

Sam Jones on the occasion of his home going, and 36-year reign at CEO and president of the Indianapolis Urban League. He dedicated his life to God, family, and community. He was the dean of the Urban League chapters throughout the Nation. He is inducted into the courageous Hall of Champions and is celebrated for his unparalleled moral persuasion in promoting solidarity among all peoples for the common good.

History offers few examples of leaders who were gentlemen and genteel men all the while. There were many who will say so much about Mr. Jones's contributions to so many on behalf of so many.

But in summary, Madam Speaker, he lived not because but for a cause. In his unassuming manner, he followed the instruction of a wise man many years ago: "Let your light so shine by your good works on Earth that it will be magnified on high."

He will be missed by all. He challenged us to find a cure for leukemia. We can, if we will. We cannot afford not to. My love and appreciation and admiration is extended to the Jones family and especially to a very special wife, Pree, and an extraordinary family.

PEACE FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, there is not a time that I come to the floor during this time of war that I do not feel burdened to speak to the issue of peace and some sense of recognition by the administration that all is not well with the position that the United States is taking with respect to the United Nations Security Council.

At any time we discuss war, we are reminded of the families that are mourning and the families that are also praying for their loved ones. And so it is important to acknowledge our respect and admiration and support for the success of the United States troops.

□ 1930

At the same, too, we are policy-makers and our dissent is not against the troops. It is against the policies.

I am concerned that there is no focus and thought on the aftermath of this Iraqi war, the ability to govern this Nation without government, the inability of one country to be able to occupy another. I believe it is misdirected for this administration to believe that the United States military can occupy this Nation, Iraq, without coalition efforts.

I believe it is misdirected to think that Congress should not be involved, and I hope that we will be working seriously on the question of peace. It is interesting to try and fight the war, but can we keep and hold the peace?

As I think about those thoughts, Madam Speaker, I also think about the

fact that when our troops go abroad, they are fighting for the values of this Nation. They are fighting for our freedom, our freedom of dissent, but also our freedom of equality and justice.

Is it not interesting, Madam Speaker, and it is sobering that tomorrow, April 1, 2003, one of the more historic arguments before the Supreme Court will be held, and that is, the challenge of whether or not affirmative action is unconstitutional. I might imagine that there are some troops in Iraq that will ultimately be impacted by this decision.

I think the greater tragedy is that this government, this administration decided to weigh in in opposition to the University of Michigan plan, a plan that has already been established as a non-quota plan. It is an outreach. It provides a point system, Madam Speaker, for athletes, people living in northern Michigan, individuals who happen to come from different ethnic groups. It is not a quota system, but yet our government has decided to go into the Supreme Court with my tax dollars and allow the Solicitor General to argue against the rights of millions and millions of Americans. Young people who have not had opportunity, young people who started in this life behind the finish line.

President Lyndon Johnson said that one cannot expect a person to finish a race until we take the strings off of their hands and feet, and that is what affirmative action is about.

I am a product of affirmative action, Madam Speaker, going to Yale University; but I did not graduate on affirmative action. In fact, Yale University affirmatively created women because it became coed during the time I was in college. What a tragedy that in this Nation we could not find the kind of balance in the administration to argue on behalf of an effective plan.

Let me thank the Congressional Black Caucus for having the courage even in these times to stand up against the attack on civil rights and affirmative action, and I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the chairman, and thank many of the Members who participated in an affirmative action summit in Houston: the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON).

I believe, Madam Speaker, that we cannot stand silent while our rights are being denied, and I hope that we will continue to stand for what is right. There will be thousands tomorrow who will petition the United States Supreme Court in order for them to know that this impacts lives. It denies opportunity.

I close, Madam Speaker, to say that the University of Texas and the Texas system are real examples of what a court decision can do because, after the Hopwood decision, we saw hundreds of

minority students leave the State of Texas to try and get an education because they could not get into the grad school which their parents had paid taxes for. This is a shame and this is a sham.

I hope that in the wisdom of the Supreme Court that they will have the opportunity to hear the arguments and realize that the program before us, the University of Michigan plan, is an excellent plan; and I hope that the Nation's values will be upheld by the Supreme Court, the values of equality for all and justice for all.

REVELATIONS ABOUT RICHARD PERLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss several matters that have become intertwined in the Iraq circumstance, and of course, our thoughts and prayers are with the brave men and women who are fighting overseas, faced with a number of troubling episodes, though, here at home that may involve conflicts of interest of high-level Bush administration officials.

