

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the House the following article about the Government Printing Office from the December 1998 issue of *In-Plant Graphics* which describes the GPO as "Better Than Ever." As a case in point, the article describes GPO's first-rate production and dissemination of the six-volume, 8,327-page Starr Report from last September, a mammoth production job for which the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee (Mr. HYDE) has thoughtfully commended the agency.

The article correctly notes that GPO receives little national attention. The fact is, we in Congress could not perform our legislative duties without the timely, professional, non-partisan support of the GPO. Nor could millions of our constituents enjoy an easy, no-cost path to over 140,000 government publications without GPO Access [<http://www.access.gpo.gov>], an electronic gateway to more than 70 federal databases.

Mr. Speaker, as we conduct the people's business, let's remember that we could not do so without the support of many others, including the dedicated professionals of the Government Printing Office. The article follows:

BETTER THAN EVER
(By Bob Neubauer)

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Annual sales | \$195.9 million |
| Operating budget | \$187.4 million |
| Full-time production employees | 1,264 |
| Total GPO full-time employees | 3,375 |
| Jobs printed per year | 163,200 |
| Annual impressions | 4.7 billion |

Even though it's the largest in-plant in the country and produces scores of important government documents, the Government Printing Office (GPO) doesn't usually get a lot of national attention.

That all changed in September when the Starr Report was unleashed on the world. GPO was given the arduous task of disseminating that report to an eager public. The initial report arrived on disk, but supplemental materials consisted of boxes of documents, which had to be shot as camera-ready copy. The resulting products were put on the Internet, on CD-ROMs and on paper—all under the watchful eyes of armed police officers.

"We took the extra step—just to assure Congress that we were treating this with the utmost security—of posting police officers throughout the plant at key production points," explains Andrew M. Sherman, director of the Office of Congressional, Legislative and Public Affairs. Had there been no guards, though, Sherman is confident that GPO employees would have maintained their usual extreme sensitivity to security issues.

"We have never had a record of leaks," Sherman maintains. The guards, though, seemed to have their hands full just keeping the mob of reporters at bay, he adds despite the distractions, GPO employees kept their minds on their work, Sherman says—though he admits, "there was a great deal of anxiety on everybody's part."

This situation was far from normal at GPO's Washington headquarters, where the daily production of the Federal Register and the Congressional Record are usually the top jobs. Taking up three buildings and almost 35 acres of floor space, GPO is larger than most commercial printers. Under the direction of Public Printer Michael DiMario, a presidential appointee, GPO generates \$800 million a year, \$100 million of which involves document dissemination.

Created in 1860, GPO handles congressional and executive branch printing and is in charge of distributing federal documents to the public. As large as GPO's printing operation is, though, it procures about 75 percent of its work from the private sector, and produces only the complex, time- and security-critical work.

Though certain forces in the government still grumble that GPO should be shut down, some jobs just can't be printed by the private sector, Sherman insists. A prime example is the Record. Its average size exceeds 200 pages—about the size of four to six metropolitan daily papers—but its page count has fluctuated from a low of 10 to a record of 1,912 pages. Material arrives in many different forms, including handwritten notes, and Congress sometimes stays in session until late at night. Despite all that GPO is still mandated to get 9,000 copies of the Record printed and delivered to Congress by 9 a.m. every day.

Another example is the recent Omnibus Appropriations Spending Bill. A 16-inch tall stack of documents arrived at GPO and it had to be keyed in, proofread very carefully and output in the Congressional Record in just two days. The final congressional report, completed later, was 1,600 pages long.

In producing independent counsel Starr's report, GPO showed the same trademark speed and efficiency, despite the distractions provided by the guards and the reporters. The Report was up on GPO's Web site (www.access.gpo.gov) within a half-hour of receiving a CD-ROM containing HTML files from the House of Representatives. By the evening of that same day, GPO had produced 500 loose-leaf copies for House members using DocuTechs at GPO, in the Senate and in the House. By the next morning, 13,000 additional copies had been printed on GPO's smaller 32-page 2538" Hantscho webs and bound for distribution.

