, Mr. Davis of Florida, Ms. Schakowsky, Ms. Solis.

(7) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Kanjorski, Ms. Waters, Mrs. Maloney, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. Watt, Mr. Ackerman, Ms. Hooley of Oregon, Ms. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Meeks of New York, Ms. Lee, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Moore, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Ford, Mr. Hinojosa, Mr. Lucas of Kentucky, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Clay, Mr. Israel, Mr. Ross, Mrs. McCarthy of New York, Mr. Baca, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Lynch, Mr. Davis of Tennessee, Mr. Emanuel, Mr. Miller of North Carolina, Mr. Scott of Georgia.

(8) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Lantos, Mr. Owens, Mr. Towns, Mr. Kanjorski, Mrs. Maloney, Ms. Norton, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Kucinich, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Tierney, Mr. Turner of Texas, Mr. Clay, Ms. Watson, Mr. Lynch.

(9) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: Mr. Berman, Mr. Ackerman, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Payne, Mr. Menendez, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. Sherman, Mr. Wexler, Mr. Engel, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Meeks

of New York, Ms. Lee, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Hoeffel, Mr. Blumenauer, Ms. Berkley, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Watson.

(10) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Berman, Mr. Boucher, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Scott of Virginia, Mr. Watt, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Ms. Waters, Mr. Meehan, Mr. Delahunt, Mr. Wexler, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Weiner, Mr. Schiff, Ms. Linda T. Sánchez.

(11) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES: Mr. George Miller of California, Mr. Markey, Mr. Kildee, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Faleomavaega, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Ortiz, Mr. Pallone, Mr. Dooley of California, Mr. Smith of Washington, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Kind, Mr. Inslee, Mrs. Napolitano, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Acevedo-Vilá, Mr. Carson of Oklahoma.

(12) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE: Mr. Gordon, Mr. Costello, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Ms. Woolsey, Ms. Lofgren, Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas, Mr. Etheridge, Mr. Lampson, Mr. Larson of Connecticut, Mr. Udall of Colorado, Mr. Wu, Mr. Baird, Mr. Israel, Mr. Honda.

(13) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Davis of Illinois, Mr. Pascrell, Mrs. Christensen, Mr. Brady of Pennsylvania, Mr. Udall of New Mexico, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Langevin.

(14) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mr. Rahall, Mr. Lipinski, Mr. DeFazio, Mr. Costello, Ms. Norton, Mr. Nadler, Mr. Menendez, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. Filner, Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas, Mr. Taylor of Mississippi, Ms. Millender-McDonald, Mr. Cummings, Mr. Blumenauer, Mrs. Tauscher, Mr. Pascrell, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Holden, Mr. Lampson, Mr. Baird, Ms. Berkley, Mr. Carson of Oklahoma, Mr. Matheson, Mr. Honda, Mr. Larsen of Washington, Mr. Capuano, Mr. Weiner, Ms. Carson of Indiana, Mr. Hoeffel, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Bishop of New York, Mr. Michaud, Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

(15) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Filner, Mr. Gutierrez, Ms. Corrine Brown of Florida, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Rodriguez.

(16) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS: Mr. Stark, Mr. Matsui, Mr. Levin, Mr. Cardin, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Kleczka, Mr. Lewis of Georgia, Mr. Neal of Massachusetts, Mr. McNulty, Mr. Jefferson, Mr. Tanner, Mr. Bercerra, Mr. Doggett, Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Sandlin, Mrs. Jones of Ohio.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 36) electing a named Member to standing committees of the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 36

Resolved, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following

standing committees of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Sanders.

(2) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM: Mr. Sanders.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m. for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

□ 2044

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 28, 2003.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 28, 2003 at 5:49 p.m.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.J. Res. 2, requests a conference.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 12.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms, Mrs. Kerri Hanley, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right

of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY);

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE);

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX);

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); and

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST);

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM);

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN);

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE);

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID);

The Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI); and

The Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX).

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Roble Olhaye, Ambassador from Djibouti.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Wilson Livingood, announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators

and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Vice-President CHENEY, Members of Congress, distinguished guests and fellow citizens:

Every year, by law and by custom, we meet here to consider the state of the Union. This year, we gather in this Chamber deeply aware of decisive days that lie ahead.

