

to have a hearing in committee, refuses to allow a vote to bring it out of committee, refuses to let it come to the floor of the House.

Now, this is only one way of trying to reduce costs, but a very effective way. Essentially what we have been seeing in the House under the Republican leadership is that every effort that has been made, either by the Democrats or on a bipartisan basis as this generic bill was, to try to come up with formulas that would reduce costs, the Republican leadership just will not allow it to come up.

As I mentioned before, in their own benefit bill, their prescription drug benefit bill, the privatization bill, they have this non-interference clause that says you cannot negotiate price reduction. The Democrats mandate in their bill that prices are reduced. The Democrats in the other body, they actually passed a bill that would plug up these generic loopholes. The Republicans in the House refused to bring it up.

There are many other examples. We have bills that would allow reimportation from Canada. As I think many of my colleagues know, if you compare the United States and the price of drugs in the United States to almost every other developed country, you take like the top 5 or 6 countries by gross national product, Britain, France, or even smaller countries like Canada or Italy, whatever, Western Europe, other developed countries, you will find that prescription drug prices are significantly less, sometimes 30 or 40 percent of the cost of what you would pay in the United States. So one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), proposed a bill that said that the cost that companies charge for prescription drugs in the United States has to be comparable to what citizens in these other countries pay.

Well, of course, we cannot get that bill posted by the Republicans. They will not allow that to be posted.

We have also tried to, as I said, pass a bill that would allow you to reimport a drug. In other words, you could apply to a drugstore in Canada, for example, over the Internet, or even physically go to Canada and bring the drugs back into the United States. Legislation has been introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), that would allow reimportation from Canada. Republicans will not let that bill come up. That has not come to the floor.

The list goes on and on. Probably one of the worst examples is that right now, when the brand name drug companies advertise for certain drugs on TV and encourage you to use a brand name as opposed to a generic for a particular drug, the advertising costs are actually underwritten by the taxpayers. They get a tax credit or deduction for that kind of advertising. That actually encourages you as the consumer to pay higher prices for the brand name drug.

So all of these things, we have legislation on the Democratic side that

would eliminate the tax subsidy or the deduction or the tax credit for that kind of advertising by the pharmaceutical companies. We cannot bring that up either. They will not allow it.

The Republican leadership does not want us in any way to address the issue of cost and trying to reduce costs for prescription drugs, because basically the drug industry is behind the Republican efforts, paying for the Republican candidates, and they are basically in the pockets of the brand name drug industry.

I do not mention this because I am trying to be evil or trying to say that all Republicans are bad or anything of that nature, but the problem is that the leadership very much does whatever the brand name drug industry wants, and that is the main reason why we are not able to get any kind of effort to reduce prices, and it is another reason why we are not able to get any kind of expansion of Medicare to include prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to take a little more time, and then I am going to conclude this evening, to talk about the benefit.

My constituents in New Jersey over the last 2 or 3 years since the Medicare+Choice, the HMO programs effectively tried to sign up a lot of seniors under Medicare on the theory that if you signed up for an HMO you would get your prescription drug coverage, because Medicare does not normally cover it, but some of the HMOs that were offering Medicare policies in New Jersey were offering a prescription drug plan as part of their HMO Medicare policy.

But what we found is that more and more of the HMOs after 6 months or a year would pull out of the Medicare program and would not give seniors the option, if you will, of joining an HMO and getting their prescription drug benefits.

There was an article just last week in the New York Times dated September 10 entitled "HMOs for 200,000 Pulling Out of Medicare" by Robert Pear. It says, "Health maintenance organizations serving 200,000 elderly and disabled people said they will pull out of Medicare next year, raising to 2.4 million the number of beneficiaries that have been dropped by HMOs since 1998."

Again, if you talk about a privatization plan for prescription drugs, we already have the example with HMOs which were offering prescription drugs to seniors and increasingly have dropped them because they cannot afford to provide the benefit. It seems to me that that goes far to explain why a privatization program for seniors to provide seniors with a prescription drug will not work, and that is why you have to simply expand Medicare along the lines of what the Democrats have talked about in order to provide a decent benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with that, but I want to say that I am going

to be here many times, many nights, over the next 3, 4, 5 weeks before we adjourn, and I know I am going to be joined by a lot of my colleagues on the Democratic side, saying that before we adjourn we need a Medicare prescription drug benefit that covers all seniors and everyone under Medicare and that is affordable, and, secondly, that we need to address the issue of price and rising costs for prescription drugs, pass the generic bill, provide some kind of reimportation, provide some sort of process whereby the agency that administers the Medicare program can negotiate cheaper drug prices. All these things have to be done.