"Everybody was just at their top performance here in getting it done," Sherman praises.

The overwhelming response to the GPO's Web site publication of the Starr Report was a landmark event in that it was one of the first times that such a newsworthy document was available on the Internet before it was printed. Even so, this was really just another example of how GPO has been changing to accommodate the latest technologies.

"There's a great public expectation for quick electronic access to government information and for it to be free, and we have accommodated that with our Web site," Sherman remarks. He says 15 million documents are downloaded from GPO's site each month. The band-width of the site is currently being expanded, he says.

Fiber-optics and lasers are playing increasingly large roles for GPO. Up to half of the Senate portion of the Record is transmitted to GPO from Capitol Hill via fiber-optic connections, and 80 percent of the Register is transmitted by laser beam from the Office of the Federal Register.

GPO recently took another bold step forward in technology when it purchased two new Krause America LX170 computer-to-plate systems. They will make plates for GPO's three 64-page, two-color, 3550" Hantscho web presses, which are used to print the Record, the Register, the U.S. Budget and other documents.

Though the Starr Report may have made life difficult at GPO, it also brought GPO a lot of praise and recognition. Papers like the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Hartford Courant* and the *Baltimore Sun* published articles lauding GPO. House Judiciary Committee Chairman Henry Hyde even sent a letter of praise.

"People were very impressed with our ability to get this done," says Sherman.

JERRY SOLOMON FLAG
PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) that replaced Jerry Solomon, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a colleague of mine from San Diego.

Before I go into what we are going to talk about, which is a flag amendment that was first brought up before this Congress by Jerry Solomon from New York, I would make a statement to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) that Republicans will join him gladly in school construction. Last year, in the 105th, we offered a bill for school construction that gave a 30 percent tax incentive for school construction for private companies to build them. The President vetoed that, and he came back with a school construction bill.

We would even support that if the gentleman will waive Davis-Bacon, which is the union wage which costs 35 percent more to build those schools. What we propose is to have an amendment to waive Davis-Bacon, let the schools keep the money instead of going to the unions, let the schools keep it and develop teacher training or equipment for the schools and whatever.

So, I would say to the gentleman there is room for maneuver. We want school construction, but we want the majority of the money going to the schools, not to a special interest group.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from California agree to join me in a special order in the future to talk about this, the two of us?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will, my friend.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) took Jerry Solomon's place in New York and he swore that he would carry on the fight of the great Jerry Solomon, who just retired. And there was no one, not the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), not myself or the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), who can speak with the passion that Jerry Solomon did on this particular bill. As a matter of fact, I am going to title it the Jerry Solomon Flag Protection Act when we submit this thing.

We have 230 cosponsors, Mr. Speaker, and I think that is a great tribute to this body, both bipartisan. The great gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is cosponsor on the other side of the aisle and well respected by both parties and will go forward with the message as well on his side. But with 230 cosponsors in the last Congress, we had 312 votes, well over the requirement of two-thirds to pass this.

What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is speak of just a few ideas for 5 minutes, maybe 10, and then I will turn over the mike to my colleagues and let

them have as much time as they want. We can go back and on the different issues that have come up in previous bills all the way from the sovereignty issue, to first amendment rights on the issue, and the actual flag amendment itself.

What I would like to start off the debate with, Mr. Speaker, is to start off that some would say that this violates the first amendment or that the flag is merely a piece of cloth and why should there be a penalty for the desecration of the flag?

Before a Supreme Court case called *Texas vs. Johnson*, 48 states held that it was a crime to desecrate the flag. It was a narrow Supreme Court decision by five to four that changed 200 years of policy. We think that is wrong. Eighty percent of the American people feel that that is wrong, Mr. Speaker.

