

Science, we would probably have at least two thirds of the Members of this body having served on a committee that exercised jurisdiction over this bill. I cannot imagine any piece of legislation produced in this body in my 18 years that had so large a percentage of the body's hands on the legislative process. What could be more inclusive than that?

But that inclusivity was not, in itself, enough to satisfy the Speaker's desire that this be an open, inviting, and inclusive process. He then arranged that these 12 different select committees would report their work to a select committee comprised of Members of the leadership of both the Republican and Democrat party. And we digested the work of these 12 different committees after we had had hearings that included virtually every member of the cabinet that had anything to do with this, each of the chairmen and ranking members of each of these committees, and we had a very special hearing that included a group that I like to call the bipartisan innovators in the body that had presented themselves to this task long before it was conceived by the President, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) and of course the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) whose work was invaluable to us as we proceeded.

The Speaker, when he set up this process and invited us to go to work, agreed that there would be a rule that would govern our proceedings, that would be a product of the joint recommendation of himself and the minority leader. And at the conclusion of our event, 102 amendments were offered for consideration to the Committee on Rules. The Speaker and the minority leader have spent the last 48 hours digesting these, structuring these, negotiating, and have given us this rule that defines the content of 27 opportunities to amend this legislation and the structure of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no time ever in my time as a Member of this body when we considered anything whatsoever under procedures, jurisdictions, participations that were broader and more bipartisan and more inviting and more inclusive than this. In the close of business this day and the next, we will produce a bill for the Department of Homeland Defense, and it will be a bill that will have had, in terms of participation in the writing of chapter and verse, the participation of virtually every Member of this Congress.

May I say on behalf of the body, Mr. Speaker, thank you, thank you for understanding, Mr. Speaker, how serious this business is, how important it is to the Nation, and thank you for making it possible for each and every one of us on both sides of the aisle to know that we were respected, included, and participated in this process. No Speaker ever in the history of the House showed a greater respect for the House Mem-

bers than our Speaker, Mr. HASTERT, and if I may again say on behalf of all of us, Mr. Speaker, thank you for being the fine man you are.

You are, Mr. Speaker, a fine servant to freedom, and that is the kind of governance we should have in this House. I ask that we vote this amendment out of respect to the generosity and inclusiveness of the Speaker who made it possible.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today disappointed that the Rules Committee would not allow an amendment that would have provided the new Department of Homeland Security with the tools that are necessary to appropriately respond to a terrorist attack or another Homeland Security Emergency.

The amendment that I speak of is one that I offered in the Committee on Government Reform, where it passed by a unanimous vote.

Government Reform is the Committee that had primary jurisdiction in the creation of this new department, yet much of its wonderful bipartisan work was unexplainably rejected by the Majority, was not allowed in today's Bill and is not even being allowed a chance to be debated on the floor today.

Obviously, prevention needs to be our and the Department of Homeland Security's number-one priority, and we must do everything possible to prevent all future attacks.

However, there are two major priorities for homeland security—not only preventing terrorism, but also responding to the impacts of terrorism should it occur again.

With this reorganization, we seem to have only focused on the first.

If a fail-safe system cannot be created, then why are we being blocked today from taking the lessons learned from the worst terrorist attack in American history and using the research of GAO, CRS and the NY Federal Reserve to create an improved system of response?

Experience is often the best teacher and very regrettably, New York learned much on 9/11.

The bipartisan amendment that I introduced recognized the need to improve the nation's response should we have another attack.

My amendment does exactly that.

It gives the Secretary the authority to respond quickly following a homeland security event and eliminates much of the redtape New York experienced after 9/11.

These are things that when they need to be done, they need to be done quickly. If they are not done quickly then the challenges to the affected areas significantly increase.

I must stress that all of these options are at the discretion of the Secretary.

I cannot imagine why the Majority would not allow the opportunity to give the Department of Homeland Security the ability to respond and provide aid to schools, hospitals and local governments that may need it.

We know from September 11th that there's a great deal of room for improvement in response and recovery operations.

While the hearts of Washington were 100% behind New York's recovery, the system was not adequately prepared to get the job done.

The series of complications and delays in federal relief efforts for New York City show a real need for expanded authority and flexibility in disaster recovery operations.

I think we can all agree that delivering immediate aid, to the right people, at the right time, is and will always be our top priority.

It's painful to think that thousands of people, in any of our districts, could once again be left without assistance because of outdated rules and inconsistent procedures.

Sadly, America experienced a major disaster we can learn from, showing in some cases what works, and in many cases, how not to respond.

My amendment learns from the past and prepares for the future.

Enclosed are materials on my amendment. Although my amendment was not included, I do support the rule and underlying bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. 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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3763) "An Act to protect investors by improving the accuracy and reliability of corporate disclosures made pursuant to the securities laws, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5121. An act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 5121) "An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHN-SON, Mr. REED, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. COCHRAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention, my hope, that we can make progress on this legislation this evening such that would enable us to complete this work this week. It would turn out, I would think at this point, that it would be very difficult for us to anticipate completing our week's work in time to make planes to return to our districts tomorrow or tomorrow evening, but we could, I think, if we are prepared to work late tomorrow,

complete all the work we need to do in order to make our early planes on Saturday morning to begin our district work period and have time with our families. But in order to do that, we must move forward tonight on this.

What I would propose to the body is that we follow this procedure in the interest of giving Members at large the maximum opportunity to make progress on the bill and still indeed make rest for themselves for the long and arduous day we are certain to have tomorrow:

That we proceed now with the general debate and that we begin to work on amendments. It is my recommendation that, as we work through amendments, we roll votes through the Shays/Watson amendment No. 23. That would enable us to come in in the morning, pick up those votes that have been rolled from tonight's work, and complete the work on this bill tomorrow.

I should also mention to the body, we should expect to work late tomorrow night to complete consideration of this bill, but we will also have at least one other, perhaps two other important legislative opportunities that this body will want to consider because the opportunity is here to do indeed additional good things, for example, quite

possibly, complete consideration of the bankruptcy conference report.

So we will be here, we will work hard tomorrow, and we will get a lot done. But we will only be able to do that and make our early morning planes on Saturday if we are willing to find a way to work our way through tonight. If we can proceed through the Shays/Watson amendment, that would leave us a few votes to begin the morning with and the chance to get right into the completion of the work.

That is my proposal, Mr. Speaker, and, without objection, I would move forward on that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, now in your capacity as leader, I was seeking a clarification. Certainly we want to move this bill expeditiously, knowing its importance to the American people, even at the expense of starting the district break a few hours later, and I know you share that concern. But what I heard you say, I had a concern about, and I am seeking clarification.

I was hoping that we could take up the Oberstar and Young amendments

tonight, roll the votes for them to tomorrow, take up the Waxman amendment tomorrow and vote on it tomorrow, and then proceed tonight with 52 down to Shays/Watson, rolling the votes until tomorrow.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentlewoman is exactly correct, in that if you took the beginning of the amendments in the rule, we would agree to move the Waxman amendment to tomorrow, but roll the votes on Oberstar, Young and all others up through Shays/Watson, which would be amendment No. 23. That would give us a great deal of progress tonight, and obviously we would also have the general debate out of the way.

Ms. PELOSI. That is agreeable to the minority, Mr. Leader.

So that would mean that there would be no more votes tonight and we would take up the Waxman amendment tomorrow and vote on it tomorrow?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), I might add, is going to want to thank the gentlewoman for working very hard to make sure that this is a clear understanding that we are proceeding in that way.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the distinguished leader.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.