You and I serve our country in a time of great consequence. During this session of Congress, we have the duty to reform domestic programs vital to our country, we have the opportunity to save millions of lives abroad from a terrible disease, we will work for a prosperity that is broadly shared, and we will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people.

In all these days of promise and days of reckoning, we can be confident. In a whirlwind of change, and hope, and peril, our faith is sure, our resolve is firm, and our Union is strong.

This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents and other generations. We will confront them with focus, and clarity, and courage.

During the last 2 years, we have seen what can be accomplished when we work together. To lift the standards of our public schools, we achieved historic education reform, which must now be carried out in every school, and in every classroom, so that every child in America can read and learn and succeed in life.

To protect our country, we reorganized our government and created the Department of Homeland Security, which is mobilizing against the threats of a new era. To bring our economy out of recession, we delivered the largest tax relief in a generation. To insist on integrity in American business, we passed tough reforms, and we are holding corporate criminals to account.

Some might call this a good record. I call it a good start. Tonight I ask the House and the Senate to join me in the next bold steps to serve our fellow citizens.

Our first goal is clear: We must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job.

After recession, terrorist attacks, corporate scandals and stock market declines, our economy is recovering; yet it is not growing fast enough or

strongly enough. With unemployment rising, our Nation needs more small businesses to open, more companies to invest and expand, more employers to put up the sign that says, "Help wanted."

Jobs are created when the economy grows; the economy grows when Americans have more money to spend and invest; and the best and fairest way to make sure Americans have that money is not to tax it away in the first place.

I am proposing that all the income tax reductions set for 2004 and 2006 be made permanent and effective this year. And under my plan, as soon as I sign the bill, this extra money will start showing up in workers' paychecks. Instead of gradually reducing the marriage penalty, we should do it now. Instead of slowly raising the child credit to \$1,000, we should send the checks to American families now.

This tax relief is for everyone who pays income taxes, and it will help our economy immediately. Ninety-two million Americans will keep, this year, an average of almost \$1,100 more of their own money. A family of four with an income of \$40,000 would see their Federal income taxes fall from \$1,178 to \$45 per year. Our plan will improve the bottom line for more than 23 million small businesses.

You, the Congress, have already passed all these reductions, and promised them for future years. If this tax relief is good for Americans 3 or 5 or 7 years from now, it is even better for Americans today.

We should also strengthen the economy by treating investors equally in our tax laws. It is fair to tax a company's profits. It is not fair to again tax the shareholder on the same profits. To boost investor confidence, and to help the nearly 10 million seniors who receive a dividend income, I ask you to end the unfair double taxation of dividends.

Lower taxes and greater investment will help this economy expand. More jobs mean more taxpayers, and higher revenues to our government. The best way to address the deficit and move toward a balanced budget is to encourage economic growth, and to show some spending discipline in Washington, DC. We must work together to fund only our most important priorities. I will send you a budget that increases discretionary spending by 4 percent next year, about as much as the average family's income is expected to grow, and that is a good benchmark for us. Federal spending should not rise any faster than the paychecks of American families.

A growing economy and a focus on essential priorities will be crucial to the future of Social Security. As we continue to work together to keep Social Security sound and reliable, we must offer younger workers a chance to invest in retirement accounts that they will control and they will own.

Our second goal is high-quality, affordable health care for all Americans.

The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives. Yet for many people, medical care costs too much, and many have no health coverage at all. These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and rations care. Instead, we must work toward a system in which all Americans have a good insurance policy, choose their own doctors, and seniors and low-income Americans receive the help they need. Instead of bureaucrats and trial lawyers and HMOs, we must put doctors and nurses and patients back in charge of American medicine.

Health care reform must begin with Medicare, because Medicare is the binding commitment of a caring society. We must renew that commitment by giving seniors access to preventive medicine and new drugs that are transforming health care in America.

Seniors happy with the current Medicare system should be able to keep their coverage just the way it is. And just like you, the Members of Congress, members of your staffs, and other Federal employees, all seniors should have the choice of a health care plan that provides prescription drugs. My budget will commit an additional \$400 billion over the next decade to reform and strengthen Medicare. Leaders of both political parties have talked for years about strengthening Medicare. I urge the Members of this new Congress to act this year.

