

This is wrong. Support H.R. 4555 to correct this.

PROBLEMS OF TANF REAUTHORIZATION

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

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support my Democratic colleagues in their approach to welfare reform. Voters overwhelmingly believe that expanding training opportunities that will help new people from welfare to good jobs should be a top priority of this Congress.

The voting public supports a TANF reform agenda of expanded access to training, education and flexible time limits. The polling data demonstrates that 82 percent of Americans favor increasing funding for job training and child care. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Democratic proposal presents.

The Republican proposals do not represent the voice of America or our welfare recipients. The one-size-fits-all, Washington-knows-best unfunded mandates of Republican proposals will not work. We need to build upon the success of the past by increasing funding flexibility. We need to assist TANF recipients to get living wage jobs so that they have access to upward mobility.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic proposals will do just that.

SENIORS NEED PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. Like Yogi Berra said, "It is deja vu all over again."

The Republican majority is trying to convince the American people that they want to do something to provide prescription drug benefit for our Nation's seniors, but it is the same proposal that went nowhere last year. It is nothing but an election year proposal that will provide very little benefit to most seniors.

This tiered proposal, leveled proposal, treats some seniors differently than others, despite the fact that all seniors have paid into the program and deserve a meaningful prescription drug benefit.

I am in favor of providing real prescription drug benefits to seniors. If this proposal is going to work, we need a benefit that is good for all seniors, not just a few. Unfortunately, the Republican plan will not help middle income seniors who have only moderate drug costs. Their plan is unworkable. Even the insurance industry says that insurance will not go for it. So what we have here is a plan that the seniors will not like, the insurance companies will not like, and the public will be able to see through. And even members of my

Republican colleagues' party have mentioned that this bill is not a good proposal.

Let us stop playing games with seniors' lives. It is time to provide a meaningful, generous benefit that actually does something to address the prescription drug problem.

STICK TO THE PRESIDENT'S SUPPLEMENTAL DEFENSE REQUEST

(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 has been a hallmark of the Republican majority in Congress to practice fiscal restraint and to stand by a strong national defense. Today here on Capitol Hill we will be about the business of responding to the President's supplemental defense request, and there are some reports and some discussion on Capitol Hill that we may in this majority bring to the floor later this week a bill that could exceed the President's request by nearly 10 percent, adding in spending on election reform and interior agencies; nothing much to do with national defense.

I urge my colleagues to hew to their roots, Mr. Speaker. Spend not one penny more than the President has requested when we pass the defense supplemental this week. By demonstrating fiscal discipline, our majority will renew our commitment to fiscal responsibility and to national defense without compromising either.

HONORING SOUTH CAROLINA POLICY COUNCIL

(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, in 1986 a group of South Carolina civic leaders dedicated to improving their State joined together and created the South Carolina Policy Council. South Carolina at that time was dominated by a legislature which controlled an array of semi-autonomous boards and commissions that fostered red tape and hindered accountability. Through the visionary leadership of the late Thomas A. Roe, the Policy Council was formed to fill the void of reformist conservative philosophy.

By publishing timely reports, comprehensive white papers, and hard-hitting editorials, the Policy Council grew in stature and membership. In the beginning of the Republican Revolution, Ed McMullen was chosen as its president. The Policy Council has played a role in every major reform debate. From modernizing State government, to promoting performance audits, to reforming welfare, to cutting taxes, the Policy Council was there. It was further energized by dedicated researcher Hal Eberle and now South Carolina Senate Clerk Jeff Gossett.

Today the South Carolina Policy Council boasts a membership of over 5,000 and regularly participates in policy debates with political, religious and business leaders throughout the Palmetto State.

I am honored to take this opportunity to thank the Policy Council and to wish them well on the ongoing fight to conserve the principles of limited government and traditional values.

STRENGTHEN U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as a representative of industrial America, I am urging my colleagues today to vote both to strengthen the U.S. steel industry and to put on hold plans to ship spent nuclear material to Yucca Mountain.

In an era where our rail beds as well as human error yield major train derailments and accidents each year, why authorize Yucca Mountain? Why not improve our rail beds, improve our steel industry and make this country an industrial leader in terms of rail transportation?

In an age of terrorism, why have nuclear material moving all over this country? And, finally, in my own district, a recent nuclear mishap occurred in which boric acid ate through 80 pounds of carbon steel in the central container inside the core. I really ask the question—Why do we have such poor engineering and poor inspection in the nuclear industry? Why do we have a plant reactor that cannot be repaired in this country? Why even if we were able to repair it, do we have to send the core to Japan to cast a new head and then to France for finishing? Why is the nuclear industry exempt with no one responsible under the Price Anderson Act, for liability in the event an accident occurs? Please, I urge my colleagues today to vote to strengthen the U.S. steel industry and vote for nuclear safety.

Vote to uphold the steel decision on limiting imports and to table the Yucca Mountain nuclear storage proposal.

FREE MARTIN AND GRACIA BURNHAM

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 347th day that Martin and Gracia Burnham have been held captive by Muslim terrorists in the Philippines.

