

taxpayers in this sweetheart deal, \$850 million, \$400,000 per trainer. DynCorp should be ashamed, but I suppose they are laughing all the way to the bank.

PRESIDENT BUSH SIGNS PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

(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, yesterday I had the privilege of sitting just a few feet away as President George W. Bush signed the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. In both deed and in word, President George W. Bush did much for the cause for life yesterday, ending a period of time in our history when a terrible form of violence directed against children inches from birth was allowed under the law.

But in addition to his signature, the President also expressed clear moral leadership, saying, "America stands for liberty . . . and the unalienable right of life." The President went on to say, "Every person, however frail or vulnerable, has a place and a purpose in this world" because "the right to life cannot be granted or denied by government, because it does not come from government." The President said, "It comes from the Creator of life."

The President not only lent his signature to an important legislative initiative, but in the very best example of American leadership, he provided a clear moral vision, leading us away from the nightmare of abortion in America.

Righteousness exalts a Nation and did so yesterday.

A VOTE FOR LIGHT RAIL

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that we come to the floor to discuss a myriad of local official issues, but this one is worth announcing. The voters of Harris County and Houston and the metroplex have spoken in Houston, Texas. We have voted overwhelmingly to improve the quality of life, to enhance regional mobility and to say to the world that we do believe that the environment is premised on more and more of us being concerned about the idea of not polluting our air quality. We have voted for light rail.

For 30 years, it may sound humorous to some, but we have argued and debated this question in Houston, Texas, and through large opposition, moneyed opponents, misleading statements the people saw the truth and have voted to provide for light rail for their students, for their businesses, for their communities, for their tourism, and for the enhancement of economic development.

With that vote, we now come to this House to ask for our fair share, our fair

share of rail and transportation dollars, \$2.4 billion. Congratulations to the metro for voting for light rail and the people of Harris County.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would ask Members to heed the gavel.

BENEFITS FOR THE TOP ONE PERCENT

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the tax cut that went to the top 1 percent, we withstood that. The trade deals that send our jobs to Mexico, the loss of manufacturing jobs, we have talked about that. The vetoing or threatening of vetoing the Buy American legislation for the defense appropriations bill, we have thought that took the cake, but now the administration took out the antiprofitteering provision for the \$87 billion supplemental. Give me a break.

It is obvious now to the American people that this administration and this Congress is bought and paid for by the top 1 percent of the people in this country. They get all the money they want for the deals in Iraq. They get their tax breaks back. They donate it to the President and they get the legislation they want.

It is time for the American people to stand up and pay attention to what is going on and take the country back.

TAX CUTS WORK

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, do the tax breaks work? Well, not according to Howard Dean and Al Sharpton and Wesley Clark and all the other liberal left running for President. But a funny thing happened in the economy. Last month, the numbers came out. The gross domestic product increased 7.2 percent. The economic growth rate, one of the highest since 1984 when Ronald Reagan was President, right after he had cut taxes. The jobless claims have decreased. More people are working and there has been a surge in productivity.

Do tax cuts work? Well, the economy and the economic numbers that are just out say, yes, they do. People are working. Revenues are up. Why do they work? Because if a worker has more money in his pocket then he is going to go out and spend more. Small businesses will respond by increasing their inventory. When they do that and demand goes up, they hire more people. When more people are hired, more peo-

ple are paying taxes and fewer people are on welfare depending on government checks. Tax breaks work.

ELECTION OF AFRICAN AMERICAN WOMEN TO MUNICIPAL COURT

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on election day Tuesday in the city of Cleveland, Ohio, the voters of the city of Cleveland elected four smart, intelligent, good-looking African American women to the municipal court: Emanuella Groves, reelected; Lauren Moore, elected for the first time; Anita Lassiter May, elected for the first time; and Pauline Tarver, elected for the first time.

We are so excited about the opportunity for these young women to serve and provide justice to the people of the city of Cleveland. I join with the voters of the city of Cleveland in congratulating these fine young women who will serve well as Cleveland municipal court judges.

□ 1030

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1904, HEALTHY FORESTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1904) to improve the capacity of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to plan and conduct hazardous fuels reduction projects on the National Forest System lands and Bureau of Land Management lands aimed at protecting communities, watersheds, and certain other at-risk lands from catastrophic wildfire, to enhance efforts to protect watersheds and address threats to forest and rangeland health, including catastrophic wildfire, across the landscape, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 1 hour on his motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Nation is well aware of the problem we have with our national forests. The wildfires in California for the past 2 weeks have made it all too painfully clear that we need to take measures to protect our forests. The legislation that is before the House, H.R. 1904, that the House passed with strong bipartisan support, accomplishes that goal. The Senate has also passed legislation to address this matter. There are substantial differences

between the House and the Senate on this matter, and it is vitally important that we address this as quickly as we possibly can.

There is a lot of work that needs to be done. We will be entering another fire season starting next spring. We can see from the California fires that these fires can occur any time of year in different parts of the country, and so it is vitally important that we get this matter resolved as quickly as possible. Because there are substantial differences between the House and the Senate and because there is substantial agreement here on the House side that some of the measures in the Senate legislation do not adequately address the concerns that we have raised, we need to have a conference on this, and we are prepared to do that and act very, very quickly.