If any of my colleagues on either side of the aisle doubt that this is an important issue for the average American, whether they are a senior or not, they just should spend a couple of days at a forum or talking to their constituents on the street, and they will find that they are crying out for this Congress to address this prescription drug issue in an effective way.

#### ENSURING FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you and the staff that I will not take that much time. That might be the best news I can give.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have a few minutes of this hour to talk about an issue that I think, as my friend from New Jersey feels that the issue he is talking about, prescription drugs, is important, and I would agree it is important, but I want to talk about freedom of speech.

I think that there is nothing except the Bible that is more sacred to the American people than the Constitution. It is second only, again, to the Bible.

Tonight I want to talk a little bit about H.R. 2357. This is a bill that I introduced about 2 years ago. I actually have 130 sponsors, and I believe you, Mr. Speaker tonight in the Chair, are a cosponsor of this also.

In this country we have our men and women in uniform that right now are overseas in Afghanistan, and they could be called on to be in other parts of the world to defend the national security of this country, and the national security of this country includes our constitutional rights and our freedoms, the things that we cherish. We really appreciate those who have given their life for this country in the past and what they have done to ensure that we would have the freedoms that we enjoy in this great, great Nation, blessed by God Almighty.

I would like to give a little bit of the history of this bill that I put in. If this was 1953, Mr. Speaker, I would not even be on the floor, because there would be

no issue. In 1953, the churches, synagogues and other houses of worship had no restriction on what they might say in their church. But in 1954, Lyndon Baines Johnson, the United States Senator from Texas and the majority leader, was very offended that there was a 501(c)3 group that was opposed to his reelection by the name of the H.L. Hunt family. These were not churches. These were think tanks, as we know them today, and they were opposed to his reelection.

So what Lyndon Johnson did, he put an amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate in 1954 that was never debated. There was no debate at all. The Republican minority accepted what they call a UC, a unanimous consent, so therefore it became the law. It gave the authority to the Internal Revenue Service that the Internal Revenue service would be able to, if you will, evaluate what could and could not be said in a church, synagogue or mosque.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the firm belief that those men who came to this country along with their wives years and years and years ago came to this country for religious freedom. They came here to build a new nation, a nation that would be and still is blessed by God Almighty.

Mr. Speaker, my problem is, and the reason I introduced H.R. 2357, that I believe that spiritual leaders of this country must have the freedom to talk about the issues of the day, whether they be about political issues of the day or whether they be about the moral issues of the day, and sometimes those sermons in those churches have to touch on the political issues of the day.

I will give an example of that, because it happened in my district. A very dear friend of mine who happens to be a Catholic down in New Bern, North Carolina, whose name is Jerry Shield, Jerry asked his priest, Father Rudy at St. Paul's Catholic Church in New Bern, in the year 2000 to just make one little comment the Sunday before the Tuesday election. He said, "Father, how about just saying that George Bush, who is a candidate for President of the United States, is pro-life?"

Believe this or not, Mr. Speaker, the priest said, "Jerry, I cannot say that. If I do, I will violate the 501(c)3 status of this church and we might lose that status."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you that I am offended that any clergy in this country, our spiritual leaders that talk about morality, that talk about the political issues of the day as they see fit to talk about those issues, that they should have any restriction at all on them.

What I wanted to do tonight, I was on the floor last week and I talked about a few of the national leaders who are supportive. Again I want to say we have 130 cosponsors of this bill. I am pleased to tell you that in the last couple of weeks we have picked up three additional Democrats. I want to pick up more.

I am reaching out to my friends on both sides of the aisle to ask them to please look at this as nothing more. It is not a political issue, it is not a party issue, it is just an issue of freedom of speech, because, again, I cannot say it too much, that if this was 1953, I would not be on the floor.

□ 2115

There was no restriction. I have researched this issue and when the churches qualified by the law to become 501(c) status, there is no, no restriction of what they could or could not say.

