

work on this subject; also the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan for their hard work on fashioning legislation here that protects the second amendment rights of all Americans, but also ensures that criminals cannot more easily get their hands on guns. And also, as the gentleman from Michigan mentioned, that law-abiding citizens are not denied or delayed their right simply because State officials have not the resources or the inclination to move ahead on this.

I am proud to support this legislation. I urge support of it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As you can hear from the debate and a lot of people that might even be watching this debate, back and forth, even though we all support this legislation, it is strange to hear that the NRA and certainly all of our gun groups have worked together. I think that is the important key that we are talking about. We worked very hard to make sure that the privacy of citizens would also be protected.

Again, people have to understand that we are not picking on one particular group. Anyone that is denied access to getting permission for a gun only comes up as denied, so we do not go pinpointing, especially on mental illness or other things. They are just plainly denied. I think that is an important part because I think people out there are misunderstanding, and they actually thought we were targeting people with mental illness. We are not. We just want to make sure that people that should not own guns do not get their guns and people that should be able to have guns have the right to own guns. We will continue to work together on this.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I too would like to add my thanks to the gentlewoman from New York and the gentlewoman from Maryland for putting together this bill. I have been in the Congress for 24 years. This is the first bill on the subject of firearms that I can remember that is supported by both the NRA and most of the major gun control groups. That means we ought to seize this moment and pass this bill right away before this coalition unravels. I urge the Members to do that.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of H.R. 4757, considered today by the House of Representatives on the Suspension Calendar.

H.R. 4757, the Our Lady of Peace Act, would amend the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act to require the Attorney General to secure directly from any U.S. department or agency information on persons who are prohibited by federal or state law from having a firearm, such as a convicted felon criminal or

mental incompetent. In effect, to make the record collection system work more efficiently than it currently does. The measure provides more money to the States to make their information available to the federal government, making the partnership of the two governmental systems a better working arrangement.

Specifically, H.R. 4757 requires the Attorney General to make grants to each State: (1) to establish or upgrade information and identification technologies for firearms eligibility determinations; and (2) for use by the State's chief judicial officer to improve the handling of proceedings related to criminal history dispositions and temporary restraining orders as they relate to disqualification from firearms ownership under State and Federal laws. And the measure requires the Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics to study and evaluate the operations of the System and to report on grants and on best practices of States.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee in 1993 (and currently), I was the chief proponent of the National Instant Check System. And so I view passage of this measure as a positive step towards both preventing prohibited persons from acquiring firearms and protecting the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

A key provision added to this legislation is the prohibition of the federal government imposing a "gun tax," by charging fees for gun purchases through NICS. This is an important provision the National Rifle Association worked to secure. The NRA has been working for nearly a decade to improve NICS so that it works the way Congress intended it—instantly, without any delay or waiting period for gun purchases by law-abiding buyers.

The Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution reads, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." I firmly believe that the plain language of the Amendment guarantees the right of citizens to keep and bear arms and pledges to protect this right from being infringed upon. Instead of more gun control laws we must forcefully execute the laws that are already in place, while leaving law-abiding citizens alone.

As the chief proponent of the National Instant Check System as a substitute for "waiting periods," I know that the mandate of the NICS was to provide an instant screening of criminal history records in concert with the purchase of a firearm from federally licensed dealers. In this day of instant communications and nearly instant everything, it may not seem like such a feat. But ten years ago, even with the massive use of instant credit card transactions, the concept of using an instant check system for a firearm purchase was novel and somewhat groundbreaking. But in the decade since the mandate of the NICS, the system has needed many improvements. I have gladly welcomed each improvement, such as this measure, as another step toward the instant check system that will both protect and defend citizens and legal gun owners alike.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4757, bipartisan legislation which promises to greatly improve the Instant Check by encouraging states to automate and share disqualifying records with the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background System, NICS, database.

H.R. 4757 is a model of sensible, common-sense public safety legislation. It represents what we can achieve when we leave the rhet-

oric behind and concentrate on how to best keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4757 manages to be both pro-gun owner and pro-law enforcement—stopping criminals in their tracks while permitting law-abiding citizens to be approved for purchases in minutes, not days or weeks. And it does so by focusing on enforcement of existing laws, on strengthening them.

Mr. Speaker, instant background checks serve little purpose if they are based on incomplete or inaccurate criminal history records. Today, we strive for accuracy, for completeness. H.R. 4757 goes a long way toward making the NICS system work the way we intended it to work, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4757, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMED FORCES DOMESTIC SECURITY ACT

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5590) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the enforcement and effectiveness of civilian orders of protection on military installations.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5590

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Armed Forces Domestic Security Act".