Let me speak to those that would say that the flag is merely a piece of cloth. I have a friend that was a prisoner of war for nearly 6½ years in Vietnam and his treatment was not exactly in the best stead. On occasion, they would be allowed to gather together. Now, this gentleman, a POW 6½ years, it took him nearly 4 years to gather bits of thread and knit an American flag on the inside of his shirt. And when they would have a meeting, he would take his shirt off, turn it inside out, and hang it above them and they would have the meeting under this American flag.

Well, that was fine until the Vietnamese guards broke in, Mr. Speaker. They saw the prisoner without his shirt on, they looked on the wall, and saw the American flag. Well, they ripped it to shreds. They took it and stomped it in the floor and they took out this POW and brutally beat him for some 3 hours. When they brought him back into the room, he was unconscious. He had broken bones, internal damage to himself. He was so bad, his colleagues did not think that he would even survive the night, his wounds were so bad.

So, they went about and huddled in a corner just to discuss the happenings and they comforted their fellow POW as much as they could on a bale of straw and they went back in the corner. They heard a stirring and they looked out in the center of the floor and there was that broken body POW that had regained consciousness and he had drug himself to the center of the floor and started gathering those bits of thread so that he could knit another American flag.

The flag is not just a piece of cloth for all different nationalities that have come to this country and fought under the flag or served or fought for civil rights or fought battles or draped a coffin or even seen the flag fly over national tragedies. It is more than that.

Mr. Speaker, the last stanza of the Star Spangled Banner asks a question and I would ask us to think about what that stanza says. I am not going to read it, but ask my colleagues to look it up. It asks a question and I think the

answer is yes. That symbol is very, very important.

In California we had a proposition, Prop 187. It had its supporters and it had its people that did not support Prop 187. There was a group of protesters up in the northern section of my district and one of the protesters had burned an American flag. They started pouring lighter fluid on another one.

One of the protesters who was against Prop 187, which I support, he was out there protesting until the young man saw the protesters burning the American flag. He reached over and he grabbed and he protected that flag and he himself, even though once was with this group of protesters, they turned on him and brutally beat him because he was trying to save the American flag.

So for many Americans, the flag has special meaning and it is not just a piece of cloth.

If we take a look, I talked to one of my colleagues, the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. BILBRAY). The flag he has in his office draped the coffin of his father. He respects it that much.

The father of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), was a veteran who I understand his sister has their flag. And that flag is more, I guarantee, to those individuals than just a piece of cloth. It is a symbol. It is a piece of love. It is a piece of honor. It is a piece of democracy and what it stands for in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to my friends to speak from their heart. This is not a partisan issue. This is something that we deeply believe in, that over 80 percent of the American people support, Mr. Speaker, and we hope to pass this amendment in the House.

We passed it in the last Congress, but the Senate did not have time to complete it. We will pass it in the House. This time we will pass it in the Senate. It will go the President and he will sign it. It will go to the States where they have to have two-thirds to ratify it. Mr. Speaker, 49 States have petitioned Congress, 49 State governments have petitioned Congress for us to pass this amendment. So there is overwhelming support across the aisle and in the Republican party as well.

□ 1945

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I just recently became a Member of this House, so I have not been a part of some of the occurrences of the past and some of the events of the past.

I have heard, though, that some people believe this House is divided by partisanship. Mr. Speaker, this House is not divided by partisanship, as my good friend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) pointed out.

To show proof of that, I commend my colleagues' attention to the list of original cosponsors of the bill to be introduced tomorrow. There are more

than 230 names on this list. More than 230 Members of this House have extended their hands across the aisle to join together to cosponsor the Flag Protection Amendment.

I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for going forward and putting in the hard work and the effort to obtain those cosponsors.

Together we represent the united front of Republicans and Democrats working to ensure that Old Glory will be protected from physical desecration through an amendment to the United States Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I bring your attention to the testimony of Professor Richard D. Parker given before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary July 8 of last year. Mr. Parker is the Williams Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and a self-proclaimed liberal Democrat who, as a young man, participated in the Civil Rights movement. In the marches, Professor Parker proudly waived the flag, using it as a symbol to emphasize that we are all Americans despite our differences.