It is my hope that the House will pass this motion and will move to appoint conferees, and then we will turn to the Senate and ask that they take the same steps over there. There has been some slowness in the movement in the other body on this, and we hope that will be rectified by the action taken here on the House side today.

It is our hope that legislation that was included in an appropriations bill a few years ago to address this problem in the State of South Dakota, which has far more leniency in terms of the flexibility given to the Forest Service to address the measure, address the concerns in the State of South Dakota, should be extended to other States around the country. Neither the House bill nor the Senate bill has language that goes as far in giving that authority as already exists in the State of South Dakota, but we would certainly like to have the opportunity to pass a measure worked out between the House and the Senate to give our national forests and other national lands the same type of management tools to expedite what is necessary to protect our national forests from wildfire, from disease and insect infestation, and we can accomplish that and accomplish it expeditiously if we move forward to appoint conferees and the Senate does the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our efforts to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY
MR. STENHOLM

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STENHOLM moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on

the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1904, shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report not later than Thursday, November 13, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. Speaker, this motion is really very simple. It is basically intending to return this body to regular process. I know this is a novel idea around here lately, but it requires the managers of the House to meet in open session with the Senate conferees, House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion.

In addition, it requires the conferees to file a conference report no later than Thursday, November 13. The November 13 deadline is meant to highlight the imperative nature of the Healthy Forests legislation. However, we all recognize the time-consuming nature of conferences and the short time frame this will provide, but let me remind Members, we have been talking about this issue for years. I remember when it was chairman Bob Smith of the Committee on Agriculture, and the tremendous work he did all over this country in trying to reach out and find a compromise. It was turned down.

If we are going to deal with problems as severe as what we have now witnessed in California, it means some strongly-held beliefs are going to have to be compromised in order to do things that some folks do not want to see done; but most people believe and will agree that they must be done if we are going to accomplish what is needed for our national forests. The important part of my motion is the requirement that the conferees meet and deliberate on the merits of the Senate and House proposals.

We will hear that the Senate has a finely tuned deal if it breaks up, everything breaks up. I hope that is not going to be the argument. I hope that we can have a meaningful conference.

The House Committee on Agriculture has a reputation, a long-held reputation, of working in a bipartisan way and that is why we accomplish as much good for our Nation as we do. No Speaker, no majority leader, would ever dare rewrite a farm bill in the Committee on Rules or in the leadership office. It has been tried, but it has never worked.

I am personally very disturbed by what I have seen going on in the energy conference. I am very interested in energy legislation, and I am very disturbed when the leadership of this body suggests that they are the only

ones that can write this legislation. This body does not work well when we do some of the things that we have been doing in this body over the last several years.

On the Committee on Agriculture, we have a history of bipartisan cooperation. Many of my colleagues have suggested that we simply take the Senate bill, pass it and send it to the President. I am not supportive of that procedure. We need to reach a consensus on the issue surrounding the Healthy Forests legislation. I know many on the far left and many on the far right will say that is impossible, but both sides of the aisle have a responsibility to come to the table with a willingness to compromise. This is an issue that demands just that kind of process if we are going to deal with disasters like we have just seen in California, disasters like we have seen all over Colorado, and all over areas of this country that are witnessing what happens when we do what we have done over the last several decades in the handling of our national forests. The record is there.

I think the House bill is a good bill. It was put together with bipartisan support, not unanimity of opinion. There were differences held, and we will never get 100 percent to agree because politically that is impossible. But I think if we do our job in this conference, as this simple motion, as I said in the beginning, a novel idea that we actually allow this House of Representatives to function as was intended by our forefathers who wrote the Constitution, gave us the responsibility to deliberate and set forth under the rules of order of this body how we should go about it.

Yes, we can do it in a very short period of time if we are willing to. So I hope and fully expect, since I cannot imagine any controversy over this motion today, that it will pass. That is not what I am most interested in, though. I am very interested in seeing the process work. I think this body will be better off if at least one committee, and there are a few others that still function in a bipartisan way, but very few. The energy bill is a prime example of how not to run this House. The Medicare pharmaceutical bill is an example of how not to run this House. Maybe we need a good example.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, that the gentleman is correct, this is an unusual motion to instruct. It is also a very welcomed motion to instruct.

This is exactly the approach that we need to take in resolving a very, very important piece of legislation and the differences that exist between the House and the Senate on this legislation. We can do it exactly because, as

the gentleman notes, the House Committee on Agriculture, the committee of primary jurisdiction over this legislation, has a long history of working together across the aisle between the parties, Member to Member, on all kinds of important and complex legislation.

The farm bills that we pass are obviously the greatest example of that. Farm bills bring together every region of the country, every political ideological difference, every type of farm commodity, and we have to agree upon one piece of legislation to send to the President for signature so American agriculture can plan ahead for 5, 6, 7 years. That requires intense cooperation.

We have the same problems with our Nation's forests and our forest policy. It is in disrepair. It is not working. The forest fires that we are seeing in California now that we have seen all across the country, the infestation of our forests in the east and south from disease and insects require proper management and proper management policy. We do not have an effective working policy today that allows us to promptly address these major problems that in California have taken more than 3,500 homes, taken the lives of 20 people, have scorched the earth. These are not natural fires that occur that thin out our forests, these fires take the entire forests. In some places, the heat is so intense it turns the ground to glass. Water cannot permeate the soil. The devastation lasts for decades. Proper management of these forest will yield the correct result.