To improve our health care system, we must address one of the prime causes of higher costs: the constant threat that physicians and hospitals will be unfairly sued. Because of excessive litigation, everybody pays more for health care, and many parts of America are losing fine doctors. No one has ever been healed by a frivolous lawsuit, and I urge the Congress to pass medical liability reform.

Our third goal is to promote energy independence for our country, while dramatically improving the environment.

I have sent you a comprehensive energy plan to promote energy efficiency and conservation, to develop cleaner technology, and to produce more energy at home. I have sent you Clear Skies legislation that mandates a 70 percent cut in air pollution from power plants over the next 15 years. I have sent you a Healthy Forests initiative, to help prevent the catastrophic fires that devastate communities, kill wildlife, and burn away millions of acres of treasured forests.

I urge you to pass these measures for the good of both our environment and our economy. Even more, I ask you to take a crucial step and protect our environment in ways that generations before us could not have imagined. In this century, the greatest environmental progress will come about not through endless lawsuits or command and control regulations, but through

technology and innovation. Tonight I am proposing \$1.2 billion in research funding so that America can lead the world in developing clean hydrogen-powered automobiles.

A simple chemical reaction between hydrogen and oxygen generates energy, which can be used to power a car, producing only water, not exhaust fumes. With a new national commitment, our scientists and engineers will overcome obstacles to take these cars from the laboratory into the showroom so that the first car driven by a child born today could be powered by hydrogen, and pollution-free. Join me in this important innovation, to make our air significantly cleaner and our country much less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Our fourth goal is to apply the compassion of America to the deepest problems of America. For so many in our country, the homeless and the fatherless, the addicted, the need is great. Yet, there is power, wonder-working power, in the goodness and idealism and faith of the American people.

Americans are doing the work of compassion every day, visiting prisoners, providing shelter to battered women, bringing companionship to lonely seniors. These good works deserve our praise, they deserve our personal support, and when appropriate, they deserve the assistance of the Federal Government. I urge you to pass both my faith-based initiative and the Citizen Service Act, to encourage acts of compassion that can transform America, one heart and one soul at a time.

Last year, I called on my fellow citizens to participate in the USA Freedom Corps, which is enlisting tens of thousands of new volunteers across America. Tonight I ask Congress and the American people to focus the spirit of service and the resources of government on the needs of some of our most vulnerable citizens, boys and girls trying to grow up without guidance and attention, and children who have to go through a prison gate to be hugged by their mom or dad. I propose a \$450 million initiative to bring mentors to more than 1 million disadvantaged junior high students and children of prisoners. Government will support the training and recruiting of mentors; yet it is the men and women of America who will fill the need. One mentor, one person, can change a life forever, and I urge you to be that one person.

Another cause of hopelessness is addiction to drugs. Addiction crowds out friendship, ambition, moral conviction, and reduces all the richness of life to a single destructive desire. As a government, we are fighting illegal drugs by cutting off supplies and reducing demand through antidrug education programs. Yet for those already addicted, the fight against drugs is a fight for their own lives.

Too many Americans in search of treatment cannot get it. So tonight I propose a new \$600 million program to

help an additional 300,000 Americans receive treatment over the next 3 years.

Our Nation is blessed with recovery programs that do amazing work. One of them is found at the Healing Place Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A man in the program said, "God does miracles in people's lives, and you never think it could be you." Tonight, let us bring to all Americans who struggle with drug addiction this message of hope: the miracle of recovery is possible, and it could be you.

By caring for children who need mentors, and for addicted men and women who need treatment, we are building a more welcoming society, a culture that values every life. And in this work we must not overlook the weakest among us. I ask you to protect infants at the very hour of their birth, and end the practice of partial-birth abortion. And because no human life should be started or ended as the object of an experiment, I ask you to set a high standard for humanity and pass a law against all human cloning.