I take the floor tonight to raise the discussion on the ongoing revelations that Richard Perle, a member of the Pentagon's defense policy board, may have used his government position for private financial gain. It could be that he did not use his position for private financial gain, but I am alarmed with a number of lucrative government contracts that were recently awarded to the company formerly headed by the Vice President of the United States, DICK CHENEY.

What I am troubled about is the apparent link between the private financial gains made by the administration and their friends and the administration's prosecution of the war in Iraq. In the short term, American businesses could stand to gain nearly \$2 billion in government contracts for reconstruction projects in Iraq; and over the long run, over the long term, the next 3 years, the United Nations Development Program estimates it will cost up to \$30 billion or more to rebuild that country. Indeed, some of that money has already been awarded, including a contract to a subsidiary of Halliburton Company, which the Vice President was the CEO of from 1995 to the year 2000.

Many in the government are already benefiting from these payouts, including Mr. Richard Perle, who, for example, is on the board of directors for Onset Technology. Onset is the world's leading provider of message conversion technology. The company's customers include Bechtel, a well-known government contractor widely considered the

leading candidate for rebuilding the Iraqi infrastructure, and Raytheon Company, which is a provider of defense electronics, including the Patriot and the Tomahawk missiles.

There are many ways in which Mr. Richard Perle could be benefiting from his government position on the Defense policy board. For example, he has contracted with bankrupt telecommunications company Global Crossing, Limited to try to win the United States Government approval of its \$250 million chapter 11 buyout by two Asian companies, Hutchison Whampoa, controlled by the Hong Kong billionaire Li Ka-shing, and Singapore Technologies Telemedia, a phone company controlled by the Government of Singapore itself.

Mr. Perle was being paid \$125,000 for his efforts but stood to reap a \$600,000 bonus if the sale was approved by his superior, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Both the Department of Defense and the Federal Bureau of Investigation were opposed to the sale for national security reasons because it would place Global Crossing's fiber optic network, used by the United States Government, under foreign control.

In a March 7, 2003, affidavit, Mr. Perle said, "As the chairman of the Defense Policy Board, I have a unique perspective on and intimate knowledge of the national defense and security issues that will be raised by the review process." Mr. Perle even acknowledged contacting at least one government official on Global Crossing's behalf, though he refused to identify this person. And though Mr. Perle said he is no longer lobbying on Global Crossing's behalf and will donate his \$125,000 fee to American servicemen and their families, which I applaud, the fact remains that he may well have used his government position improperly to secure this fee. It is not relevant what he chooses to do with the money after he gets it.

Mr. Richard Perle also serves as managing partner of a private venture capital firm called Trireme Partners that invests primarily in companies that deal in goods and services related to national security. Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist Seymour Hersh recently reported that on January 3 of this year, Mr. Perle met with Saudi businessmen, including arms dealer Adnan Kashoggi, in Marseilles, France, to secure their investment in Perle's company.

The report contains a disturbing quote from Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the Saudi ambassador to the United States, and he said, "There were elements of the appearance of blackmail. 'If we get in business, he'll back off in Saudi Arabia,' as I have been informed by participants in the meeting." Though Perle denied that securing investment in his company was the purpose of the meeting, he said that he did meet with the Saudis concerning Iraq.

There is also concern about Perle's position as a nonexecutive on the board

of directors of software developer Autonomy, a data mining company that lists the Defense Department and Homeland Security Department as customers. For example, last October the company won a major contract with Homeland Security. While Mr. Perle has drawn no salary, he has received more than 120,000 share options from Autonomy.

Mr. Perle's award of these share options gives him a direct financial stake in the success of this company. Indeed, the National Association of Pension Funds recently recommended that shareholders abstain when Mr. Perle comes up for reappointment this summer because the group feels that share options compromise the independent status of the independent directors such as Perle.

In yet what some term an amazing incident on March 19 of this year, Mr. Perle spoke in a conference call sponsored by Goldman Sachs, in which he advised participants on possible investment opportunities arising from the war in Iraq. The conference title was "Implication of an Imminent War: Iraq Now. North Korea Next?" Clearly, Mr. Perle has little regard for the conflict-of-interest rules that are in place for government officials, and I am assuming in that statement that he is aware of the rules in the first place.

The most recent Perle revelation is that while on the Defense policy board he advised a major American satellite maker, Local Space and Communications, as it faced government accusations that it improperly transferred rocket technology to China.

In an attempt to divert us from continuing to look into these matters, Mr. Perle has recently announced that he would immediately step down as chairman of the Defense policy board last week. Yet he does remain on the board as a member, along with 29 others.