Professor Parker stated,

A robust system of free speech depends, after all, on maintaining a sense of community. It depends on some agreement that, despite our differences, we are "one," that the problem of any American is "our" problem. Without this much community, why listen to anyone else? Why not just see who can yell the loudest? Or push hardest?

It is thus for minority and unpopular viewpoints that the aspiration to, and respect for the unique symbol, of the national unity is thus most important.

Mr. Speaker, though we have a broad base of support, the Flag Protection Amendment does have its opponents. The small minority who oppose a constitutional amendment prohibiting the physical desecration of the flag believe that such a law would infringe on the first amendment.

In his testimony, Mr. Parker also makes an interesting point to those who oppose the Flag Protection Amendment. He says,

As the word goes forth that nothing is sacred, that the aspiration to unity and community is just a "point of view" competing with others, and that any hope of being noticed (if not getting a hearing) depends on behaving more and more outrageously, won't we tend to trash not just the flag, but the freedom of speech itself?

Mr. Speaker, there is a reason, as the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has pointed out, that we don't casket fallen heroes with this great flag. In fact, as the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) pointed out, it is entirely appropriate and fitting today that I stand before my colleagues in support of this bill, because it was a year ago today that my father, a veteran of two theaters during World War II, passed away. I know that one of his greatest honors was serving his country, and I know that my family thought it was a great honor to have his casket draped with our great flag.

I had intended initially when I first came to this Congress to introduce my own bill, and I step back and recognize that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) had put in many, many years in an effort to pass this legislation. Rather than stand before that and serve as an obstacle to that passage, I join happily and willingly with them for passage.

Opponents of the proposed amendments imagine themselves as champions of the theory of free speech, but their argument is based in a strange disdain for it in practice.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a single Member of this list of cosponsors who does not passionately defend the right to free speech. I do as well, and I just as passionately defend this amendment. The right to free speech is the bedrock of America's founding, and the flag is a symbol of our freedom.

I implore my colleagues in this House to duly consider the remarks of Professor Parker, the considerations of all of us Americans who support this amendment and join our efforts to protect the great flag of the United States of America.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the great gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who is a Vietnam War veteran, Army special forces, who not only fought under the flag but nearly gave his life for it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for that great introduction, one of the best I have ever had, but I have to confess I did nothing special in Vietnam, and it was just that I happened to show up, like many people over there.

I want to thank my friend who really was a combat veteran and who was nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor and the only member of the Navy to have shot down five MIGs and become an ace in the Vietnam conflict. I am just his wing man in this operation.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) for his very eloquent remarks, and I want to thank him also for the participation of his father in two of our conflicts.

I think that goes to this issue. The flag is a piece of property. It is property that represents freedom, represents sacrifice, represents in many cases the ultimate sacrifice, that is, the giving of one's life. If my colleagues see the great movie that is out now, "Saving Private Ryan," it is evident that that sacrifice in many cases was enormous.

So every American owns a piece of the flag, and that is a problem with burning it. When one is burning it, one is really burning some of the property that belongs to every American, and we do not have the right to do that.

For those who would say that burning the flag represents speech, I think that Chief Justice Rehnquist made the right observation, and I would paraphrase his words, when he said, "Burn-

ing the flag is not a political statement. It is not speech. It is an inarticulate grunt." I think that is true.

Look at all of the ways that one can communicate now with others, whether one is communicating with a large body of people or communicating just with another individual. One not only has all of the classic methods of communication, of speaking to people and, in this century, talking over the telephone, now talking over the electronic media, radio, television, one now has computers. One now has e-mail.

There have never been as many methods of speaking, of communicating as we have today because of high technology. So why do we have to say that we are going to characterize this inarticulate grunt, this burning, putting the torch to something, why are we going to classify that as speech?