The qualities of courage and compassion that we strive for in America also determine our conduct abroad. The American flag stands for more than our power and our interests. Our Founders dedicated this country to the cause of human dignity, the rights of every person and the possibilities of every life. This conviction leads us into the world to help the afflicted, and defend the peace, and confound the designs of evil men. In Afghanistan, we helped to liberate an oppressed people, and we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children, boys and girls. In the Middle East, we will continue to seek peace between a secure Israel and a democratic Palestine. Across the Earth, America is feeding the hungry; more than 60 percent of international food aid comes as a gift from the people of the United States.

As our Nation moves troops and builds alliances to make our world safer, we must also remember our calling, as a blessed country, to make this world better. Today, on the continent of Africa, nearly 30 million people have the AIDS virus, including 3 million children under the age of 15. There are whole countries in Africa where more than one-third of the adult population carries the infection. More than 4 million require immediate drug treatment. Yet across that continent, only 50,000 AIDS victims, only 50,000, are receiving the medicine they need.

Because the AIDS diagnosis is considered a death sentence, many do not seek treatment. Almost all who do are turned away. A doctor in rural South Africa describes his frustration. He says, we have no medicines. Many hospitals tell people, you've got AIDS. We can't help you. Go home and die.

In an age of miraculous medicines, no person should have to hear those words. AIDS can be prevented. Antiretroviral drugs can extend life for

many years. And the cost of those drugs has dropped from \$12,000 a year to under \$300 a year, which places a tremendous possibility within our grasp.

Ladies and gentlemen, seldom has history offered a greater opportunity to do so much for so many. We have confronted, and will continue to confront, HIV/AIDS in our own country. And to meet a severe and urgent crisis abroad, tonight I propose the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, a work of mercy beyond all current international efforts to help the people of Africa. This comprehensive plan will prevent 7 million new AIDS infections, treat at least 2 million people with life-extending drugs, and provide humane care for millions of people suffering from AIDS and for children orphaned by AIDS. I ask the Congress to commit \$15 billion over the next 5 years, including nearly \$10 billion in new money, to turn the tide against AIDS in the most afflicted nations of Africa and the Caribbean.

This Nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this Nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the man-made evil of international terrorism.

There are days when our fellow citizens do not hear news about the war on terror. There is never a day when I do not learn of another threat, or receive reports of operations in progress, or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers. The war goes on, and we are winning.

To date we have arrested or otherwise dealt with many key commanders of al Qaeda. They include a man who directed logistics and funding for the September 11 attacks, the chief of al Qaeda operations in the Persian Gulf who planned the bombings of our embassies in East Africa and the USS *Cole*, an al Qaeda operations chief from Southeast Asia, a former director of al Qaeda's training camps in Afghanistan, a key al Qaeda operative in Europe, and a major al Qaeda leader in Yemen. All told, more than 3,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested in many countries, and many others have met a different fate. Let's put it this way: They are no longer a problem to the United States and our friends and allies.

We are working closely with other nations to prevent further attacks. America and coalition countries have uncovered and stopped terrorist conspiracies targeting the American Embassy in Yemen, the American Embassy in Singapore, a Saudi military base, ships in the Straits of Hormuz and the Straits of Gibraltar. We have broken al Qaeda cells in Hamburg, Milan, Madrid, London, and Paris, as well as Buffalo, New York. We have the terrorists on the run, and we are keeping them on the run. One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice.

As we fight this war, we will remember where it began, here, in our own

country. This government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our people and defend our homeland. We have intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly trained Federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first responders against smallpox, and are deploying the Nation's first early warning network of sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this very Nation against ballistic missiles.

I thank the Congress for supporting these measures. I ask you tonight to add to our future security with a major research and production effort to guard our people against bioterrorism called Project Bioshield. The budget I send you will propose almost \$6 billion to quickly make available effective vaccines and treatments against agents like anthrax, botulinum toxin, Ebola, and plague. We must assume that our enemies would use these diseases as weapons, and we must act before the dangers are upon us.

Since September 11th, our intelligence and law enforcement agencies have worked more closely than ever to track and dislodge the terrorists. The FBI is improving its ability to analyze intelligence, and is transforming itself to meet new threats. And tonight I am instructing the leaders of the FBI, the CIA, Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense to develop a Terrorist Threat Integration Center to merge and analyze all threat information in a single location. Our government must have the very best information possible, and we will use it to make sure the right people are in the right places to protect all our citizens.