So I agree fully with the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) because it calls on the conferees to be appointed here, led by the Committee on Agriculture, to do what we have always done. And we will work with the Committee on Resources and the Committee on the Judiciary to make sure that we have an effective conference, and we look forward to working with the Senate. They have put forward a work product that we are interested in. We think there are many things in the House bill not included in the Senate bill, and some things in the Senate bill that are not included in the House bill that are problematic.

But we are confident, given our history of working together, that this will be a conference that includes, as the gentleman requires in his motion to instruct, meeting in open session with fair discussion. How do we know that will take place, because it has always taken place with the Committee on Agriculture. It took place in the farm bill just last year, and it will again. We have a good working relationship, and we intend that that carries over into the passage of this legislation.

The proof of it is how we worked this bill through the committee. It passed the committee by overwhelming support. On the floor of the House, I believe of the 24 Democrats on the com-

mittee, I think 19 of them voted for the legislation on the floor. There was very strong, overwhelming bipartisan support for the legislation that the House passed.

□ 1045

That calls for us to have a conference with the Senate, to not simply accept the premise that somehow the Senate should dictate to the House as they so often try to do time and time again. This matter is too important; this House is too important to accept that premise. It is time that we go to conference. We should go quickly. This instructs us to act quickly, to report back a conference report within a week. We are very prepared to undertake that ambitious agenda and to work it through with the Senate, with Members of the House on our committee, with Members of the House not on our committee, and work this out as quickly as possible. This is important legislation that we should send to the President for his signature. He is anxious to sign it.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to accomplish a very fine healthy forests final product that is worked out fairly between the House and the Senate for the President's signature.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this motion to instruct and appreciate his remarks and the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee. The reason this motion is offered is because there has been concern about the deterioration of the conference process between the House and the Senate. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, the process that we are now witnessing with the energy bill and with the prescription drug bill is a disaster in terms of public participation, public understanding of what is taking place, and the protection of Members of this body as they represent their constituencies.

I am delighted that the Committee on Agriculture has a long tradition of open conference committees. I believe that the Committee on Resources has that same long tradition of ironing these kinds of legislative conflicts out. I think it is also important that this motion to instruct have the date due to try to encourage the conference to get this done.

We do this in the aftermath of the California fire disasters, but the California fire disasters did not happen in a vacuum. It is not that this Congress was not working on this problem; it was that this Congress could not reach

agreement. Over 2 years ago, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), and others tried to work on a provision. We ended up reporting from the committee a bipartisan agreement. Unfortunately, at the end of the session, it was not taken up by the Congress of the United States. But it did, in fact, focus the resources on the thinning around communities where we know these catastrophic fires can occur in terms of the loss of life and the loss of property. It expedited the consideration by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to make sure that decisions could be made on a timely basis so we could treat this threat when it was necessary, and it provided for robust public participation and critical environmental protections.

But that bill is in the past. That was not accepted. In our committee we had open debate. People offered amendments. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) went on a different tack this time. I did not agree with that. But it was done openly and it was done with the amendment process. But I have concerns with that legislation now, and I am worried that there are some huge differences between the Senate bill, which I think directs more of the resources toward the so-called urban interface where these catastrophic fires can happen. I want to make sure that we do that. I want to make sure, as the Senate did, that we authorize the money to be spent. I think the House bill is built on a bit of a fallacy and that is somehow that the timber value of the trees that are removed and thinned is going to pay for the fire treatment that is necessary. If you really believe that and if that is the basis on which you are going to operate, as does the House bill, then you would never get around to treating the lands in Southern California because they are not timberlands. There is no value to be extracted.

We were saying earlier, I think, in Texas, you hook up an anchor chain between two Caterpillar tractors and you drag it across the land when you want to get rid of this kind of scrub. That is essentially what you are going to have to do here. There is no value. This is going to cost Federal dollars. Like the Senate bill, we have got to authorize those moneys to be spent.

We also have got to recognize, as we see in Southern California, that this is a patchwork of public and private lands, that we have got to be able to go in and treat those public lands. I think we have got to figure out some cost-sharing with those private landowners, but we cannot let their neglect start fires on public lands or fires that get out of control. In the House bill, we do not address that. We must address that in the conference report.

I think that we have got to understand that time is working against us.

They say that we are going to be out of here on November 21. We cannot go into another fire year with Congress failing to address this issue. It takes time to lay out these treatment plans. It takes time to marshal the resources. Unfortunately, historically what we have seen is the money that is supposed to be used for treatment, the money that is supposed to be used for prevention is not put there because those accounts are raided to fight the fires that result because we do not treat them. We saw this unfortunate situation where California's Governor made application for money to treat the southern lands, many of the lands that burned, joined in bipartisan support from our delegation asking that this money be used, made the application many, many months ago, unfortunately turned down, and then we had the fires. Could we have been able to treat that? Some of it. Not all of it. Not by any means. But it takes time to move into these areas. It is going to take real resources. You simply are not going to be able to take enough timber off these lands if you do it properly and pay for the kind of treatment.