This afternoon many members of my family, including my father and mother, will arrive in Washington to visit me and their grandchildren. As I look forward to their visit, I think of the Burnham family and the family reunion they await every day. Too often

congressional schedules keep us away from our families. Many of us have had to miss Little League games, school recitals and concerts. That is the hardest part of our job. I cannot imagine missing a year's worth of my children's lives, a year of birthdays, holidays, games, concerts and those precious daily moments.

Of all the hardships that Martin and Gracia have endured in the past 11½ months, the greatest must be their separation from their family and knowing how desperately their children miss them. I always cherish my time with my parents and my family, but this week I am especially aware of how lucky I am to have time.

I encourage the Bush administration and the Philippine government to continue their efforts, all their efforts, to free Martin and Gracia so the Burnham family can enjoy a family reunion.

As always, I ask you to join me in prayer for Martin and Gracia and their loved ones that this nightmare may soon be over.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity to speak today on behalf of National Small Business Week. Small businesses play a crucial role in the economy of our Nation, and it is important that we take this week to recognize their efforts.

As a member of the Committee on Small Business and a former small business owner, I am aware of the everyday difficulties that many of our Nation's small businesses have to face. We must work together to ensure that their needs are met and not put behind the needs of corporate America.

With approximately 25 million small businesses in the United States, we need to focus on affordable health care for the small business employer and employee. We must ensure that pension plans will be provided to employees while protecting our system's Social Security. Last year many small businesses were left out of the President's tax cut. Let us make sure that that never happens again, and provide for fair tax breaks to small businesses who may need the extra capital to survive.

Many Americans dream of owning their own business, and we need to help that dream become a reality and stay a reality for years.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF H.J. Res. 84, DISAPPROVING THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECTION 203 OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TRANSMITTED TO THE CONGRESS ON MARCH 5, 2002

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 414 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 414

Resolved, That the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 84) disapproving the action taken by the President under section 203 of the Trade Act of 1974 transmitted to the Congress on March 5, 2002, is hereby laid on the table.

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

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

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, while I am waiting for some of my remarks, first, I would like to welcome our new colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), who will be managing the rule for the minority.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 414 is a unique rule providing for the disposition of House Joint Resolution 84, a resolution of disapproval. Under the rule, the House Joint Resolution 84 would be automatically tabled. House Joint Resolution 84 disapproves the action taken by President Bush to impose temporary tariffs on some types of steel products. Under the Trade Act, Congress has the authority to disapprove of such actions within 90 days. Such approval resolution is highly privileged, not amendable, and floor debate is limited to 20 hours.

To put it simply, a vote in favor of this rule will lay on the table the disapproval resolution and conclude further deliberations.

Responding to concerns within the steel industry, President Bush instructed the International Trade Commission on June 2001 to begin an investigation under section 201 of the U.S. Trade Law. This investigation would study the effects of steel imports on the U.S. steel industry. The ITC released their findings in October of 2001, making an affirmative determination of injury on the American steel industry caused by steel imports.

The ITC further relayed recommendations to the President for relief that would prevent or remedy such injuries.

On March 5 of this year, the President put in place trade remedies based on the ITC findings. President Bush announced trade remedies for all products on which the ITC had found substantial injuries except two specialty categories.

Under present law, the President, not the ITC, makes the final decision whether to provide relief to the U.S. industry, as well as to the type and amounts of relief.

Passing the disapproval resolution as written would not undo the remedies imposed by President Bush. Rather, it would merely put in place the tariff levels suggested by the International Trade Commission.

□ 1030

While congressional disapproval is certainly allowed under this statute, this rule recognizes that the circumstances in this case simply do not warrant such action. Even the measure's sponsor noted in committee markup that the resolution was not the best solution.

Laying this resolution on the table does not hurt the steel industry. In fact, it will keep intact the President's remedy that the industry favors. The disapproval resolution could potentially be even more harmful to the industry, nor would the resolution not eliminate tariffs on steel imports. It merely replaces one set of tariffs with another.

Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that a vote in support of this rule will table the disapproval resolution, keep intact the President's current enacted remedy, and conclude debate on this issue.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I thank him for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), and the rest of my colleagues for my appointment to the Rules Committee.

I am honored to take the seat held for over 25 years by my friend and mentor, Joe Moakley; and before him the seat was held by the late Speaker, Tip O'Neill. I feel so privileged to be part of that legacy, and I will try to do everything possible to live up to their examples of hard work, collegiality and dedication to this House.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first rule that I have managed on the floor; and if I did not know better, I would think that my friends on the other side of the aisle were trying to make it as difficult as possible because this rule, Mr. Speaker, is a complex and convoluted contrivance designed to protect some Members from an unambiguous vote on an issue of vital importance to America's steel industry and its workers.

This rule is self-executing, which means that a vote in favor of the rule will table the resolution, thereby killing it without a clear up or down vote. While I strongly oppose the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), I see no reason why the committee does not simply allow this body to vote on it.

This is an issue with real consequences for hard-working Americans and their families. Quite simply, Mr.