Our war against terror is a contest of will in which perseverance is power. In the ruins of two towers, at the western wall of the Pentagon, on a field in Pennsylvania, this Nation made a pledge, and we renew that pledge tonight: Whatever the duration of this struggle, and whatever the difficulties, we will not permit the triumph of violence in the affairs of men. Free people will set the course of history.

Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could also give or sell those weapons to their terrorist allies, who would use them without the least hesitation.

This threat is new; America's duty is familiar. Throughout the 20th century, small groups of men seized control of great nations, built armies and arsenals, and set out to dominate the weak and intimidate the world. In each case, their ambitions of cruelty and murder had no limit. In each case, the ambitions of Hitlerism, militarism, and communism were defeated by the will of free peoples, by the strength of great

alliances, and by the might of the United States of America. Now, in this century, the ideology of power and domination has appeared again and seeks to gain the ultimate weapons of terror. Once again, this Nation and all our friends are all that stand between a world at peace and a world of chaos and constant alarm. Once again, we are called to defend the safety of our people and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this responsibility.

America is making a broad and determined effort to confront these dangers. We have called on the United Nations to fulfill its charter and stand by its demand that Iraq disarm. We are strongly supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency in its mission to track and control nuclear materials around the world. We are working with other governments to secure nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union and to strengthen global treaties banning the production and shipment of missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction.

In all of these efforts, however, America's purpose is more than to follow a process, it is to achieve a result: the end of terrible threats to the civilized world. All free nations have a stake in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. We are asking them to join us, and many are doing so. Yet the course of this Nation does not depend on the decisions of others. Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people.

Different threats require different strategies. In Iran, we continue to see a government that represses its people, pursues weapons of mass destruction, and supports terror. We also see Iranian citizens risking intimidation and death as they speak out for liberty, human rights and democracy. Iranians, like all people, have a right to choose their own government and determine their own destiny; and the United States supports their aspirations to live in freedom.

On the Korean peninsula, an oppressive regime rules a people living in fear and starvation. Throughout the 1990s, the United States relied on a negotiated framework to keep North Korea from gaining nuclear weapons. We now know that the regime was deceiving the world and developing those weapons all along. And today the North Korean regime is using its nuclear program to incite fear and seek concessions. America and the world will not be blackmailed. America is working with the countries of the region, South Korea, Japan, China and Russia, to find a peaceful solution and to show the North Korean Government that nuclear weapons will only bring isolation, economic stagnation, and continued hardship. The North Korean regime will find respect in the world and revere for its people only when it turns away from its nuclear ambitions.

Our Nation and the world must learn the lessons of the Korean peninsula and

not allow an even greater threat to rise up in Iraq. A brutal dictator, with a history of reckless aggression, with ties to terrorism, with great potential wealth will not be permitted to dominate a vital region and threaten the United States.

Twelve years ago Saddam Hussein faced the prospect of being the last casualty in a war he had started and lost. To spare himself, he agreed to disarm of all weapons of mass destruction. For the next 12 years, he systematically violated that agreement. He pursued chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons even while inspectors were in his country. Nothing to date has restrained him from his pursuit of these weapons, not economic sanctions, not isolation from the civilized world, not even cruise missile strikes on his military facilities.

Almost 3 months ago, the United Nations's Security Council gave Saddam Hussein his final chance to disarm. He has shown instead his utter contempt for the United Nations and for the opinion of the world.

The 108 U.N. weapons inspectors were not sent to conduct a scavenger hunt for hidden materials across a country the size of California. The job of the inspectors is to verify that Iraq's regime is disarming. It is up to Iraq to show exactly where it is hiding its banned weapons, lay those weapons out for the world to see, and destroy them as directed. Nothing like this has happened.