So Congress has got to understand after the disasters of California that I think most of the people in the United States would believe that this is an area of priority where America's government ought to spend money to protect America's forests, to protect the timber crops, to protect the recreational values, and to protect those communities that are now located in that catastrophic zone where fires can get out of control and we have no way to prevent the loss of life and of property.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his comments and for his understanding of what we are trying to accomplish with this motion in terms of an open and public conference committee, and I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering this. I also want to thank my chairman of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), for the manner in which we were allowed to debate this measure in the House. I would hope that this would not get sucked into this whirlpool of partisanship and the shutting down of conference committees, because this is a matter that is desperately important to so many of our communities in the timberlands and the wildlands of the United States.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman of the Committee on Resources who has worked so closely with us and has provided so much leadership. Being from the State of California, he knows full well the nature of the problem out there and knows this is a problem that exists across the country.

Mr. POMBO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct. I would like to

start off by saying I agree with much of what my colleague from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) had to say. This is an extremely important piece of legislation, not only to the State of California because of our recent problems that we have had with wildfires in Southern California but we have also had wildfires in Northern California and throughout much of the West and quite frankly into the South as well in recent years. The reason that we have had those fires to a large degree has been because of mismanagement on the part of the Federal Government. It has been something that has drug on for and built up over the last 100 years, the management of our national forests, of our BLM lands. The decisions that were made in this body and by numerous administrations over the years led us to this point where we have an intolerable level of fuels throughout our public lands which has caused these fires not to be a natural fire but to be a catastrophic fire that goes in and burns areas.

I agree with my colleague from California that we cannot allow this to drift into some partisan whirlpool, I think was his comment. When I hear people in the other body saying that they are going to refuse to go to conference on this bill, that is intolerable. This is something that we should have acted on many years ago. I hear some of those in the other body saying that this is a carefully crafted bill that they spent weeks putting together. Well, this body has spent years putting this bill together, in doing the research and putting this bill together. The first bill, the healthy forest bill that was introduced in the House, was introduced in 1995. This has been something that we have been working on for a number of years.

A couple of years ago, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), and others sat down and tried to craft a compromise that we could bring to the House floor. As we worked through that compromise, we were not able to get the other body to move along with us. We put together a bill and spent months and hours in working through and crafting a bipartisan bill.

As my colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture have said, this was something that was passed bipartisan. I serve on the Committee on Agriculture. Yes, it was a bipartisan bill coming out of the Committee on Agriculture. It was a bipartisan bill coming out of the Committee on Resources. It was a bipartisan bill coming off the House floor. It was something that we worked extremely hard on to put together and craft a balanced bill. That is what we are going to conference with. All I ask is that those in the other body come to that conference with that same dedication, to craft a bipartisan bill, a bicameral bill that we can put on the President's desk. If we can do that, we can deliver something that will help the American people and

help to better manage our national lands.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, inaction is not an option for this Congress. We must have this legislation as well as some other essential legislation before we leave town. I feel strongly about that. I felt more strongly, or as strongly, a year ago when what was previously the largest fire in recent Western history burned between my district and the district of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the Biscuit Fire. We entered into discussions last fall and came very close to bringing a bill forward into the House. Unfortunately, the clock ran out because of the elections. This year we are not operating under the imperative of pending elections. We can stay here as long as we need, and we should, to get this legislation done.

The Senate bill is not a perfect bill. It is not the bill that I would have written, but it is, in my opinion, in a number of areas, which I will touch on briefly, far superior to the House bill; and it does have a statement of support from the administration. So we know that if we were to just take up that bill and pass it from the desk, which is no longer an option having gone to conference, that we could enact it into law. So hopefully there lie the seeds of an agreement here.

Why do I feel that the Senate bill is superior? What I say briefly, and it is hard to quantify things around here a lot, but the Senate bill is 760 million times better than the House bill. Someone may say, how did you come up with that number? The Senate bill included a \$760 million annual authorization to do the fuels treatment. Why is that important? This is something that cannot be done for nothing. The House bill omitted any new funding for fuels treatment. The national fire plan, which is supposed to deal with these fuels issues, is chronically underfunded as the gentleman from California mentioned previously. So is firefighting. So every year the Forest Service is confronted with major fires; they then freeze and begin to borrow from other accounts and almost every year they borrow from the national fire plan fuel treatment accounts.

So instead of acting to prevent future fires, we borrow the money to pay for current firefighting because we always start the year underfunded on firefighting. This year was no exception. And despite the actions last week on other legislation, the Forest Service is still going to have to eat \$300 million of those fire costs out of its budget, which means reductions in recreation and in fuel reduction and other programs that are already underfunded. So we need a substantial sum of dedicated funds to deal with this problem.

The only good study out there was done at the Northwest Research Station in Oregon. They said, looking at the Klamath forest, which is fairly typical of a lot of the intermountain forests, dry, not a lot of commercial value in there but a tremendous amount of fuel accumulation, that after backing out the commercial value of anything removed, it would still cost \$1,684 an acre to do the work.