In fact, I thought that speech was supposed to take the place of burning, of destruction, of destroying something to make a point. That is the whole point of speech. Speech is the alternative.

The idea that some people can only manifest their feeling about their country by burning a piece of this property that really belongs to all of us because of the joint and common American sacrifice that has touched almost every single family that lives in this land does not make any sense.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that we are following exactly the right course here in following the lead of the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), that lead that was initiated by Jerry Solomon, a great Member of this House of Representatives, and also supported by another great patriotic gentleman who used to stand here many times with us, Bob Dornan, who flew every single airplane that the U.S. military ever made and who loved our flag and stood in front of and stood every time that flag went by, whether it was a parade or any other type of event and who used to offer very articulate arguments on behalf of the flag in this Chamber.

So let us move forward on this.

Also, I wanted to mention, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) is leaving today. And watching the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) make some comments about the gentleman from Louisiana in his testimonial today reminded me that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON) was another individual who supported this amendment very strongly and has been a great Member of this House. I know that this is his wish that we pass this amendment to protect the American flag.

So the United States is not just made of the stock market and tax cuts and the latest movie and all of the things that other people around the world think represents America. It is also made of tradition and a legacy of a lot of people, many of whom knew America for only a short period of time. If

one goes over to the Arlington Cemetery, one will notice a lot of people that were killed in America's wars that did not spend much time in this country before they were killed and did not get to have that piece of enjoyment.

But the idea that this flag is part of their legacy, part of that tradition and that it represents property, a little bit of which is owned by every single American family, that is a good fundamental principle upon which we should act to protect the American flag with this piece of legislation and ultimately with this amendment.

So I want to thank my good friend. I want to thank him also for his great service to this country in a very difficult time and his hard work. I know one thing about the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) and that is he is tenacious. He will have the rest of us up here working away, pushing away on this amendment until we get this thing passed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I would like to go through is that there has been some arguments in past debate, and it will be a handful of individuals that feel that their first amendment rights are abridged if we pass this amendment. I am not chastising their feelings or their intent. They may believe that the first amendment is touched.

But I would like to go through what some of the Supreme Court Justices have said about the first amendment rights and some other folks as well. First of all, they would say, how can you reconcile the Flag Protection Amendment with the first amendment's guarantee for free speech? It does not limit free speech, Mr. Speaker. The first amendment freedoms are not absolute.

This compatibility was consistent with the views of the framers of the Constitution who strongly supported government actions to prohibit flag desecration. As I mentioned, actually 48 States had this amendment before the famous Texas versus Johnson Supreme Court decision, which was a narrow five to four decision, which overruled 200 years of history.

Such leading proponents of individual rights, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) talks about Judge Rehnquist, but members such as fighters for justice and liberty and the first amendment, like Judge Earl Warren, Justice Abe Fortas, Justice Hugo Black, each have opinions that the Nation could consistently work with the first amendment and prosecute physical desecration of the flag.

As Justice Black, perhaps the leading exponent of the first amendment freedoms to ever sit on the Supreme Court stated, "It passes my belief that anything in the Federal Constitution bars making deliberate burning of the American flag an offense."

Former Chief Justice Earl Warren stated, "I believe that the States and the Federal Government do have the power to protect the flag from acts of desecration and disgrace."

Moreover, Justice Fortas, "The flag is a special kind of a personality." I think each person that views the flag, whether it is singing the National Anthem or The Star Spangled Banner or saying the pledge, people view that differently.

As one walks down the mall here in Washington and one looks at it, I have seen literally thousands of people stop and take a look at the flag and the other monuments that we have to this great country. But Justice Fortas, "The flag is a special kind of personality."

Its use is traditionally and universally subject to special rules and regulations. The States and the Federal Government have the power to protect the flag from acts of desecration.

