

(3) CERTIFICATION REPORT.—The Chief Executive Officer of the Corporation shall annually prepare and submit to Congress a report that contains a certification that the Corporation is in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1).

(4) APPROVAL.—The requirements of this subsection shall apply to each approved national service position that the Corporation approves—

(A) during fiscal year 2003 (before or after the date of enactment of this Act); and  
(B) during any subsequent fiscal year.

(c) RESERVE ACCOUNT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND CONTENTS.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—Notwithstanding subtitles C and D of title I of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq., 12601 et seq.), and any other provision of law, within the National Service Trust established under section 145 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601), the Corporation shall establish a reserve account.

(B) CONTENTS.—To ensure the availability of adequate funds to support the awards of approved national service positions for each fiscal year, the Corporation shall place in the account—

(i) during fiscal year 2003, a portion of the funds that were appropriated for fiscal year 2003 or a previous fiscal year under section 501(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 12681(a)(2)), were made available to carry out subtitle C or D of title I of that Act, and remain available; and

(ii) during fiscal year 2004 or a subsequent fiscal year, a portion of the funds that were appropriated for that fiscal year under section 501(a)(2) and were made available to carry out subtitle C or D of title I of that Act.

(2) OBLIGATION.—The Corporation shall not obligate the funds in the reserve account until the Corporation—

(A) determines that the funds will not be needed for the payment of national service educational awards associated with previously approved national service positions; or

(B) obligates the funds for the payment of such awards for such previously approved national service positions.

(d) AUDITS.—The accounts of the Corporation relating to the appropriated funds for approved national service positions, and the records demonstrating the manner in which the Corporation has recorded estimates described in subsection (b)(1)(B) as obligations, shall be audited annually by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. A report containing the results of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by subsection (b)(3).

(e) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), all amounts included in the National Service Trust under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 145(a) of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12601(a)) shall be available for payments of national service educational awards under section 148 of that Act (42 U.S.C. 12604). The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2471, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of June 23 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2417, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence filed its report in the House yesterday, June 18, 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 24.

Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the House.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to yield to the majority leader for the purposes of informing us of the proposed schedule for next week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of this week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. Monday.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, we will consider several additional measures under suspension of the rules. We will also consider the fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security appropriations bill; the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004; H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act; and the Fiscal Year 2004 Military Construction Appropria-

tions bill; and, finally, we may consider H.R. 2351, the Health Savings Account Availability Act.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am happy to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for providing us with that information. The leader points out that the Medicare prescription drug bill will be on the floor.

First I would like to know, Mr. Leader, if you know which day of the week or days of the week can we expect to see the Medicare prescription drug bill on the floor?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I would anticipate that the Medicare bill would probably come later in the week. I cannot give the gentleman a firm time, but I would anticipate either late Wednesday or certainly no later than Thursday.

Mr. HOYER. It would be the intention of the leader to have this bill finished prior to the end of next week?

Mr. DELAY. We anticipate to finish that bill. I know it is a big, complicated measure, but it would be our intention to finish that before we broke for the July 4th district work period.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, obviously this will be one of the most important bills that we consider during this session of the Congress of the United States, and I would ask if it is the gentleman's intention and the leadership on your side's intention to provide a rule which will allow the minority to offer such amendments as it deems to be appropriate, to offer a substitute that it deems to be appropriate, and to provide sufficient time to debate those amendments?

I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding further.

As the gentleman knows, this gentleman is very hesitant to speak for the Committee on Rules, but we do understand how important the Medicare Modernization Act is, how important it is to the seniors of this country, and we would give the minority every consideration to provide a substitute.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we appreciate the fact that the gentleman will be, I am not sure I heard you, you will be giving us a substitute or you will consider giving us a substitute. I am not sure I understood.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, it concerned me when the gentleman said "what the minority deems as a substitute." Obviously we need to look at all of these things individually and considerations need to be made.

For instance, one consideration is, is the substitute within the bounds of the Budget Act and the budget rules of this House? That may not be the qualifying issue, but that is one example of issues that we consider.

The bill marked up, at least, in the Committee on Ways and Means, I know the Committee on Energy and Commerce has not finished yet, but the bill

marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means fits within the budget rules of the House.

So we have to look at everything on its own merits and make that decision, and the Committee on Rules will make that decision.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, we understand that, but everybody on this floor, every Member, perhaps not the American public, but every Member knows that the majority, when it needs a waiver of the rules to present something on the floor that it wants to present, waives those rules.

□ 1715

So when I said something that the minority wants to offer, I meant that, very frankly, if the democratic process is going to operate openly and effectively so that there can be different alternatives considered, alternatives that we believe are appropriate, as well as, obviously, the majority can present the alternatives it deems to be appropriate. Clearly, if one fashions a bill so that the alternative we believe is appropriate is not consistent with those rules and will not give us a waiver, you effectively have precluded us from offering that substitute or those amendments. I mentioned the substitute, but I also would hope that there would be a willingness to make in order numerous amendments from the minority side of the House.

As I have pointed out, Mr. Leader, we represent approximately 140 million Americans on this side; you represent approximately 150 million Americans. That is pretty close. The Americans who sent us here obviously would want to see their alternatives considered by the full House. And if they are rejected, so be it. But I would urge the leader, particularly on a bill as important as this, as controversial as this, having such ramifications to 40 million Americans on Medicare, that you would be, you and the Speaker and the whip on your side, would urge the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the Committee on Rules to be as broad in their approval of alternatives as they could be.

I see the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is on the floor. I carry around with me, as he knows, quotes. I do not know how many people carry around quotes of the gentleman from California, but I carry around quotes of the gentleman from California in my pocket. From time to time I bring them out. He made the point as a minority Member that a Member ought to be given the ability to offer alternatives; and if they lose, they lose. But in a democratic institution that prides itself on being the people's House, all of the people's representatives ought to be given an option to offer their alternatives.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate the fact that my friend from Maryland has again raised this issue.

I will tell the gentleman that the Committee on Rules is anxiously looking forward to considering the measures that will emerge from both the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on Ways and Means as we deal with this extremely important issue. The American people have spoken very clearly. They want us to put into place, and the President very much wants to have, a package which will provide access to affordable, quality prescriptions for seniors. We want to do this in a way that will allow for a wide range of issues to be considered. And I know that based on the 8 hours that was expended by all of the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, through their markup, that many proposals were offered there, and I know that this process is an ongoing one. I will assure my friend that the Committee on Rules will deliberate, and we will make a determination as to exactly what it is that we will move forward with.

The distinguished majority leader just talked about the fact that we will hope that measures will fall within the guidelines of the \$400 billion that was allocated in the budget over a 10-year period to deal with prescription drugs; and when the majority leader was talking about that, I know that what we are looking at will be something that will fall within the strictures that were put forth in the budget, and that is all that the majority leader was indicating. His hope is that if a substitute is submitted that it will fall within those guidelines.

The gentleman from Maryland is correct when he refers to the fact that the Committee on Rules does have the power to provide waivers. And waivers are often provided to the minority just as they are to the majority as well, for amendments, for substitutes. So I just want to assure my friend that we plan, as we take this up next week, to take this issue very seriously, as we do all others; and we will take whatever requests that the minority makes into consideration as we deliberate.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments. As we all know, the Committee on Rules is the least representative committee in terms of distribution of numbers, and that was true when we were in charge, so I understand that. It is not a criticism. That is the way the Committee on Rules is run. It is an agent, if you will, of the majority. It is how the majority runs the House.

We are not deluded on our side, anymore than you were when you were in the minority, deluded to the fact that you would be able to make an impact in committee. So very frankly, taking under consideration seriously our request is interesting and we are appreciative that you will take it under consideration.

But more basically than that, the gentleman has sole authority to do it. You can do it any way you want. We understand that. But our expectation is that on a bill of this magnitude and importance, that we will be allowed not only to offer a substitute, but amendments.

I will tell the gentleman that we understand the strictures of the Republican budget and, by the way, our budget, both of which have close numbers, we had \$528 billion and I think you had \$5 billion in terms of a number of items in your budget. But the fact is, we understand those strictures. And if those are the only strictures which we are confronted with, we will work within those restraints.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I would simply say that it is true that the Committee on Rules has traditionally had this 9 to 4 ratio, and we continued another tradition that we learned when you were in the majority of maintaining that.

My point is very simply that we will take this issue very seriously. The Committee on Rules has yet to act. No decisions have been made. I think that it is important for us to underscore that. I know that there will be members of the minority who will come before the committee who will offer proposals, and we will look forward to hearing about those proposals, and then we will deliberate on it. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his representation. Let me, reclaiming my time, make another observation.

In times past, the defense bill being, for instance, the authorization bill which we passed very quickly a few weeks ago, we had spent 6 days, 7 days on that piece of legislation. This legislation is going to have an extraordinary impact on millions of Americans, and we would hope that there would be sufficient time to debate the bill and, again, substitutes and amendments, so that we could fully air its ramifications to those millions of people, and to Medicare itself.

Obviously, there are different points of view on how to get to where we all want to get, or at least most of us want to get. I think there is a substantial difference on whether or not we want to see a program in a viable, ongoing, healthy Medicare, or whether or not Medicare is eliminated or shrunk very substantially and the private sector is in charge of whether or not to offer such benefits. That is a significant policy difference between us, I think; and it needs to be debated.

So not only would I urge that we be given the amendments and substitutes that we seek, but also the time to develop those amendments and positions

on those amendments, as it is appropriate for the American public to understand the perspectives of the parties and of the individuals offering amendments.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. Just one clarification. I do not know of any Member of this House who has offered a proposal that would eliminate Medicare. I do not believe that either committee will be moving a proposal that would eliminate Medicare.

Our goal is a very clear and simple one: it is to make the Medicare program as efficient as we possibly can to ensure that our seniors have the best quality health care and access to affordable prescription drugs. So I just wanted to make it clear that I do not know of any proposal to eliminate Medicare.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that. I think we have made our point. I do hope that the chairman, although we may differ on intents, but in any event, I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, nobody has introduced something like that. Nobody has been so bold as to introduce a specific proposal, although many have been bold enough to discuss that objective and result, I say to my friend from California. Some have been that bold to discuss that result, if not introducing such a bill.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

On the appropriation bills, again, this is a concern that we have, because we have heard some discussions, Mr. Leader, about having restrained rules for appropriations. As the gentleman knows, more often than not, when we were in the majority, we brought many appropriation bills to the floor without a rule. As the gentleman knows, under the rules, appropriation bills do not need a rule.

Can the gentleman tell me what the majority contemplates for appropriation bills as they come to the floor and the rules that they may be coming to the floor under?

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows and has stated, we do have a tradition of having open rules for consideration of appropriations measures. I do not know what discussions the gentleman is referring to. This side has had no discussions that I am aware of about what the rules would look like on appropriations. I would hope that we would continue the tradition of open rules on appropriations; but obviously, we do have to look at all of these bills on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's

assertion of what we have done in the past and that he hopes we can continue to do that.

The intelligence authorization, when does the gentleman believe that that would be coming up? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that it is quite possible that the intelligence reauthorization bill would come on Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I saw a grimace, and I thought I would give time for communication between the people who know what is going on like our staff here and the gentleman and myself.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the source of my intelligence says it is probably Wednesday.

Mr. HOYER. Okay. Fine.

The MSA bill. When does the gentleman expect that? We are trying to get sort of the flow of bills so we can be prepared. The Medicare bill we assume is going to come late Wednesday and Thursday, and then these other bills will come earlier. The MSA bill, when does the gentleman think that will come?

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the Health Savings Accountability Act we would hope to get to sometime next week, but this is a bill that is just being marked up, I think today; and we do have a very ambitious schedule for next week, and we just wanted to warn the Members that the Health Savings Accountability Act could very well be brought up, if we can find time next week to do so. But the other list of major pieces of legislation will take priority over that, and we hope to get to it; but I really cannot say what day we might get to it.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader.

Now, Mr. Leader, one of the things I was very concerned about in hearing the schedule, it has now been just short of 7 days that we passed the child tax credit legislation that many of us have expressed real concern about. We went to conference that same day, as the gentleman knows.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not the conference is meeting? Can the gentleman tell me whether we expect to consider a conference report so that prior to July the 6.5 million families and the 12 million children that were left out when it came out of conference might be helped? Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is either the conference proceeding or whether or not there is any expectation that we will take a conference report up on the floor next week prior to going home for the July 4th break? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding; and as the gentleman knows, we are very excited about extending the \$1,000 per

child tax credit beyond 2005, to extend it to 2010. Rather than leaving out refundable tax credits, those that are getting refundable tax credits will continue to get them. They just will not get the full \$1,000 unless we are able to pass this bill.

□ 1730

And we are also very excited about the fact that the House put many tax provisions tax relief for our military and military families. And we are very excited about the fact that we gave some tax relief to those families that lost their loved ones in the shuttle accident. So we are very interested in getting this bill done as quickly as possible.

I am sure the gentleman knows that the other body just went to conference yesterday and, therefore, we are discussing how we can do this conference and, hopefully, do it before the Fourth of July district work period. However, the other body also is very much engaged in the debate over their Medicare bill, which ties up their finance committee and ties up those Members that would be serving on the conference committee. So we are trying to work that out, and we hope that we can call a conference and come to some sort of agreement on this bill and have it out before the Fourth of July.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that information. I also thank him for his excitement and because he is so excited about passing this, I want to tell him, and I say this very seriously on behalf of our leader, the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and myself, we are prepared to give you unanimous consent to take the Senate bill from the desk, put it on the floor and pass it by unanimous consent. We were excited about it, too. But much more than being excited about it, we think it is an essential act of fairness to assist some of the neediest working tax-paying families in America who were left on the cutting room floor when it came out of conference. And if you share, as I think you do, or at least you express that excitement and enthusiasm for accomplishing that objective, we may not be able to accomplish everything. But we can accomplish some things. And we ought not to have everything fail or some things fail because we could not do everything.

And I say very sincerely to the leader, on our side, we are prepared to give unanimous consent on Monday night, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Friday or Saturday or as long as we want to stay here next week for the purposes of passing that, so those families who were included but cut out in the conference would be included and would participate in the advantages under the tax bill that has already been signed by the President.

Mr. DELAY. I greatly appreciate the gentleman's generous offer, but I remind the gentleman that that Senate bill has nothing on it that would give tax relief to our fighting men and

women and their families. And that particular provision passed this House and has been sitting over in the Senate for a very, very long time. It is a provision that had huge support in this House. And along with giving working families their \$1,000 per child tax credit and extending it to 2004, rather than what the gentleman is suggesting, allowing it to go away in 2005, giving the working families that you have such concern for only 2 years of benefits, we think they ought to get the benefits permanently, but if we cannot get it permanently, we would like those benefits to be until 2010.

So if we just take up the Senate bill, they may enjoy it for 1 or 2 years, but then it goes away in 2005. We think they ought to be able to count on it until 2010, and we think military families ought to have the tax relief they deserve.

Mr. HOYER. I will tell you, Mr. Leader, very seriously that these 6½ million families, these 12 million children will, frankly, not understand that the perfect of what you just spoke was the enemy of the extraordinarily good, which is included in the Senate bill. And I will tell the gentleman further, during the Senate bill, unlike the bill that we passed in the House, the men and women in combat who fall within the income constraints which were covered in the Senate bill were not covered in the House bill. And while we certainly agree with you on helping all of the military who qualify, we certainly believe that the folks in combat whose combat pay is now counted against them for qualifications under this bill, would be helped by the Senate bill. So I think we could help the men and women in combat first.

And I will tell you also, Mr. Leader, we are prepared to offer unanimous consent for a companion know bill as we pass the Senate bill to fix the problem or address the problem of which you have spoken with reference to the military. But we ought not to, Mr. Leader, with all due sincerity, if we are excited, if we believe this is an important thing to do, if you wanted to make it permanent, you could have done so, of course, you did not make it permanent. You did it 5 more years than we did it. We were in the constraints of the Senate bill.

We would like to make it permanent as well. However, what we would not like to do is have July come and there be no relief for these families which is going to happen if the perfect, if the objective of doing everything defeats us in doing something.

Mr. DELAY. I just cannot let the gentleman get away by scaring working families in this country by saying they will get no relief. That is entirely untrue.

In the bill that we passed and signed by the President in 2001, it gave these working families refundable tax credits. It just did not, what we are discussing is accelerating 2 years up to this year and giving them an addi-

tional \$400 from this, in addition to the \$600 that they are already receiving. So to say that they get no relief, I think, is just untrue. And to say that the military families are not covered by the bill passed by this House is also untrue, because military families are covered by the bill passed by this House and is presently in conference.

Mr. HOYER. Well, the bill passed, I think we disagree on some of the information, Mr. Leader, that you have just said. I do not think you are accurate on some of that information, but be that as it may.

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman will yield, I am not accurate that since 2001 working families have been receiving refundable tax credit?

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is accurate on that. As you know, in the Senate bill, we increased from 10 to 15 percent the credit that would be available to them. That was dropped, as you know, in the conference.

Mr. DELAY. Were they not to receive that 15 percent starting in 2005?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. And we were talking about accelerating the 15 percent to 2003?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. DELAY. Which is in the House bill sitting in conference right now.

Mr. HOYER. The House bill has not been taken up, Mr. Leader. It is very nice to say and, reclaiming my time, that it is in the House bill. It is permanent in the House bill. We do a lot of things in the House bill. On our side, we did not believe the House bill was going to be taken up, and we said that, which is why we said we ought to take up the Senate bill and pass it and do something, even though we were not doing everything, and we still maintain that position. And as I am reminded, and I would remind the leader, this House voted to instruct the conferees to take the Senate bill.

So we are simply giving unanimous consent to do what the House has already voted on that same day last Thursday to do, and that is, pass the Senate bill. That is what we instructed the conferees to do. So it is not as if we are asking for something that the House has not voted on to do and to accelerate the passage of this legislation so we can help these families.

Mr. DELAY. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is correct. The motion instructed the House to accept the Senate bill in a small margin in doing that. Unfortunately, the Senate does not agree with our motion to instruct. And as the gentleman knows, it is not binding anyway. The Senate decided to go to conference. They could have and they decided to work out the differences between the House and the Senate, and those conferees will be meeting hopefully next week and produce a bill that will give much needed relief to families in this country.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, I hope we are not going to

give people the impression that a body that passed a bill 94 to 2 would not agree to us passing their bill because, frankly, I do not think that is the case.

I understand what you are saying, and I understand that they have been told you are not going to take the Senate bill; and, therefore, they need to go to conference. So they are bowing to practicality. What I am saying is we ought to bow to needs and to practicality and pass the bill. And I am saying to you that we can give you and will give you unanimous consent to do exactly that so that these folks can get that which they will not get, and that is, the additional payment which was provided for in the conference but not reported out of the conference, and, therefore, we are going to leave 200,000 armed services personnel not advantaged as others were in the bill.

We are going to leave 6½ million families with 12 million children not advantaged, as was the intent of the Senate, and I think most of the House.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 23, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

---

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

---

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Resources:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
June 19, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Resources.

I appreciate the opportunity to serve you and Chairman POMBO.

Sincerely,

ADAM H. PUTNAM,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.