According to a recent study by the Center for Public Integrity, of the 30 Defense policy board members, some of them have ties to companies that have won more than \$76 billion in defense contracts in last year and the year before. Indeed, four members are, in fact, registered lobbyists, one of whom represents two of the three largest defense contractors.

□ 1945

Perle, like the others, continues to be a key adviser to the administration on defense issues, even as he pursues his personal business in the same area, a potential violation of the Federal criminal ethics rules.

In order to get to the bottom of this matter, I plan to ask the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, to publicly release the financial disclosure forms that each member of the board must file with his office. To date, these forms have not been seen by anyone outside the Pentagon. I am further requesting of the Secretary of Defense to release the minutes of all meetings held by the Defense policy

board so that we can see whether issues relating to the private financial interests of the members have been discussed. There are persons on my staff who have security clearance and can view the minutes of these meetings without any danger of compromising national security. As a matter of fact, I would be willing to do so myself. Of course, regardless of what was discussed at the meeting, the fact still remains that the members of the board are still government employees who simultaneously sit on the boards of and are employed by private companies that can and do benefit from Defense Department contracts. This is a direct and disturbing conflict of interest.

Mr. Perle and the other members of the Defense policy board are not the only ones capitalizing on the war in Iraq. I turn now to the Vice President of the United States, whose former company, Halliburton, has already secured a number of contracts in the Middle East since the Vice President took office. For example, on March 25 of this year, the United States Army announced that it awarded the main Iraq oil well firefighting contract to a unit of Halliburton, which incidentally was let without any bidding whatsoever. Furthermore, it was reported that Halliburton had been working closely with U.S. Army engineers prior even to the awarding of the contract.

This was not the first time Halliburton has profited from a government contract since the Bush-Cheney administration has taken office. Halliburton recently secured a \$140 million contract by the Saudi Arabian Government through their state-owned petroleum firm, Saudi Aramco, to develop oil fields in their country. And a Halliburton subsidiary was also hired by the Saudis to build a \$40 million ethylene plant.

Now, it is a matter of record that Halliburton gave nearly \$18,000 to the Bush-Cheney Presidential campaign of 2000. There is some concern that these campaign contributions from CHENEY's former company, coupled with Halliburton's success in securing government contracts under this administration, at the very least create the appearance of favored treatment. And while the Vice President divested nearly all of his financial interests in Halliburton when he stepped down as CEO to be President Bush's running mate, he still continues to receive \$1 million a year in deferred compensation from his Halliburton severance package. And though he sold most of his shares when he left the company, he retained options worth in the range of \$8 million. Like Perle's donation of his \$125,000 fee to war victims, the Vice President has also arranged to pay any profits derived from his Halliburton stock to charity. How nice. It seems, Madam Speaker, that the Bush administration is not opposed to using government position for private gain as long as one does not keep all the profits for oneself.

Quite frankly, like Mr. Perle, it is time for the Vice President to make a much fuller disclosure than he has up till now. The American people have a right to know if their officials are or are not using their office for self-interested reasons. From the evidence already made public, Mr. Perle and others really should, and I recommend this, give a full accounting of their business dealings; and the Vice President must completely divest himself of any and all financial ties to Halliburton. Then the American people can be sure that their representatives in Washington, their leaders, are working for the good of the many and not in any kind of personal way to benefit themselves.

Now, while it is true that Halliburton, and I am not picking on them, but they are the subject of these discussions, while it is true that Halliburton is now out of the running for the prime contract to rebuild Iraq, and I presume they took themselves out, there is nothing that prevents them from being subcontractors in many instances.

Madam Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD a couple of articles, from the Washington Post and even from the Wall Street Journal, which are critical of Mr. Perle. I quote from today's paper: "Our own view is that Mr. Perle should have understood that Global Crossing was politically toxic." As well, Madam Speaker, I would like to include a statement of Mr. Perle that explains his position and what has happened in this matter. It is one that I think, in all fairness to him, should be reproduced in the RECORD.

[Mar. 31, 2003]

FOR THE RECORD

(By Richard Perle)

Last week I resigned my position as chairman of the advisory Defense Policy Board after news stories, rich in innuendo, suggested that I had acted improperly in advising Global Crossing (the New York Times) and, in a separate matter, in meeting over lunch with two Saudi businessmen (The New Yorker). They provoked an avalanche of stories, mostly repeating points in those first two, with each iteration making more extreme allegations than the last. There was no way I could quickly quell the press criticism of me, even though it was based on factual errors and tendentious reporting. So I wrote to Donald Rumsfeld, "I have seen controversies like this better and I know that this one will inevitably distract from the urgent challenge in which you are now engaged. I would not wish to cause even a moment's distraction from that challenge."

Let me explain my milieu, and context. Government officials, particularly at the most senior level, frequently seek advice from outside the departments they superintend. The perspective of knowledgeable outsiders is often a needed corrective to an institutional view that may have come to dominate the department's thinking. Sometimes senior officials face vexing questions for which their staffs provide unsatisfying answers, or they want a longer-term view. It is only natural that an intellectually curious cabinet officer will reach out to peers who have occupied similar positions, in the hope that their experience will help avoid mis-

takes or point the way to new ideas. When he does so, he must have confidence that the advice he receives is candid, that it is the product of serious deliberation, and that it is free from advocacy reflecting private interests. The relationship between official and adviser is ultimately one of trust.

Most often, the people best able to help are professionally involved in the businesses for which the official is responsible: health professionals or pharmaceutical company executives advising the Department of Health and Human Services, for example, or energy company officials advising the Department of Energy, or defense executives advising the Department of Defense. If the secretary of defense wants advice on new approaches to the conflict between India and Pakistan, or how far and how fast to press technical innovation in precision-guided weapons, he is unlikely to turn to a dress designer or a molecular biologist. (Hollywood personalities might be similar ill-equipped, but he is likely to get their advice whether he wants it or not.)

There is no way, of course, to be sure that an outside adviser (or for that matter, a subordinate) is not driven by a private passion, a deeply held conviction that skews his judgment, or a private policy agenda. Only by judging the cogency of the advice he receives—and over time the track record of the adviser—can he be confident that he is receiving balanced counsel.

But there are ways to ensure that advice does not advance personal financial interests, and they are reflected in rules that apply to the many thousands of individuals serving on hundreds of boards which advise government at all levels. The two key rules are simply and flow from a familiar principle: that public office should not be used for private gain.

The first rule is full disclosure of the financial interests of the adviser. This is accomplished by annual filings of the board member's business interests, sources of income, clients, share holdings and the like. The second rule is straightforward: If the discussions or advice of the board should involve matters that have a direct and predictable effect on an adviser's financial interests, he is recused from taking part. An adviser following these rules should be free to give his best candid advice, and the official receiving advice should not have to worry that it might be tainted. These are the rules that members of government advisory boards accept when they agree to serve on them. They are not obliged to terminate their employment or abandon business interests, even those that may benefit from decisions of the department or agency they advise.

Since most people with experience and knowledge relevant to defense and national security policy are likely to earn their livelihood in defense-related enterprises, the possibility of conflict of interest is always present and must be contained by adherence to the two rules, disclosure and recusal. Without those rules, and the protection they afford, few individuals with knowledge or experience would agree to serve on advisory boards, and the benefits of those boards would be lost to policy officials.

I have been privileged to chair the Defense Policy Board for nearly two years. During that time the board has debated many issues, including U.S. policy with respect to Iraq, weapons of mass destruction, European-U.S. relations, the war on terrorism and the like. The discussions have been lively, the views expressed diverse, and the board's experienced members—former secretaries of state, defense and energy, former directors of Central Intelligence, former speakers of the House from both parties, a former vice-president, professors, a Nobel

laureate (in economics) and several recently retired general officers—have used the board's meetings to share their views with the secretary of defense.

The Times story about my work for Global Crossing gave the impression that I had been retained to use influence stemming from my chairmanship, my "close ties to current officials," to obtain favorable ruling on the acquisition of Global Crossing by a joint venture including a Hong Kong company. This is incorrect. (When I asked the times to publish a letter in reply, I was told that they would not unless I dropped the word "incorrect." Thus I learned that the Times censors letters to the editor.)

In truth, I was retained to advise Global Crossing on how it could meet the government's security concerns about the transaction, not to "help overcome Defense Department resistance" to it. To do this I had to persuade Global Crossing to accept some far-reaching safeguards, which it has now done. My task was to make intelligible to Global Crossing the government's concerns, not to use influence to get the government to set those concerns aside—the precise opposite of the Times' characterization.

The New Yorker piece by Seymour Hersh is a masterpiece—of falsehood and innuendo. He describes a lunch I had with two Saudi businessmen, during which the situation in Iraq was the sole topic of discussion, as a "cover story" for another purpose—eliciting a private Saudi investment in a fund in which I am a partner. And he quotes Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar to the effect that "if we get in business," I would "back off on Saudi Arabia." Sprinkled in the article are references to conflicts of interest, although the incoherence of the piece reflects Mr. Hersh's Houdini-like twists and turns, intended to question my integrity.

Neither piece shows that I departed from the rules of disclosure and recusal. Global Crossing was never a topic in my board. Had it been, I would have recused myself. Mr. Hersh implies that my involvement in a fund set up to invest in homeland security technologies might by itself constitute a conflict of interest. But there is nothing in the rules governing the board, or in any reasonable ethical judgment, that would preclude my working in such a fund. He implies there may be a conflict of interest issue because I am a non-executive director of a software company, Autonomy, which recently won a contract to supply software for homeland security. But Autonomy never came before my board—specific companies almost never do. Had it, I would have recused myself.

The Times story further suggested that the very fact that I served on a board—and that this service was mentioned in documents that summarized my background and qualifications—was in itself a conflict. But this suggestion cannot be serious. Everybody I work with knows who I am and what I have done, whether I attach my résumé to the paperwork or not. Those who serve without any compensation on these boards do so as a civic responsibility. We give time and expertise and we accept the terms of membership, including rules concerning conflicts of interest, willingly. But few of us could do so if we were prevented from working in the areas about which we are consulted, and the value of our advice would be sharply diminished if we left our professional pursuits.

Somewhere there is probably a board that advises some agency of government on fashion trends. I suppose I could join it without fear that the New York Times or Seymour Hersh would accuse me of a conflict of interest. My wife would be appalled.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

CENTER FOR PUBLIC IGNORANCE

Richard Perle explains the attack on his tenure at the Defense Policy Board nearby.

Our own view is that Mr. Perle should have understood that Global Crossing was politically toxic. But you can tell something else is going on here because the ethics attack is now extending to the rest of the Board.

An outfit called the Center for Public Integrity—moral modesty is not part of its charter—has issued a report warning that “at least” nine of the 30 Board members have some sort of ties to defense contractors. Keep in mind that the Defense Board is purely advisory, its members work without pay and they abide by disclosure rules even though they have zero decision-making power. They serve only because the Secretary of Defense thinks their counsel might occasionally be worth listening to.

The suggestion nonetheless is that former CIA Director Jim Woolsey, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and retired Admiral William Owens, among others, shouldn't be able to serve on the advisory panel. How about taking a phone call from Donald Rumsfeld? Is that also too “incestuous?” We have reached the state of ethics in Washington in which Madonna could presumably serve as a Pentagon adviser but people who actually know something about national security cannot.

The objection is so transparently silly that one can only conclude that the real motivation here is political. The opponents of war with Iraq and change in the Middle East are trying to drive from public influence the folks who speak on behalf of those Bush Administration policies. “Integrity” is simply a smokescreen.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

Mr. EVERETT (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. TOOMEY (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, April 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, April 1.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OSE, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 330. An act to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary; in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to commend and express the gratitude of the United States to the nations participating with the United States in the Coalition to Disarm Iraq; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 1, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1560. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bacillus pumilus GB 34; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-2002-0328; FRL-7286-9] received March 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1561. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — S-Metolachlor; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-2003-0 046; FRL-7229-8] received March 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1562. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request to make available contingent emergency funds pursuant to Public Law 107-42, the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act, 2001; (H. Doc. No. 108—60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1563. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priority — Experimental and Innovative Training Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1564. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting an

update on the status of submissions of Fiscal Years (FY) 2001 and 2002 Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) Reports for the Department; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1565. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania; Construction, Modification and Operation Permit Programs [PA202-4400a; FRL-7474-2] received March 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1566. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas; California — Indian Wells Valley PM-10 Nonattainment Area [CA-276-0380; FRL-7461-5] received March 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1567. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN214-1a; FRL-7470-7] received March 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1568. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certifications and waivers and their justification under section 565(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 of the prohibition against contracting with firms that comply with the Arab League Boycott of the State of Israel and of the prohibition against contracting with firms that discriminate in the award of subcontracts on the basis of religion, pursuant to Public Law 103—236, section 565(b) (108 Stat. 845); to the Committee on International Relations.

1569. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the annual report on Military Assistance, Military Exports, and Military Imports for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on International Relations.

1570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations Related to the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) [Docket No. 030304054-3054-01] (RIN: 0694-AC22) received March 26, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1571. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of the Presidential Determination No. 2003-04, Imposition and Waiver of Sanctions Under Section 604 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on International Relations.

1572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

1573. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report of surplus real property transferred for public health purposes for October 1, 2001, through September 30, 2002, pursuant to Public Law 100—77, section 601 (101 Stat. 515); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1574. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 15-33, “Emancipation Day Fund Temporary Act of 2003” received March