SEC. 2. FORCE AND EFFECT OF PROTECTIVE ORDERS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 80 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1561 the following new section:

"§ 1561a. Civilian orders of protection: force and effect on military installations

"(a) FORCE AND EFFECT.—A civilian order of protection shall have the same force and effect on a military installation as such order has within the jurisdiction of the court that issued such order.

"(b) CIVILIAN ORDER OF PROTECTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'civilian order of protection' has the meaning given the term 'protection order' in section 2266(5) of title 18.

"(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section. The regulations shall be designed to further good order and discipline by members of the armed forces and civilians present on military installations."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1561 the following new item:

"1561a. Civilian orders of protection: force and effect on military installations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First let me thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her presence, her leadership, her good humor and tremendous contribution to a very, very serious issue that a group of us from Congress traveled to Fayetteville to try and help provide some solutions.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is currently one of the greatest ills in our society. In both the civilian and military sphere, spousal abuse remains one of the most underreported and difficult crimes to detect and prosecute. Often victims are at a loss as to where to seek help, refuge and comfort.

Unfortunately, this past summer at Fort Bragg in my district in North Carolina, there were several homicides that resulted from domestic violence. Four military wives tragically lost their lives, Mr. Speaker. One case of domestic violence is one too many.

In order to address this grave problem and help stop domestic violence in all sectors of our society, four members of the House Committee on Armed Services and I recently spent the day at Fort Bragg and Fayetteville, North Carolina, in order to hear from many different individuals regarding this tragic problem. We met with military leaders, chaplains, civilian law enforcement, health care providers, advocacy organizations and women's groups, to name a few. We also met with victims.

One of the most salient things we heard during this session with survivors of domestic abuse is that safety is hard to come by. Finding resources to help one out of a desperate situation is an arduous challenge, and often victims feel trapped. For those who are able to come forward and take action, enforcement mechanisms within our legal system often remain inadequate.

We heard from local officials, notably Judge Beth Keever of Fayetteville, North Carolina, that presently there is a legal loophole that does not require protective orders issued by civilian courts to be enforced on military facilities. This means the victim could be without necessary, extra physical protection while on Federal property.

Mr. Speaker, today we help make sure that we provide safety and resources to victims of domestic vio-

lence. This legislation takes a step forward, moving our society in the direction to help stop domestic violence. Making protective orders enforceable on military installations will protect both civilian and military individuals on Federal property. They will know that no matter where they are, Fort Bragg, Fayetteville, the supermarket or the PX, the individual from whom the victim is protected will not be allowed to come near.

The recent murders at Fort Bragg are truly a tragedy. Domestic violence is wrong, and we must do everything we can to prevent it. This important legislation represents a small, initial step to address this problem. It is important that we close this loophole. This act was inspired by the courageous stories of former domestic violence victims, insight from those who have experience in the area, and others. Passage of this bill will appropriately honor the courage of these individuals and the dedicated work of their advocates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 5590, the Armed Forces Domestic Security Act, and take a step forward in protecting the lives of individuals, both on and off military property.

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

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this summer in the aftermath of news reports of murders in Fort Bragg, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), requesting the opportunity for us to start to understand exactly what impact domestic violence and other issues were having on our military families. The gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, who is a great leader, and others traveled with me to Fort Bragg this past few weeks on a fact-finding mission which I hope will begin what I think will be very important work of our subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

In this time of asymmetrical warfare, this time of great uncertainty for military families and, frankly, for reservists around the country, where we have a war on terrorism where we have extreme PERSTEMPO and extreme OPSTEMPO, where families are double deployed around the world, it is important for us to understand what the trauma of this deployment means to military families, and I think it is very important for us to understand that the American people are not only supporting our military with the best training and the best leadership and the best materiel that we can possibly have, but we are also supporting the most important component of military families, the families themselves, by making sure that we have the kinds of programs that are found in the private

sector. They are called employee-assisted programs.

□ 1600

And they do everything from helping families find child care, to helping to find elder care, to find hospices when they have a sick family member, but also in the area that is very troubling, of domestic violence, to find a way to make sure that families are protected with anonymity and respect, to make sure that spouses of families do not have to worry about the chain of command when they are considering what they do about family violence in their own family.