The United Nations concluded in 1999 that Saddam Hussein had biological weapons materials sufficient to produce over 25,000 liters of anthrax, enough doses to kill several million people. He has not accounted for that material. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed it. The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had material sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin, enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He has not accounted for that material. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed it. Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein has the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard, and VX nerve agent. In such quantities, these chemical agents could also kill untold thousands. He has not accounted for these materials. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

U.S. intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein had upwards of 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents. Inspectors recently turned up 16 of them, despite Iraq's recent declaration denying their existence. Saddam Hussein has not accounted for the remaining 29,984 of these prohibited munitions. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq in the late 1990s had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents and can be moved from place to place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities.

He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon, and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.

The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary, he is deceiving. From intelligence sources, we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspection sites, and monitoring the inspectors themselves. Iraqi officials accompany the inspectors in order to intimidate witnesses. Iraq is blocking U-2 surveillance flights requested by the United Nations. Iraqi intelligence officers are posing as the scientists inspectors are supposed to interview. Real scientists have been coached by Iraqi officials on what to say. Intelligence sources indicate that Saddam Hussein has ordered that scientists who cooperate with U.N. inspectors in disarming Iraq will be killed, along with their families.

Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons is to dominate, intimidate or attack. With nuclear arms or full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, Saddam Hussein could resume his ambitions of conquest in the Middle East and create deadly havoc in that region. And this Congress and the American people must recognize another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly and without fingerprints he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists or help them develop their own.

Before September 11, 2001, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses, and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans, this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take just one vile, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes.

Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when

have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.

This dictator who is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages, leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured. Iraqi refugees tell us how forced confessions are obtained, by torturing children while their parents are made to watch. International human rights groups have catalogued other methods used in the torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues and rape.

If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning. And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: your enemy is not surrounding your country. Your enemy is ruling your country. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation.

The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm. America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country, our friends, and our allies. The United States will ask the U.N. Security Council to convene on February 5 to consider the facts of Iraq's ongoing defiance to the world. Secretary of State Powell will present information and intelligence about Iraq's illegal weapons programs, its attempts to hide those weapons from the inspectors and its links to terrorist groups. We will consult, but let there be no misunderstanding. If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Tonight I have a message for the men and women who will keep the peace, members of the American Armed Forces. Many of you are assembling in or near the Middle East, and some crucial hours may lie ahead. In those hours, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you.

Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make. The technologies of war have changed. The risks and suffering of war have not. For brave Americans who bear the risk, no victory is free from sorrow. This Nation fights reluctantly, because we know the cost, and we dread the days of mourning that always come.

We seek peace. We strive for peace, and sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means, sparing in every way we can the innocent, and if

war is forced upon us, we will fight with the full force and might of the United States military, and we will prevail. And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies and freedom.

Many challenges abroad and at home have arrived in a single season. In 2 years America has gone from a sense of invulnerability to an awareness of peril, from bitter division in small matters to calm unity in great causes. And we go forward with confidence, because this call of history has come to the right country.

Americans are a resolute people, who have risen to every test of our time. Adversity has revealed the character of our country to the world and to ourselves.

America is a strong Nation and honorable in the use of our strength. We exercise power without conquest, and we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers.

Americans are a free people who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world. It is God's gift to humanity.

We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone. We do not claim to know all the ways of Providence, yet we can trust in them, placing our confidence in the loving God behind all of life and all of history.

May He guide us now, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 10 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m. the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Deputy Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

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. ALLEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBERSTAR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICHAUD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BELL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARSHALL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 2003, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

255. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reengineering and Reinvention of the Direct Section 502 and 504 Single Family Housing (SFH) Programs (RIN: 0575-AB99) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

256. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Pakistan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

257. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Exemption for Certain Investment Advisers Operating Through the Internet [Release No. IA-2091; File No. S7-10-02] (RIN: 3235-AI15) received December 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

258. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Security Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Repeal of the Trade-Through Disclosure Rules for Options [Release No. 34-47013; File No. S7-18-02]

(RIN: 3235-AI52) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

ant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

259. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged (RIN: 1810-AA91) received December 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

260. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency, declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995, with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 108-24); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

261. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification stating that the emergency declared with respect to foreign terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process is to continue in effect beyond January 23, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 108-25); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective November 3, 2002 a 25% danger pay allowance has been designated for Indonesia, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

263. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on matters relevant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002, Public Law 107-243; (H. Doc. No. 108-23); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

264. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report, consistent with the War Powers Resolution, to help ensure that the Congress is kept fully informed on continued U.S. contributions in support of peace-keeping efforts in the former Yugoslavia; (H. Doc. No. 108-26); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

265. A letter from the Chairman, J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, transmitting the annual report of the Board; to the Committee on International Relations.