□ 1100

If they say there is 20 million acres that are critical and need work, that would be \$34 billion. So the Senate bill, at \$760 million a year, does not get all the way there, but it gets us down the road. It would provide for a big boost in rural communities for jobs to get people out there and do the work, because it would not pretend that we can do this for nothing.

Further, even more instructive, the President was to go to the Metolius basin to hold a press conference regarding the fuel reduction legislation this year. He could not because of a fire. But that Metolius thinning project was to be conducted of large trees of substantial commercial value in an area that is already eroded and virtually flat. But even given all that and given the fact there was going to be 20 million board feet of high-value commercial timber taken out of that fuel reduction, it was still going to cost a net of \$400 an acre for the Forest Service. So that just underlines the point that even in the areas where there is viable commercial timber to be removed, unless they remove it all, which would not make a lot of sense in terms of protecting the values of the forest and the old fire-resistant trees, they are not going to be able to do it without paying for the work. That would cost \$400 an acre. So inclusion for an authorization for funding hopefully at the Senate level, maybe even higher, would be absolutely essential to pass a bill that is going to get the job done.

Two other issues. I do not totally trust the government to always do what is right, no matter who is sitting in the White House. I did not trust the Clinton Administration to always do what was right. I do not trust this administration to always do what is right. And removing any right of meaningful appeal or judicial review is not an option, as far as I am concerned, in actions that affect public resources and the public generally, and the Senate bill does a much better job of preserving people's right to appeal and to go to court, but limits it so that there will not be frivolous appeals. It requires meaningful participation. And I believe if we adopted something like the Senate bill that there would be few, if any, appeals. And very few, if this is done right, successful appeals that would delay projects.

So the bottom line here is we do have the possibility of getting a bill done this year, and I believe we must get a bill done this year. It must include ro-

bust funding. That will not only begin to move us forward in dealing with this huge backlog of fuels accumulation and doing it the right way, leaving the large, old fire-resistant trees, returning the forests to more of a presettlement condition, a natural condition, but it will also put rural communities to work, and it will avoid sometime down the road, and unfortunately not immediately, some of these absolutely massive fires and massive costs that are incurred with the fires because after these forests are treated, fires can become more of a natural regime, and we will not have to fight them as aggressively. They will not present the threats to life and property that they do today.

So I am supporting this resolution with the hope that before this Congress leaves that we will have a viable bill that can be passed by both Houses by a large bipartisan majority and signed by the President of the United States, so we can begin this absolutely vital work before the next fire season.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his indulgence.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), who has been a leader on this issue as well.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to commend my colleague from Texas for offering this motion to instruct. I think it is a valid one. I think it is an important one. I concur with his comments about the need to conduct this discussion in open and in a conference. It is probably misplaced in that where it really needs to be put is to our fellows and ladies on the other side of the Chamber in the sense that we need them to come to the conference. I think we have a reputation in the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Resources, as we have heard, about in the importance of working together, debating these issues, coming to closure in a fair and aboveboard and open way.

I want to point out too that when it comes to the issue of hazardous fuels reduction, we have heard a lot about how the Senate bill provides a \$750 million a year authorization, and, indeed, we know that authorization is important. What we never hear is the fact that in the underlying law, the law already on the books that provides for the national fire plan, there is already an authorization that provides for such sums as may be necessary to be spent for hazardous fuels work.

So in other words, the Department of Forestry and the Department of Interior both have the authority already under existing law to spend whatever sums are necessary that can be appropriated by this Congress to do the kind of work that we are talking about needs to be done. And in fact, in the last 5 years we have quadrupled in the Congress the spending on hazardous fuels work, recognizing the importance of doing this work. But so much more has to be done out there if we are going

to prevent the kinds of catastrophic fires we saw in California this year, that we have seen in Oregon year after year, and to get in and clean up these forests, to get the brush out, to get the ladder fuels out, so that we can have healthy forests, green forests, not black ones, so people are not forced to evacuate and lose everything that they have spent a lifetime trying to create around their homes, so that we can protect communities.

There are some issues in the Senate bill I have some disagreements with. They tripled the size of the bill, first of all, from 51 pages to 153 pages. Now, there are some editorial writers supporting the Senate bill, telling us in the House we had to adopt it before the Senate even finished amending it, which is kind of ironic. They have added protection for ginseng and Green Mountain National Forest Boundary and a prohibition on cock fighting, and Karst conservation in Puerto Rico, some things that are not normally considered prime topics when it comes to hazardous fuels reductions in Federal forests. I mean, I do not know what ginseng labeling has to do with hazardous forests, but we are dealing with the other body here, and we will accommodate them to the best of our ability. But our focus has to be on making sure we solve the procedural problems. In some of the hazardous fuels reductions projects the Members have heard about in my State today from my colleague, what was not mentioned was the fact that some of those very projects were appealed by groups while those places were burning this summer. The audacity. These groups are actually appealing a hazardous fuels project on the same day part of that proposed hazardous fuels project was burning. This is how out of control the appeals process is. This is why this legislation is so critical, and why we need to go to conference and act swiftly to pass it.

I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), the original chief sponsor of this legislation. We thank him for his efforts.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to compliment the chairmen of the various committees. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), in his committee he expedited this bill. He understood very clearly what the threats were out there not only just in the West but obviously threats in the East as well.