Mr. Speaker, another very famous individual, Mr. Thomas Jefferson, while serving as George Washington's Secretary of State, instructed American counsels to punish those that violated our flag. James Madison pronounced flag desecration in Philadelphia as objectionable in court and requested penalties for such.

□ 2000

Well, then, when the first amendment debate was covered, they said that is fair enough, to Mr. Solomon, but. Always followed by but. Still, there is a constitutional guarantee for expression of conduct. How do you express yourself if you do not do it verbally, or if you cannot express it by burning a flag? Do you not have the right for expressing conduct?

The Supreme Court has accepted the premise that certain expressive acts are entitled to first amendment protections based on the principle that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable. That was Texas versus Johnson. But they go on to say that not all activity with an expressive component is afforded first amendment protection.

For example, someone who opposes wildlife protections cannot go out and shoot a Bald Eagle, because it is protected. It is not only a national symbol but it is wrong.

Applying these principles, the Supreme Court upheld a statute prohibiting the destruction of draft cards against the first amendment challenge. The court stated that the prohibition served a legitimate purpose, facilitating draft induction in time of national crisis, that was unrelated to the suppression of the speaker's idea since the law prohibited the conduct regardless of the message sought to be conveyed by the destruction of the draft card.

Four Supreme Court Justices, Justice Rehnquist, Justice O'Connor, Justice Stevens and Justice White, dissenting in United States versus Eichman, stated that Congress could prohibit flag desecration consistent with first amendment protections. Their reasons are as follows:

The Federal Government had a legitimate interest in protecting the intrinsic value of the American flag, which, in times of national crisis, inspires. It motivates the average citizen to make personal sacrifices in order to achieve social goals of overriding importance.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen films of someone carrying the flag in a battlefield and going down; and his comrade, knowing that he would be killed, would pick up that flag and charge on, because it had significance. We have seen civil rights leaders carry the American flag at the forefront of their issues; their own kind of a battle fighting for justice in this country.

So I would say that under the Constitution the Supreme Court has found that this amendment is proper, it is justifiable, and that it will pass both the House, the Senate, and we feel the President will sign it and the States will ratify it and make it illegal.

Now, the amendment is not self-enacting, Mr. Speaker. It will have to go through the ratification of States. It will have to have a statute which will define the actions taken with the desecration of a flag. It will be refined. So this is not a self-enacting amendment, and that process will go through each of the States so that they can ratify their own decisions, which most of us support the States' statutes.

Would a flag amendment reduce our freedoms under the Bill of Rights? Would this be the first time in our 200-year history that an amendment has limited the rights guaranteed under the first amendment?

No, on both accounts. The proposed amendment would not reduce our freedoms under the Bill of Rights. Rather than posing a fundamental threat to our freedom under the Bill of Rights, the proposed amendment would mature constitutional freedoms. The Bill of Rights is a listing of the great freedoms our citizens enjoy today. It is not a license to engage in any type of behavior.

The proposed amendment affirms the most basic conditions of our freedom, our bond to one another and our aspirations of national unity. That is what the American flag means to most of us, national unity and what brings us together, especially in a time of need, whether it is in combat or whether in civil strife within the boundaries of these United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California, if he has additional comments.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my friend that I think he has stated the issue very well, and I look forward to hundreds of our colleagues coming on board this effort, as many of them already have, and making sure that we succeed.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from California.

Does the gentleman from New York have any closing comments?

Mr. SWEENEY. I just want to say to the gentleman from California (Mr.

CUNNINGHAM), as one of my first pieces of legislation that I have been able to cosponsor, I am honored to be here, honored to be here as part of the gentleman's effort to push forward. The flag is a part of my family's heritage, and I feel very honored to be here.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank my colleagues. God bless America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and tomorrow, February 23rd and 24th, on account of family illness.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, February 23rd, on account of business in the district.

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 Ms. NORTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, on February 24.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on February 24.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, on February 24.

Mr. COBLE, for 5 minutes, on February 24.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on February 24.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. OWENS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 24, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

539. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department