266. A letter from the Chair, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and management's report for the period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

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

268. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Circular 2001-10; Introduction — received December 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

269. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

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

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

272. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's final rule — Technical Amendment to 5 CFR Part 1800 — received December 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

273. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period ending September 30, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

274. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period ending September 30, 2002 and the Management Response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 8G(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

275. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Education Tax Credit [TD 9034] (RIN: 1545-AW65) received January 2, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

276. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2003-2) received December 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

277. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Coordinated Issue All Industries Intermediary Transaction Tax Shelters (UIL 9300.16-00) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

278. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting for Qualified Tuition and Related Expenses; Magnetic Media Filing Requirements for Information Returns [TD 9029] (RIN: 1545-BA43) received December 20, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

279. A letter from the Regulation Coordinator, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Application of Inherent Reasonableness to all Medicare Part B Services (Other than Physician Services) (RIN: 0938-AJ97) received December 13, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WU, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 394. A bill to restore the Federal civil remedy for crimes of violence motivated by gender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself and Mr. DINGELL):

H.R. 395. A bill to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to collect fees for the implementation and enforcement of a "do-not-call" registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 396. A bill to provide assistance to the unemployed, tax relief for average Americans, fiscal assistance to state and local governments, and jobs and security through infrastructure investment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, Financial Services, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 397. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 398. A bill to revise and extend the Birth Defects Prevention Act of 1998; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 399. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote organ donation; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 400. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of

Transportation to require automobile manufacturers to provide automatic door locks and interior-opening trunk locks on new passenger cars manufactured after 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 401. A bill to create an office within the Department of Justice to undertake certain specific steps to ensure that all American citizens harmed by terrorism overseas receive equal treatment by the United States government regardless of the terrorists' country of origin or residence, and to ensure that all terrorists involved in such attacks are pursued, prosecuted, and punished with equal vigor, regardless of the terrorists' country of origin or residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 402. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the environmental cleanup of certain contaminated industrial sites designated as brownfields; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 403. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to require that anticipated child support be held in trust on the sale or refinancing of certain real property of an obligated parent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 404. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide penalties for open air drug markets, and for other purposes; 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 405. A bill to provide that a person who brings a product liability action in a Federal or State court for injuries sustained from a product that is not in compliance with a voluntary or mandatory standard issued by the Consumer Product Safety Commission may recover treble damages, and for other purposes; 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. BALLANCE (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. McINTYRE, and Mr. ETHERIDGE):

H.R. 406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to use unobligated funds from a housing demonstration program in the State of North Carolina to make grants under section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949 in such State; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 407. A bill to repeal the sunset of the provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 408. A bill to provide for expansion of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 409. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian employment credit and the depreciation rules for property used predominantly within an Indian reservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma:

H.R. 410. A bill to provide for the issuance of bonds to construct and modernize Indian

schools and to provide a credit against Federal income tax for holders of such bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and 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. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 411. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out certain authorities under an agreement with Canada respecting the importation of municipal solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FROST (for himself, Ms. DUNN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BELL, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MOORE, Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HILL, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FARR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KLECKZA, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WU, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. DELAUBRO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BACA, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KIND, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 412. A bill to enhance the operation of the AMBER Alert communications network in order to facilitate the recovery of abducted children, to provide for enhanced notification on highways of alerts and information on such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 413. A bill to require the Surface Transportation Board to consider certain issues when deciding whether to authorize the construction of a railroad line; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 414. A bill to deem the nondisclosure of employer-owned life insurance coverage of

employees an unfair trade practice under the Federal Trade Commission Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 415. A bill to establish a commission to make recommendations on the appropriate size of membership of the House of Representatives and the method by which Members are elected; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 416. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to provide assistance to the immediate family of a teacher or other school employee killed in an act of violence while performing school duties; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. HUNTER:

H.R. 417. A bill to revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 418. A bill to authorize certain States to prohibit the importation of solid waste from other States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KANJORSKI (for himself, Mr. NEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 419. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax to holders of bonds issued to finance land and water reclamation of abandoned mine land areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H.R. 420. A bill to establish a user fee system that provides for an equitable return to the Federal Government for the occupancy and use of National Forest System lands and facilities by organizational camps that serve the youth and disabled adults of America, 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. KOLBE (for himself, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 421. A bill to reauthorize the United States Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. LATOURRETTE:

H.R. 422. A bill to authorize the Pyramid of Remembrance Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to soldiers who have lost their lives during peacekeeping operations, humanitarian efforts, training, terrorist attacks, or covert operations; to the Committee on Resources.

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

H.R. 423. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 increase in taxes on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

H.R. 424. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion in gross income of Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 425. A bill to enable the residents of the Bayshore Manor assisted living facility in Key West, Florida, to continue to receive supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PAUL, Mr. COX, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 426. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from requiring digital television tuners in television receivers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 427. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to permit the sale in certain States of gasoline from other regions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 428. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the credit for increasing research activities permanent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the graduated income tax rates that apply to principal campaign committees of candidates for Congress shall apply to all comparable committees of candidates for State and local offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of capital losses that may offset ordinary income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 431. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian employment credit and the depreciation rules for property used predominantly within an Indian reservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 432. A bill to amend chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the indexation of deferred annuities; to provide that a survivor annuity be provided to the widow or widower of a former employee who dies after separating from Government service with title to a deferred annuity under the Civil Service Retirement System but before establishing a valid claim therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CRANE, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a minimum credit against the alternative minimum tax where

stock acquired pursuant to an incentive stock option is sold or exchanged at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BURR, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MICA, Mr. NEY, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 434. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.J. Res. 15. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to abolishing personal income, estate, and gift taxes and prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution calling for the immediate release of all political prisoners in Cuba, including Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. EVERETT (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment by the Hyundai Motor Company of its first automotive manufacturing facility in the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution calling on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States to return to an interim level of compliance with the Agreed Framework of 1994 while a more comprehensive and mutually acceptable agreement can be negotiated by those two nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ALLEN):

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the earned income tax credit is a program of critical importance designed to assist the working poor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHN, Mr. MCCREARY, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution commemorating the Bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio:

H. Res. 33. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CALVERT:

H. Res. 34. A resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 35. A resolution electing Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners to standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H. Res. 36. A resolution electing a named Member to standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 37. A resolution congratulating the Republic of Cyprus on its recent completion of the accession process into the European Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Res. 38. A resolution requiring the House of Representatives to take any legislative action necessary to verify the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment as part of the Constitution when the legislatures of an additional three States ratify the Equal Rights Amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Res. 39. A resolution congratulating Armenia on its recent accession to the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Res. 40. A resolution condemning the current political unrest and political leadership in Venezuela, calling for new elections in accordance with the constitution of that country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. STUPAK introduced a bill (H.R. 435) for the relief of Robert and Verda Shatusky; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 12: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 20: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RAHAL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 21: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 31: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. MATHE-

SON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KIND, Mr. COBLE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 33: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 49: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 50: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 57: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. ISSA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 100: Mr. REYES and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 115: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 138: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 163: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. CUMMINGSON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 196: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 200: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LEE, Mr. McGOVERN, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 218: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 219: Mr. NEY and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 220: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 235: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BURR, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 241: Mr. REYES and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 242: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 243: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 250: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BLUEMENAUER Mr. LEACH, Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 265: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 270: Mr. FERGUSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 290: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 302: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 303: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 308: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LATOURRETTE, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 309: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 311: Mr. CANNON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 315: Mr. BURR.

H.R. 318: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 323: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BOYD.

H.R. 339: Mr. MICA, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. PENCE, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 352: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 389: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. FROST.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. LATOURRETTE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FORBES, Mr. NEY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HALL, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. FROST, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BURNS, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 31: Mr. FOLEY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 107: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 111: Mrs. McCARTHY of New York.