And this bill addresses not just fire hazards. Do not forget we have a very evil beetle out there, and these beetles go out there, and they are like a cancer on a tree. It is like once that beetle lands on that tree, that tree is dead, and that tree only has commercial viability for about 2 years. So if they cannot get that tree out of the forest within a 2-year period of time, two things happen. One, they are going to have to

pay somebody to take it out of there because it has no commercial viability for others to pay them to take it out of there; and, two, it is a cancer that is sitting there spreading not just to other dead trees, but to live trees. This beetle is wrecking havoc on our forests, and the chairman saw this. The chairman knows first hand, and I appreciate that.

The gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the chairman of the full committee, the Committee on Resources, of course, he comes from the State of California, which has just suffered devastating losses in the last 3 weeks. Myself, I come from the State of Colorado. The mountain I grew up on, the base, Storm King Mountain, several years ago we lost firefighters, 15 firefighters on that mountain. These fires are deadly things, and we must deal with them.

Fortunately, we have had great cooperation. I appreciate the gentleman from Texas's (Mr. STENHOLM) motion today to instruct the conferees. Although it is not binding on the Senate, perhaps it will give the Senate a little more incentive, as if the last couple of weeks the disasters in California were not enough incentive of its own.

And I must say that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), I can tell the Members if they set my voting record next to that of the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) or, in fact, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), outside of procedural votes, we probably disagree 95 percent of the time. These two gentlemen, along with the able leadership of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), came to the table last year, and we had some of the best good-faith negotiations that I have seen in my elected history, and I have been in elected office for 21 years. The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) stood up, and they stood up to the radical environmental community, which is the only thing that is going to kill this bill.

Two years ago, as soon as the National Sierra Club and the Greenpeace and the Earth First! Organizations found out that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the most ardent environmental supporters in the U.S. Congress, as soon as they found out that they were sitting down with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) and with me and with the various chairmen, they said they had just joined the "chain saw caucus." If the Members want to know what is going to beat this bill, it is the persuasion that some of these organizations like the National Sierra Club are having on some of our colleagues in both of these Chambers.

It is imperative. We are very close to a compromise. We are very close for the first time in several years of being

able to go in and manage our forests. What has happened is we have taken the management away from the green hats. What are the green hats? I say that in a complimentary fashion. Those are the Forest Service people. Take a look at the U.S. Forest Service, stop any ranger anywhere in the country. Do the Members know what they are going to find out about their background? They are going to find out that ever since they were little they dreamed of being a ranger in the Forest Service. They went to college. They got a degree in forest management. They are in that forest every day of the week. They do not work for money. We do not pay them a lot of money. They work because they love the forest. They love that job.

Who do the Members think ought to be managing those forests? The National Sierra Club, which tries any obstacle they throw up? Do the Members think the United States Congress ought to be managing those forests? The people that ought to be managing those forests are the experts, the U.S. Forest Service.

We will continue to suffer massive losses as a result of fire and beetle kill if we do not let the Forest Service do what the Forest Service is best at doing, and that is in managing the forests. And that is what this bill does. But we do have a roadblock facing us out there. Our roadblock is the National Sierra Club, which has put everything into overdrive to try to stop this bill. They are saying to the general public they are going to cut down old growth. They are saying they are going to clear-cut, as if we are going into the Sequoia National Park and cut down those great big trees. They are saying this is all about lumber companies. Thank goodness, we have got somebody who will take that wood.

And by the way, there is not one person in this Chamber, there is not one member of the National Sierra Club, there is not one member of Earth First!, there is not one member of Greenpeace that does not use wood products. They sit at wood tables, by the way, to write us nasty letters. They live in a house that has got wood throughout the house.

The key here is do not let Greenpeace, do not let the National Sierra Club, do not let Earth First! block what is the most significant piece of forest legislation we have had in 2 decades. We have got very ardent support from very capable people from the environmental side of the U.S. House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), two very capable, strongly environmentally-oriented people. We have the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the chairman of our committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), both, very strongly committed to the environment but with the understanding that we have to use common sense in the management of our for-

ests. That is what this bill is about. That is why this bill should be approved. That is why the gentleman from Texas's (Mr. STENHOLM) motion to instruct and get this done now while we have got a deal in line, that is why we ought to support this. So I stand strongly in support of that. I commend Members on both sides of the aisle. This bill has bipartisan support. It ought to pass, and we need to get into those forests and let our green hats do their job.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

□ 1115

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward to a healthy, open conference. We hope this conference will set a new high standard in openness and bipartisanship in the House. But there are a couple things I think we need to talk about that are challenging us in bringing this bill to completion, and that is, first, a recognition that we have a severe resource limitation that is the real limitation as to what real treatment we can do on our forests, and that no matter what we do in this bill, the amount that has been appropriated to date still will only treat about maybe 2 percent of the acreage of the hundreds of thousands of acres that need treatment in our national forests.

That is an important point, because if we only have enough to do 2 percent of the acreage that really could potentially use thinning or other treatment in our forests, we have to really prioritize where we are going to do this work.

One of the elements we hope to talk about in our conference is how to prioritize this work where it is going to be most effective. That is why many of us have been talking about prioritizing our work to be in the areas where it will have the greatest benefit to save human life and human property, and that is in the wild-line urban interface and the areas closest to our towns, suburbs, and homes.