So I thought it was very, very important that we took this trip to Fort Bragg. Fort Bragg was just a part of the problem. It is not about Fort Bragg or the Army. It is about the military. And I am very proud of the leadership that the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) has shown, and I am very proud of my friendship with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McINTYRE), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER) who took this trip, because I think that it is important that we focus on what we can do for these military families. And that is why I rise in strong support of the Armed Forces Domestic Security Act H.R. 5590.

While the 1994 Violence Against Women Act requires certain protection orders to be enforced across State and tribal lines, it does not allow such protection orders to be enforced on Federal property or military installations. As a result, there is a gaping hole in our protection system. Military installations have become a place where there are no penalties for violating a protection order issued by a State or tribal court. The Armed Forces Domestic Security Act is intended to address this obvious oversight.

When a civilian order of protection is issued against, or to protect, a service member, there needs to be a system in place to enforce that order when the service member resides on a military installation. That system must be effective whether the order is issued by the State, tribe, or territory where the service member resides. It also must work in instances where the military installation lies in overlapping civilian jurisdictions.

Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is a complex and tragic issue, and this bill is not intended to be a cure-all or any kind of instant-fix measure for domestic violence; however, while there is no single solution to this problem, closing this loophole that has essentially made military installations a free zone for batterers is a necessary and common-sense step. A judge in North Carolina recently wrote that closing this loophole would certainly be beneficial nationwide but would be particularly helpful for judicial districts that are closely associated with a Federal facility like Cumberland County in North Carolina is with Fort Bragg.

Mr. Speaker, it would be irresponsible to allow a loophole like this to continue. I urge my colleagues to support the Armed Forces Domestic Security Act.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her leadership and her wisdom and her input.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel. He made the trip possible, and his input and leadership were instrumental in getting us to this point; and he will take us further with the passage of time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I particularly thank him for his leadership and deep sense of concern on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the key question we should ask ourselves as Members of this House anytime we rise to ponder the proposal of legislation is simply, Is this bill needed? By now, as we have heard in the comments, far too many of us unfortunately have become personally acquainted with the tragic events surrounding the acts of domestic violence that occurred at Fort Bragg over this past summer. In a matter of days four military wives lost their lives and in a matter of days eight children lost a parent. Four of those children actually lost both parents. It is truly a tragic, tragic loss, one that certainly touched not only the Fort Bragg and Fayetteville communities but Army and military communities wherever they may be found.

In response, again as we have heard, Mr. Speaker, on September 30 the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services traveled with five of its members to try to learn a bit more firsthand about this tragic series of events. I want to pay particular respect and thanks and appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) who, along with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) who also joined us that day, represent the Cumberland County, Fort Bragg, and Fayetteville community; the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), who has been a very early and very staunch proponent of addressing the demands of domestic violence in the military, who spoke so eloquently on this measure just moments ago; and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER), who traveled with us that day, giving up their personal time for this extracurricular event that all of them collectively felt was so demanding and so deserving of our attention.

Simply put, today's military is a much different structure than it was even a few years ago. Particularly as a result of the volunteer force, we now have generally a much younger mili-

tary, in this case of course a much younger Army, many more families than perhaps we have seen in the past. And when coupled with the fact that across military installations of all the services, some 70 percent of those families routinely live off base, we have found ourselves with a very, very difficult situation, that of addressing the concerns and demands of acts of domestic violence across the border of that specific military installation and the adjoining civilian community.

The Members have heard about the loophole. I happen to have been here in 1994 when I think the Congress took a very necessary, very bold, and a very appropriate step in passage of the Violence Against Women Act; but it did, as the speaker heard, create I think an unintentional, certainly a very unnecessary and very unworthy loophole, that of enforcement of civilian protection orders as issued outside the bases and their applicability on those military installations. And in our discussions with the victims, particularly of military violence, a very emotional, nearly 3-hour meeting that we held with previous victims in the Fort Bragg community, one of the primary concerns we heard about was that lack of continuity, that lack of guidance and clear legal authority to enforce domestic protection orders that were secured within the civilian community on the military base. And this legislation is intended to be, I might add, a first step, a first step towards erasing those boundaries and those barriers that exist.

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), I think, very appropriately noted that this is not just a Fort Bragg problem, it is not just an Army problem. She noted it is a military problem. I would respectfully suggest, as she knows, and I am not correcting her by any means, that this is a societal problem; and when we have a circumstance as we do here where the societal approaches, the civilian approaches, to domestic violence are not coordinated adequately enough with the military community, people suffer; and as happened at Fort Bragg this past summer, people lose their lives.