I want tonight to again just mention a few of the spiritual leaders of this country who support this legislation. Richard Land, the Southern Baptist Convention; James Dobson, we all know is the president of Focus on the Family; David Barton, director of the Wallbuilders. He has been such a strong supporter of this legislation. James Martin, president of the 60 Plus Association; Tim and Beverly LaHaye, the Concerned Women for America; Kent Synder, executive director for the Liberty Principle; Connie Mackey; William Murray, the chairman of the Religious Freedom Coalition; David Keene, chairman of the American Conservative Union; D. James Kennedy, President of Coral Ridge Ministries; and Ray Flynn, Mr. Speaker, the former ambassador to the Vatican is a strong supporter of this legislation, H.R. 2357, to return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues. In addition, Rabbi Daniel Lapin, and I have had the pleasure of talking to him twice now. What a wonderful man of God he is and he is a real inspiration to all of us who love God, there is no question about it. And James Bopp, the constitutional lawyer for the James Madison Center for Free Speech.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, I am very pleased to tell my colleagues tonight that a former Member of the United States House of Representatives, a man that was here my first session in the United States Congress, I had great respect for. I did not really get to know him, I wish I had. But he was a real leader on the Democratic side. His name is Floyd Flake. Dr. Flake is a minister, a former Member of Congress, and he is the pastor of the Greater Allen Cathedral in New York; and he wrote a very strong letter of support for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, they held a hearing on this issue on May 14, and I am very pleased to tell my colleagues that Dr. D. James Kennedy came up from Florida to testify on behalf of this legislation. In addition, I am pleased to tell my colleagues that another former Member of the House, a Democrat, Walter Fauntroy, Pastor Walter Fauntroy came to testify on behalf of this legislation. Let me read the last paragraph of Dr. Flake's letter.

It says: "I am pleased to offer my wholehearted support with sincere

prayer for passage of this important and liberating legislation." That is the key: liberating legislation. Our men and women of faith who are spiritual leaders should have every right they choose to talk about the issues of the day. I know that when Al Gore was running for the Presidency in the year 2000, he was in Dr. Flake's church and after Mr. Gore spoke, the minister said, Dr. Flake said, "I think this is the right man to lead this Nation." Well, then he got a letter of reprimand from the IRS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what Dr. Flake felt and wanted to say that to his congregation, there should not have been any Federal Government overseeing what he said in that church.

Then I gave the example earlier of my friend, Jerry Shield, down in New Bern to ask the priest just to say that George Bush is pro-life, let us support George Bush. These are the things that if this was 1953, they would be able to do it without any reservation at all. But Lyndon Johnson, who was an arrogant Member of the Senate at the time, and later became a President that I do not have much respect for his Presidency, quite frankly; but anyway, he put in an amendment without any debate, as I said earlier, that pretty much stifled the churches and synagogues of this country. They did hold a hearing on this legislation, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the chairman of the committee, for holding that hearing, because what it did, it gave us a chance to talk about this issue.

I want to read just a couple of comments, Mr. Speaker, because they had two representatives of the IRS to come talk about their authority given again by Lyndon Johnson to stifle the speech of the churches and synagogues in this country. I am not going to read all of the testimony, but I am going to read just a couple of minutes for the RECORD, if I could. Let me use for an example that one of the comments was of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), who asked Mr. Miller, who represents the Internal Revenue Service at the hearing, and Mr. LEWIS said, "As a rule," again, to the IRS, "do you monitor the activities of churches during the political season?" The IRS representative, Mr. Miller says, "We do monitor churches. We are limited in how we do that by reason of section 7611 and because of the lack of information in the area, because there is no annual filing."

But, Mr. Speaker, this is the point I want to make. He additionally said, "So our monitoring is mostly receipt of information from third parties who are looking."

Well, I think that is a sad commentary on this great Nation that we have to have our churches and synagogues having a third party to look in to see what they are saying, because then that third party, if they believe they have violated the Johnson amendment, can report them to the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. Speaker, that is

not what this great Nation is about. That is not what these great men and women in uniform are willing to give their life for. They are willing to give their life for the national security of this country and the freedom of this Nation. But that is what Mr. Miller said: we are dependent on a third party to report the church for violating the Johnson amendment for speaking freely on the political and moral issues of the day.

Then there is another question that Mr. LEWIS asked and I want to read this for the RECORD: "Do you have the ability or the capacity as an agency to monitor the activities of churches and other religious institutions?" Mr. Miller with the Internal Revenue Service says, "The only thing we can rely upon again is who would be in that audience to report it."

Mr. Speaker, I think that is so tragic. We have a law in the land of this country that restricts freedom of speech in our churches and synagogues, and we have to depend on a third party to be there to report that to the Internal Revenue Service. That again is not what should be in this country. The spiritual leaders of this great Nation should have the right to choose whatever they feel that they must say from their heart and their God to their members who are in that congregation. But again, Mr. Miller has been very honest on the committee on May 14, and he acknowledged we are dependent on a third party to report churches and synagogues who might violate the law of the land. Well, my point there is that how in the world, with all of the churches and synagogues and mosques in this country, can we enforce this law? The law is unjustified, it is unneeded, and should never have been adopted. It was done in 1954 at night without any debate. We should pass H.R. 2357 and return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues.

Just one more point on this, Mr. Speaker, and then I am going to work toward a close. Let me read this letter, and this is what really bothers me more than anything. This might better explain to the Congress what we are trying to say. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) was also on that committee that I mentioned that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) served on, the oversight committee chaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) asked this question: "So just to follow up on that, say you have a candidate who is a guest speaker, was in a church speaking from the pulpit, concludes his or her remarks, and the minister walks up, puts his hands or arms around the particular candidate and says, this is the right candidate; I urge you to support this candidate. Is that allowable under current law?" That is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) to Mr. Hopkins, who represents the Internal Revenue Service, and he says, "No, that would not be allowable under law.

That would clearly be political campaign activity. It would be protected, however, under the two bills that are specifically the subject of this hearing," a bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and myself, Congressman JONES, H.R. 2357.

Mr. Speaker, I came to this floor last week, and I am going to come a couple times this week and a couple of times next week, because I hope that the leadership of the House will bring this to the floor of the Congress to vote on. I believe sincerely that if this country is going to have a great future, and we are a Nation who cannot forget that this Nation has been blessed by God; if we are going to have a strong Nation, then our preachers, our priests, and our rabbis must have a right to talk about the issues of the day. And sometimes those moral issues of the day become political issues. I think that our ministers must have the right to talk about those issues of the day if this country is going to remain morally strong.

Let me start closing by reading a letter; it will not take but just a couple of minutes. This is a minister who is an African American minister down in Raleigh, North Carolina, and I know him, I have talked to him by phone; and I have a great deal of respect for him. He is a strong man of God. I had read an article in a Raleigh paper; all the liberal press, Mr. Speaker, they just cannot understand this legislation. The liberals just cannot understand it. I guess they forget that they are protected by the Constitution and so should the ministers and priests and rabbis, as far as I am concerned.

Let me read this. It is from Marian B. Robinson, minister of the St. Matthew AME Church in Raleigh, North Carolina, and it will not take but a moment.

"Dear Congressman Jones: I read with interest an article printed in Raleigh News and Observer as it pertained to H.R. 2157, the Houses of Worship Political Speech Protection Act. Thank you for introducing a bill that will give free speech to houses of worship on issues of moral and political significance without the fear of losing their tax exempt status. If the churches cannot do it, then who can?"

Second paragraph: "Secondly, the black church has always been a platform and forum to get the message out to our people since we have no other institution or places to go or turn to. The church continues to be the mouthpiece for informing and directing our people on most things. Part of our job consists of trying to keep families strong and together by instilling morals and values and the teachings of Christ. We need freedom of speech from the pulpits without fear of reprisals. This will help us carry out our tasks in a manner pleasing to God and meaningful to the people."

Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted to read that letter is because this support is across the board. It is from people of

faith, whether they be African American, whether they be Muslim, whether they be Catholic, Jew, or Protestant. They support this legislation because they fully understand, as I understand, that the strength of this country is the fact that our spiritual leaders have the freedom to talk about these issues.

I must say that as Pastor Robinson asked me in this letter of support, Mr. Speaker, if they are not going to have the right to talk about these issues, then who is going to talk about them? What I say to the liberal press is, I do not have much respect for the liberal press. When it suits their needs, they support it; when it does not suit their needs, then they do not support it. But I will tell my colleagues that I never saw in 1953, and I have had my staff to do a lot of research, I never saw any editorial or any news article that took the churches to task for what they might have said of a political nature in 1953. None.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight as I close, I do want to mention this. The IRS also has what they call code words. They do not just have to say to the minister that just because you say that you want to support myself, Congressman JONES, or as the minister mentioned earlier, another candidate, that that would be a violation. That would be a violation was the answer to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER). But this is what I want to start closing with tonight, Mr. Speaker, is that they print a publication that is called "Election Year Issues," and they give an example of code words, C-O-D-E, code words. And these code words can, if used, can bring the IRS into looking into that church's activity.

Let me just give an example of code words: liberal, pro-life, pro-choice, anti-choice, Republican, Democrat, and there are others.

□ 2130

These are code words that the IRS can use if they think that there is a violation. They do not mention the candidate; but they might mention a code word, and the IRS can come in and threaten a church.

Mr. Speaker, tonight as I close, and again, I am like many Members of Congress on both sides of this aisle, I have great faith in God. This is the greatest Nation in the world because we are a Nation that understands that we are blessed by God almighty.

I just think and I hope that in the next couple of weeks that the leadership will give the Congress a chance to debate this issue, to vote on this legislation; and I hope the majority of the Members of this House will vote to pass this legislation.

Again, I close by reminding the House that in 1953, and up to 1953, there were no restrictions on the churches and synagogues in this country. So let us return the freedom of speech to the spiritual leaders of this country so that they can do their job for our God.

Mr. Speaker, I close this way because I have three military bases in my district: Cherry Point Marine Air Station,

Camp Lejeune Marine Base, and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. Every time I speak, and I spoke Monday night at the Christian Coalition banquet down in my district, and I was pleased to say that the Republican candidate for the United States Senate, Elizabeth Dole, was there and did a fantastic job of giving her testimony, I close this way, and I have ever since September 11.

I first ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, I ask God to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, and I ask God to please bless the President of the United States as he leads this Nation. I ask God to please bless the men and women who serve in the House and Senate.

I ask God, and I say it three times, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mrs. ROUKEMA (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PHELPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BOYD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on September 12, 2002 he pre-

sented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3287. To redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 900 Brentwood Road, NE, in Washington, D.C., as the "Joseph Curseen, Jr. and Thomas Morris, Jr. Processing and Distribution Center".

H.R. 3917. To authorize a national memorial to commemorate the passengers and crew of Flight 93 who, on September, 11, 2001, courageously gave their lives thereby thwarting a planned attack on our Nation's Capital, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5207. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6101 West Old Shakopee Road in Bloomington, Minnesota, as the "Thomas E. Burnett, Jr. Post Office Building".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 18, 2002, 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:

9175. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Thiophanate-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-2002-0226; FRL-7196-5] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9176. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Objections to Tolerances Established for Certain Pesticide Chemicals; Additional Extension of Comment Period [OPP-2002-0057; FRL-7275-3] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9177. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his requests for FY 2003 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Interior, and Transportation; International Assistance Programs; and the National Capital Planning Commission; (H. Doc. No. 107—262); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9178. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, Case Number 99-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9179. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, Case Number 00-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9180. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 99-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9181. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report

of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 98-04, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9182. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the report to Congress for Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2001, pursuant to Public Law 104—201, section 827 (110 Stat. 2611); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9183. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the Summary of amounts for Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Programs in the Former Soviet Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9184. A letter from the Vice President, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9185. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Confirmation Requirements for Transactions of Security Futures Products Effectuated in Future Accounts [Release No. 34-46471; File No. S7-19-02] (RIN: 3235-A150) received September 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9186. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Applicability of CFTC and SEC Customer Protection, Recordkeeping, Reporting, and Bankruptcy Rules and the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to Accounts Holding Security Futures Products [Release No. 34-46473; File No. S7-17-01] (RIN: 3235-A132) received September 11, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9187. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, El Dorado County Air Pollution Control District [CA 270-0366a; FRL-7272-4] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9188. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA247-0361 FRL-7272-6] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9189. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA 0264-0365; FRL-7266-2] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9190. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to Clarify the Scope of Sufficiency Monitoring Requirements for Federal and State Operating Permits Programs [FRL-7374-6] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Pesticide Active Ingredient Production [FRL-7375-9] (RIN: 2060-AJ34) received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.