We will be talking in the conference about a way to focus our energies on those highest priority areas, because, if we do not, we risk really squandering some of it out in sort of the Timbuktu areas while we are losing homes in fires, as we have in California most recently. So that will be an element we hope to discuss in the conference.

Second, we hope to have a product that can be embraced by all points of the ideological compass. One of the things we hope to be able to accomplish is a description of the thinning that will assure that we are really doing thinning, rather than disguised commercial harvest. We think we can accomplish that in some fashion of taking off-limits the old-growth timber that gets us into political battles, rather than really furthering the effort to carve out or to thin out some of the litter brush on the forest floor.

Frankly, one of the problems we have of winning public trust for this program is the fear that this will be used as a guise to cut down 5-foot-in-diameter trees in some of our old-growth forests to finance this program. We hope we will come out with a final conference bill that will not be using old-growth timber to finance this program.

There are a lot of ways, probably 1,000 different ways, to describe old-growth timber. We need to find some. We need to assure the American public we really do have a healthy forest initiative, not a clear-cut initiative, and not a "let's get the old growth timber because that is where the most commercially valuable trees are." That should be doable. I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis to accomplish that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds just to say to the gentleman from Washington, I appreciate his comments; but I would point out that with regard to the old-growth forests and the 5-foot-diameter trees that the gentleman referred to, nothing in the legislation that the House passed, much less anything in the Senate bill, would override the Northwest Forest Plan that protects every old-growth tree in the entire Northwest. It does not override any forest plan anywhere in the country. So the gentleman should rest assured that this legislation is not going to affect the type of tree that he described to us a few minutes ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, since there still is emboldened in large cast letters above your chair the words "In God We Trust," maybe it would be appropriate for me to note for the Sierra Club or Earth First! and Greenpeace that if they will go and read the Biblical account of creation, they will find that when the Lord placed Adam and Eve in the garden, he charged them to dress and keep the garden. The point is that even in a perfect world, the Lord recognized there was a need for man to intervene in the process of nature.

So I hope these groups will take that into account and note that that is exactly what this bill does, and it is all that this bill does, is to appropriately intervene in the process of nature to benefit the forest.

The other body has passed a similar bill, of course, with a lot of extraneous material, most of which costs money. I know you are going to want to prune a lot of that out. I hope there is one little piece of that extraneous material that survives the pruner's knife, and this is a little piece of legislation that has to do with animal rights. It simply enhances the penalties for interstate commerce in cockfighting and dog fighting. It costs zero dollars; and it will do a lot of good, because now these crimes will be prosecuted.

So my congratulations for a really good bill. I hope that this little animal

rights addition in the Senate survives the pruner's knife.

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

Mr. Speaker, I will just say very briefly that this motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Texas is very welcome. It is exactly what we need. We hope the message is received, not only here on the House side, but also on the Senate side, that we will work together in an open conference, across party lines, and we will work together with the Senate to accomplish that. But it is absolutely essential that the Senate take the same step that we are taking here today and do it as quickly as possible so we can meet the timetable put forward by the gentleman from Texas.

Secondly, it is absolutely important that the message go out that this Congress on this issue has worked together, and worked together very well. The place where we find the extremism that some have expressed concern about has been on the outside, the organizations like Greenpeace and the Sierra Club and Earth First!, extremists who send the mail to so many people.

We have all seen it. It is designed to raise money for these organizations. If they said that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) was meeting with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), who has very different points of view, to work out their differences, do you think that would generate a lot of revenue for these organizations? I think not.

What they do is try to portray this legislation and this Congress as being extremist. That is wrong, and that is where the problem lies. We need to reject that. We need to reject the falsehoods that are being portrayed about the legislation on the outside, to work together in the interests of the American people, work together in the interests of our national forests here on the inside to produce a final product that will really address a severe crisis that we have.

It is time to stop that kind of game playing, and it is time to get serious about addressing this problem. We are so close to something that we have sought for so long that we should not allow that outside rhetoric, that outside pressure, to deter us from what needs to be done.

What needs to be done is exactly what the gentleman from Texas has described in his motion to instruct. We need to meet, we need to meet openly, we need to meet now, and we need to produce a product that works out the differences between the House and the Senate by next Thursday.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to endorse and support this motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say I appreciate the tenor of this discussion and

debate today, because that is exactly what we intended from this motion. It is the history of the Committee on Agriculture, working with other committees, to let the process of the House of Representatives work its will and come together in compromise.

Compromise has never been a four letter word to me or to anyone else in this body. It means that some have to give on some very strongly held beliefs. Sometimes it means to have to say no to some of the organizations who take a great deal of interest in this process.

My friend from California mentioned a moment ago that down in my district, when we clear out the underbrush, we take two Caterpillars and a string of chain between them and drag it across it. I want to go a little further with that. We do that for a different reason; we do that to preserve moisture.

In fact, we have a couple of bills pending right now, working with my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE), on salt cedar. In areas of arid Texas and New Mexico and Colorado and other areas, more New Mexico and Texas in this instance, we have a need of controlling brush to preserve water so that our people will have something to drink.

But here a little novel idea just popped into my mind, because when we clear brush in Texas, many times the landowners pay for all of it themselves, if they can, and many of them can and do. They expect no one to come in and help them clear out the trash on their own land.

In many cases though we have cost-share. We have programs that are set up that are designed to provide cost-sharing. We have got an excellent one going in Texas, in which the State of Texas puts up a share of money, the local landowner puts up a share of money, in some cases the local county puts up a share, and the property owner is expected to put up their share of the money. The Federal Government then puts up its share.

This is an idea that I think we ought to pursue as we go into a conference on this, because the gentleman from California is exactly right, we are not talking about forest lands in the area many a time that have been burning recently in California. We are talking about a different kind of problem that needs to be solved, and can be solved, if we would just put our shoulder to the wheel and solve it.

Resource limitations are very real, that is true; but also doing nothing is not an option. Even though in my district we do not have any forests, I recognize the importance of the work of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), all of my colleagues that have spoken today.

Everyone now recognizes that this debate has gone on longer than it

should. We are that close. We have two bills. It is not impossible. In fact, it is more than possible that we can achieve what we are saying with this motion to instruct today. It will just take the sincere dedication that we know we have on the House Committee on Agriculture, working with the Committee on Resources. And I know it exists with the Senate. We have always had, when it comes to agriculture, an excellent working relationship to go to conference, to work it out. That is exactly what this motion does. I hope the House will accept it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when I was talking about dragging the chains across the desert, I did not mean that to be derogatory. That is a practice that works. In California, we cannot criticize that, because then we take the mesquite and turn it into mesquite charcoal for those oven-roasted, free-range chickens.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I took it exactly like the gentleman meant it. It was a compliment. I appreciate the support in this, because in many cases some of the folks do not agree with us on doing that either.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will provide the mesquite, we will provide the chickens.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one of the requirements that I have had all along in this is do not muck around with my mesquite trees, whatever you do. But now we are talking about a very good, constructive use of mesquite trees. We have now got delineated, outlined clearly, how we can provide more of it, and we have a market for it, so I already see some benefits to this bill that are going to accrue to the 17th Congressional District of Texas in the new market for mesquite trees.

But here let us get back to seriousness. I hope we can do what this motion does.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The motion to instruct was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and

the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GOODLATTE, BOEHNER, JENKINS, GUTKNECHT, HAYES, STENHOLM, PETERSON of Minnesota and DOOLEY of California.

From the Committee on Resources, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendments, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. POMBO, MCINNIS, WALDEN of Oregon, RENZI, GEORGE MILLER of California and INSLEE.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of sections 106 and 107 of the House bill, and sections 105, 106, 1115, and 1116 of the Senate amendment and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, SMITH of Texas and Mr. CONYERS.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1829.

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

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES COMPETITION IN CONTRACTING ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 428 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1829.

□ 1130

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1829) to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with private sector firms and their non-inmate workers and empowering Federal agencies to get the best value for taxpayers' dollars, to provide a 5-year period during which Federal Prison Industries adjusts to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to enhance inmate access to remedial and vocational opportunities and other rehabilitative opportunities to better prepare inmates for a successful return to society, to authorize alternative inmate work opportunities in support of non-profit organizations, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHAW in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Federal Prison Industries, or FPI for short, was first authorized in the 1930s to require Federal agencies to buy goods made by inmates in Federal prisons. The purpose of FPI was to ensure work and training for prison inmates by guaranteeing a market for prison-made goods. Although Federal Prison Industries may have started with good intentions, it has been surrounded by controversy since its inception.

FPI enjoys a mandatory market for its goods, a government facility to produce them in, and pays its workers less than the minimum wage to manufacture them. A guaranteed market for its products and reduced costs for labor and capital clearly amounts to an unfair advantage when put in direct competition with private industries. As Members of Congress, I believe it is our duty to protect the pocketbooks of taxpayers by ensuring that the Federal Government is not misusing taxpayer dollars. I believe it is also our duty to protect American business and workers from unfair competition by the Federal Government.

FPI is a large, government-owned corporation. It currently operates 111 factories at 71 of its correctional institutions where it produces goods in over 150 product lines under the trade name UNICOR. It offers approximately 150 broad classes of products and services through eight business groups. And there is no question FPI hurts private industry. For example, in fiscal year 2002, the FPI sold over \$210 million in office furniture, representing a 17.2 share of the office furniture market nationwide.

Since I was first elected to Congress, I have been working to correct the situation with FPI and level the playing field for private industry. I became interested in this issue out of concern for small businesses in my district in Wisconsin. Two businesses in my district were shut down as a direct result of competition from FPI. Other businesses sought my help when FPI threatened to come in and begin manufacturing small engines. Over the years, I have received dozens of letters complaining about FPI and asking Congress to eliminate mandatory source in favor of a more competitive market for Federal agency business. Because of these concerns, it is not surprising that industry and labor have joined Members of this body in seeking reform of Federal Prison Industries.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1829, the Federal Prison Industries Competition and Contracting Act of 2003, is a bipartisan solution to reform prison industries. This legislation would alter the way FPI does business by requiring that FPI compete for its business opportunities. Currently, all Federal agencies