So we are intending to continue forward with this effort to initiate a series of legislative remedies to ensure that these kinds of circumstances are not allowed to go forward into the future, but for now I think this is a very, very appropriate step, a very, very important initial step toward protecting those who sadly are least in a position to protect themselves.

So a final word of thanks to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her leadership; to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and his deep, deep concern and for his initiative on bringing this measure to the floor at this moment; and to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JEFF MILLER); and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) for joining us that day and to I hope all of

the Members of this House for their vote in support of this very, very worthy piece of legislation.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I really appreciate the comments of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I want to thank again the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for his leadership and for opening his community to us. I specifically want to take a moment of personal privilege to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for setting up this first meeting and encouraging us to work together on future meetings.

When we were in Fayetteville, we had a jam-packed day, a day that was meant to be a day at home with our constituents. We had all traveled in late Sunday night, and we were going to be literally hitting the ground running; and what I was most impressed with was we found ourselves with the opportunity to talk to victims of domestic violence, and there were meant to be five or six women that were meant to come, and in fact eight showed up, and each one of them I thought deserved the respect to have themselves heard.

I really appreciate my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), facilitating that. It took 3 hours for us to sit there. Very painful stories, very emotional stories, very, very private stories; and I was I think honored not only to hear those stories and to understand what we could do as legislators on the Federal level to help support these spouses and their families, but I was very proud to sit with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) especially since a lot of those women felt, I think, that they did not want to tell that story to strangers or to perhaps a man that they did not know.

But I think it really speaks a lot for his leadership on the committee and what we can do in the future because I think that they were very thrilled to talk to him and to me to make sure these stories are out so that this does not happen again. I think we all agree this is a societal problem. But the military in this country has led the country in many different ways, specifically in an area of civil rights. It was the military that led the ability for blacks and whites to work together in the military. And I am hoping on this issue of domestic violence, where we have so many families at risk in this country day to day, that our military families can lead, that we can find good programming for them across the military, not just one branch, that we can find the best practices, that we can work together to make sure that it is not only authorized but appropriated and that we can do the best for them because we know that they are trying to do the best for us every day.

And with that I urge my colleagues to support the Armed Forces Domestic Security Act.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) who also, if I might add, celebrated his birthday in Fayetteville last Sunday night. So we appreciate his sacrifice in that regard too.

Mr. McHUGH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and pointing out to the Nation that I am older. I appreciate that.

I just wanted to very briefly say, first of all, I deeply from the bottom of my heart thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her gracious comments and to state for the record two things: first of all, this Nation should know that she intended to go to Fort Bragg on her own if that was necessary. Fortunately for us who gained from her participation, we were able to put together a subcommittee visit; but her concern is unequalled, certainly unsurpassed with respect to the cherished feeling she has towards the military and, in this instance, towards those who are the victims of violence.

I should also note, as she did, that we had more spouses show up that day than had been scheduled. It was a very tight schedule. It began at 6:30 in the morning with the first event that some of us were scheduled to do and went through until we left that early evening. She was very insistent and very appropriately so that we stay and listen to all of those spouses who again as she had noted had made the very painful decision to come and to share with us their stories that were so emotional. I have rarely, in my much older life including that recent birthday, spent a more moving, more emotional 3 hours. And thanks to her, we were able to hear all of them. So I just wanted to rise again and to underscore my deep admiration for her and to underscore as well the fact that military families have a real hero in the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for closing remarks.

Let me again thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) for her very well put, meaningful words; and I identify myself with her remarks. I would too like to take a brief moment to identify with and to thank personally the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. McINTYRE), my geographic Congress mate in the seventh, and myself in the eighth, for his participation and his consistent and constant service on behalf of our military in our State of North Carolina.

□ 1615

The moving testimony of these women, I cannot begin to tell my col-

leagues how heartwarming, but also how moving this testimony was. As I recall, one lady came on her own expense all the way from Kansas City. And in particular, one lady, Laura Sandler, I would like to pay particular tribute and thanks to her, whose written testimony I think burned a real moving, heartfelt impression on all of our hearts as she had the courage, along with her other colleagues, to come forward and bring us into a much clearer understanding of this problem.

Again, thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) and all of those involved, and I would strongly encourage unanimous support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5590.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—

HOURLY OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HAYES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will alert Members to the possible resumption of legislative business later today, but any record votes, if ordered, would be taken tomorrow. The entertaining of Special Order speeches would be without prejudice to the possibility of further legislative business.

—

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

—

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1857

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.

—

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 123, MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-755) on the resolution (H. Res. 585) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-756) on the resolution (H. Res. 586) waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

—

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the third quarter of 2002, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows: