

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOSS) having assumed the chair Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO OFFER AMENDMENT OUT OF ORDER DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2703, COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1995

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill H.R. 2703, pursuant to House Resolution 380, I may be permitted to offer the amendment numbered 7 in House Report 104-480 out of the specified order and immediately following amendment No. 15.

I spoke with the ranking minority member about this, and he indicated that he would have no objection.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question, if I might, and I would be happy to yield to him for that purpose. As I understood the amendment, it was gone over because the gentleman was not ready for presentation at the time it came up; is that correct?

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the estimates we were given—they did not—a couple of amendments were dropped before us, and they did not hold a vote on one of them, so, yes, I was not here and I could not get over in time. I was here, but I just missed it by the time we got here.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me only ask one question that I had an interest in.

I do not know; it may have just been the analysis of the amendment that was in error, but I did not understand, and I just wanted to ask this one question, if I might, and I would like to not object because I think what happened to the gentleman happens to a lot of Members, and I think it is right for all

of us to try to accommodate them. But I certainly had a question with respect to the amendment with respect to a statement that I had read before. It said that before arresting individuals who had been reported as having been here illegally, State and local law enforcement agencies would have to confirm their status with the INS before arrest. Is that the gentleman's understanding of what the amendment reads?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If the gentleman will yield further, they are authorized to arrest and detain, but only after they have obtained confirmation from the INS. So they would have to call into the INS and get their confirmation that indeed this person is a criminal alien.

Mr. COLEMAN. But, of course, that is before they are arrested. So a person could not even be detained while that is going on, is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. If I may add, typically this situation arises when they have stopped an individual for a traffic offense, and in the course of running the check this pops up. So that is kind of the normal circumstance when it would occur.

Mr. COLEMAN. But of course that is not all circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman, if the gentleman will help me answer that question during the time he has for the debate, I would not object because I think people ought to be entitled to offer their amendments that are made in order.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ADDITIONAL TIME FOR DEBATE ON AMENDMENT NO. 10 TO H.R. 2703, COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1995

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the Committee of the Whole resumes proceedings on the request for a recorded vote on the amendment which is the Watt-Chenoweth amendment, amendment No. 10, it may be first in order to debate the amendment for an additional 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by an opponent and a proponent of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFeree IN LIEU OF CONFEREe H.R. 956, COMMON SENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY AND LEGAL REFORM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] as conferee on the bill (H.R. 956) to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for other purposes, to replace the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

COMPREHENSIVE ANTITERRORISM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the House Resolution 380 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2703.

□ 1708

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism, with Mr. LINDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 15 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] and on which the "ayes" prevailed by voice vote had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, it is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 104-480.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DOOLITTLE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. DOOLITTLE:

Page 133, after line 17, insert the following new section (and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 678. AUTHORIZING STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS TO ARREST AND DETAIN CERTAIN ILLEGAL ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the extent permitted by relevant State and local law, State and local law enforcement officials are authorized to arrest and detain an individual who—

(1) is an alien illegally present in the United States, and

(2) has previously been convicted of a felony in the United States and deported or left the United States after such conviction,

but only after the State or local law enforcement officials obtain appropriate confirmation from the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the status of such individual and only for such period of time as may be required for the Service to take the individual into Federal custody for purposes of deporting or removing the alien from the United States.

(b) COOPERATION.—The Attorney General shall cooperate with the States to assure that information in the control of the Attorney General, including information in the

National Crime Information Center, that would assist State and local law enforcement officials in carrying out duties under subsection (a) is made available to such officials.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

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

Mr. Chairman, I held a meeting recently with many of our key law enforcement people in my part of northern California to help identify reasonable and constitutional ways in which Congress can assist them in their fight against violent crime in our communities. Not surprisingly, many of them pointed to California's increasing problem with illegal immigration as an issue they felt deserved Congress' immediate attention.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 2703 has taken major steps in addressing the problem of illegal immigration by specifically focusing on the deportation of criminal aliens from our country. However, I feel that the bill fails to address a critical problem associated with criminal aliens, and that is the fact that almost all of those deported eventually find their way back to our country with a potential of committing crimes again.

In California alone, the INS deports thousands of illegal immigrants every year who have committed felonies in our State, and every year thousands of those same criminal aliens return back again. In fact, the California Department of Justice recently reported that 98 percent of all immigrants who are deported for committing felonies in California will eventually return to the State, and of those, 40 percent will commit crimes again.

Unfortunately, this epidemic is not unique to urban areas, but has started to infest rural America as well. Just a few years ago, in the small rural community of Lincoln, which is located in my district, an illegal alien was found guilty of a driveby shooting, which was the first driveby shooting ever in that area. After spending a short time in prison, the criminal alien was deported out of the country by the INS. Now, despite his deportation, he returned to the area after only 1 week and, without hesitation, committed another crime.

With such a threat to our public safety posed by criminal aliens, one would think that we would give law enforcement all the tools it needs to remove these criminals from our streets, but unfortunately just the opposite is true. In fact, the Federal Government has tied the hands of our State and local law enforcement officials by actually prohibiting them from doing their job of protecting public safety. I was dismayed to learn that the current Federal law prohibits State and local law enforcement officials from arresting

and detaining criminal aliens whom they encountered through their routine duties. In fact, a low re-entry into the United States by deported aliens was considered a felony. Our State and local law enforcement officers are only permitted to release the felon and contact the INS with the details of the incident.

Mr. Chairman, current Federal law in this area places our communities at risk and has led me to offer this amendment to H.R. 2703, an amendment I feel will help put some sense back into our laws dealing with the re-entry of criminal aliens into this country.

My amendment would also permit State and local law enforcement officials to assist the INS by granting them the authority in their normal course of duty to arrest and detain criminal aliens until the INS can properly take them into Federal custody.

With my amendment, law enforcement officials would no longer be required to release known dangerous felons back into our communities. Instead, this amendment would give those with the responsibility of protecting our public safety the ability to take a known criminal alien off our streets and put him behind bars.

Mr. Chairman, you will be interested to know that shortly before my district was victimized for the second time by this criminal alien I spoke of earlier, an area police officer actually stopped him for a traffic violation. With my amendment the police officer would have been able to put him in jail for being back in the country illegally until the INS could take him into Federal custody. Without it, the officer had to release him, and our area became the victim of yet another crime.

My amendment is supported by our local law enforcement because they know that fighting illegal immigration can no longer be left solely to Federal agencies. Let us untie the hands of those we ask to protect us and include my amendment in H.R. 2703 today.

Mr. Chairman, by way of summary, I would like to allay fears or concerns that Members may have about the scope of my amendment.

First, my amendment does not require anything of State and local law enforcement. There is no Federal mandate. The provision I seek to add would merely authorize local law enforcement agencies to hold the criminal alien until the INS has taken him back into Federal custody.

Secondly, my amendment is very narrow and only covers situations in which the State or local officer encounters criminal aliens within his routine duties. In addition, the subject can only be held if the State or local police have obtained appropriate confirmation from the INS of the illegal status of the individual. Only confirmed criminal aliens are at risk of being taken into custody.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment represents commonsense

reform. It is narrow in scope but will help mightily people on the ground who have the primary responsibility of keeping our children and families safe from crime.

□ 1715

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] that a lot of us who represent border districts understand and appreciate the gentleman's effort. A lot of us believe that we need to have a process and a system that works in the way that the gentleman's amendment attempts to describe it.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I noted the gentleman pointed out that there are no unfunded Federal mandates. I will tell the gentleman that the transferring of any person taken by my local police department into custody over to the INS will require some amount of paperwork. It may be, I hope, de minimus. I truthfully hope that is the case. But I must tell the gentleman that in that process, in and of itself, there will be some expense; perhaps not even just to the local department, but certainly to the Federal agency called INS as well.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that there is an understanding, and perhaps if this amendment does survive the House and makes it into the conference, we would have an opportunity to discuss how it is that we will ensure that there will be sufficient funds to pay for the process that the gentleman has attempted, I think, to outline and describe in his amendment. It is one which I think most Members would be supportive of, except for the fact that a lot of us are not quite sure exactly how it is going to work in terms of the dollars and cents.

It is easy for us to say, Here is what we want. Americans do it all the time. Yet, they do not say how we are going to pay for it. I am one of those who has an interest in the process and want to ensure, as I know the gentleman does, the rights of the arrested individual, the guarantee and assurance that that is a person who is in violation of an immigration law, in addition to the fact that that person may have committed an offense within the United States. As the gentleman and I know, we think NCIC works pretty well. We on the border think it does work fairly well. There are exceptions, but nonetheless we would like to see it work.

Mr. Chairman, as long as the gentleman has a procedure and process now being required, as I understand his amendment would require, that some action at least would be taken by State and local officials, as well as the INS, I have to say, I am convinced there will be some costs associated with it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that I would be delighted to work with him on this

issue. Obviously, the primary responsibility for dealing with the control of our borders rests with the Federal Government. Representing California, we have had a number of problems getting, really, reimbursed for the costs that have been incurred.

On this amendment I bring today, the intent is to give the option to local law enforcement. It really came at the suggestion of one of our local police departments within the city of Roseville, which has had problems in this area, and the others who were there felt that this made perfect sense.

The gentleman is correct, of course, that if they detain an illegal, there will be some additional expense involved with the processing of that. They seemed willing, at least at this point, to incur that. But I would be more than happy to work with the gentleman to see if there is a way we can help the Government to live up to its primary responsibility of dealing with the control of our borders.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just point out that since, in fact, the ability to deal with some of the costs are directly related to the property values of a given district or a given area which is represented by a local police department, I must tell the gentleman that some communities will be unable to come up with those kinds of funds that are necessary, I think, for some of these additional costs, unless they are budgeted in some way; that there is some provision made at our level to say that we intend to hold harmless those departments who are working in that area, or at least provide some assistance to them, maybe through the INS.

That is the kind of thing I would like to work out, and maybe we can find a mechanism for funding it. I do not think that people would object, as I said earlier, to the thrust of the amendment. I am very concerned about its workability. As I say, I welcome the opportunity to work with the gentleman.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. As do I, Mr. Chairman. We will proceed ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] has expired.

Does any Member seek time in opposition? Hearing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTES ON AMENDMENTS NOS. 13 AND 15

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the demand for recorded votes on amendments Nos. 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Amendment No. 13, offered by the gentleman from Ten-

nessee [Mr. BRYANT], is agreed to by voice vote.

Amendment No. 15, offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI], is agreed to by voice vote.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 104-480.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. MCCOLLUM

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. MCCOLLUM: Add at the end the following:

TITLE —FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH TERRORISTS

SEC. . FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH TERRORISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 2333 the following:

§ 2332c. Financial transactions

“(a) Except as provided in regulations made by the Secretary of State, whoever, being a United States person, knowing or having reasonable cause to know that a country is a country that has been designated under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act (50 U.S.C. App. 2405) as a country supporting international terrorism; engages in a financial transaction with that country, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) As used in this section—

“(1) the term ‘financial transaction’ has the meaning given that term in section 1956(c)(4); and

“(2) the term ‘United States person’ means any United States citizen or national, permanent resident alien, juridical person organized under the laws of the United States, or any person in the United States.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of the chapter of title 18, United States Code, to which the amendment of subsection (a) was made is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 2333 the following new item: “2332c. Financial transactions.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] and a Member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

Mr. Chairman, the centerpiece of the existing bill as far as terrorism is concerned is the provision which denies the right of a terrorist organization or state to come to the United States and raise money to then take back abroad and presumably use it to engage in terrorist activities, perhaps in a foreign country, wherever that might be, northern Africa, southern Europe, the Middle East, or wherever.

The converse or the complement to this is equally important. That is what my amendment addresses. It addresses the situation where a terrorist organization, in an effort to be able to be involved in the United States in some terrorist activity, actually has some American citizen, a recipient, to bring

into this country from a terrorist state government a certain amount of money that might be used to further the cause of terrorist activities in the United States.

As opposed to the underlying bill's provisions, the amendment I am offering only applies when a terrorist country, one designated in law by existing law that we already have, which currently includes Iraq, Iran, Libya, Syria, Sudan, Cuba, North Korea, are the donee countries, rather than to the organizations, because that becomes a more complicated technical problem.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we should not permit American citizens or American permanent resident aliens to bring money into this country under any guise from a country that has been put on the terrorist state list. We do not know what that money might be used for, but more likely than not, when we think about it, for terrorist activities it would be used to buy explosives or to perhaps harbor some people who are going to actually commit the technical acts, or maybe to buy the taxicab fare or the plane fare, or who knows what. Certainly it could be used for those purposes. We have no business having financial transactions with terrorist states coming to American citizens.

There is some existing law, but it is very weak law in this regard. The definition in the amendment I am proposing with regard to a financial transaction that would be prohibited is the one currently used in our money laundering statutes. It is a fairly broad definition, defined as “any movement of funds, use of any monetary instruments or financial institution or the transfer of any real property or certain types of personal property.”

The Secretary of State under this amendment could make certain exceptions in cases of an inconsequential nature, perhaps something connected with the United Nations activity by one of these countries, such as postal, telephone, travel services, for specific purposes and the like.

Mr. Chairman, why is this important? It is obviously important. We want to protect our citizens from terrorist acts just as much as we want other countries to be protected. The bill just is not adequate as it is now.

An example of what might be, and I do not know that it is, a situation of this nature came to my attention reading the newspapers recently, when Louis Farrakhan went abroad and visited a number of terrorist states. It has been reported that in Tripoli during his stop, Farrakhan received a pledge of \$1 billion from the Libyan Government, from Mu'ammarr Qadhafi. I do not know whether that is true or not, but that is what has been reported.

I do not believe that the Libyan Government ought to be giving Farrakhan or any other United States citizen \$1 billion to come to the United States. Who knows what that might be used for? I am not trying to disparage Mr.

Farrakhan's purposes, although he is reported as having said during his tour, "You can quote me, God will destroy America by the hands of Muslims."

I do not know his motives or his intent, and I do not wish to bring up his situation to disparage him, because I really do not know. But it does call to our attention the fact that there are states like Libya and the Sudan and Iran who could provide money to the wrong hands in the United States in large quantities, potentially under current law. We need to close that loophole. That is what my amendment does. That is why I offered it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

I support the amendment, Mr. Chairman, for a simple reason. I think it is wrong for anyone in the United States, I think it is wrong for anyone in the United States to knowingly deal with a country that sponsors terrorism. Why should we allow countries that sponsor such horrible acts as blowing up our barracks or blasting our airliners out of the sky to benefit from dealings with U.S. citizens?

As I understand the measure, it essentially ties together in one place existing prohibitions that depend on a series of executive acts. I want to salute the gentleman for doing it. I think it is not controversial, and hope we can move the amendment with alacrity.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. DOOLITTLE] having assumed the chair, Mr. LINDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2703) to combat terrorism had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 163, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 163) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, when called up; and that it be in order at any time to consider the joint resolution in the House; that the joint res-

olution be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would not object, I would like to inquire of the chairman if he has any idea what time tomorrow this would be brought up on the floor.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman that we expect to bring this up sometime mid-afternoon tomorrow. I would tell the gentleman that, had we received a more speedy process on the current bill that passed the House last week, that this might not be necessary. But in view of the fact that we have not been able to go to conference, it does become necessary.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1730

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) authorizing the use of the Capitol rotunda on May 2, 1996, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the rotunda of the United States Capitol is hereby authorized to be used on May 2, 1996, at 2 o'clock post meridian for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Reverend and Mrs. Billy Graham. Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 359.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 359.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the Following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. FATTAH 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 Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEJDENSON 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 Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON 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 Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SHADEGG addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

WOMEN IN THE HISTORY OF THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for giving me this time. I guess we are not finishing the bill today. I must say I hope Members think about the bill that we had under debate when the committee rose, because at this moment we still have the President in Egypt talking about terrorism, and what I think has happened is we have gutted the terrorism provisions in this bill. So while the President is away trying to say we will not