

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 386, nays 0, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 486]

YEAS—386

Abercrombie	Dicks	Kennedy (RI)
Aderholt	Dingell	Kildee
Akin	Doggett	Kind
Alexander	Dooley (CA)	King (IA)
Allen	Doolittle	Kingston
Andrews	Doyle	Kirk
Baca	Dreier	Klecza
Bachus	Duncan	Kline
Baird	Edwards	Knollenberg
Baker	Ehlers	Kolbe
Baldwin	Emerson	Kucinich
Barrett (SC)	Engel	LaHood
Bartlett (MD)	English	Lampson
Barton (TX)	Eshoo	Langevin
Bass	Etheridge	Lantos
Beauprez	Evans	Larsen (WA)
Becerra	Everett	Larson (CT)
Bell	Farr	Latham
Berkley	Fattah	LaTourette
Berman	Feeney	Leach
Berry	Ferguson	Lee
Biggart	Filner	Levin
Bilirakis	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Forbes	Lewis (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Ford	Lewis (KY)
Bishop (UT)	Fossella	Linder
Blackburn	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Blumenauer	Franks (AZ)	Lofgren
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Boehner	Frost	Lucas (OK)
Bonilla	Galleghy	Lynch
Bonner	Garrett (NJ)	Majette
Bono	Gephardt	Maloney
Boozman	Gerlach	Manzullo
Boucher	Gibbons	Markey
Boyd	Gilchrest	Marshall
Bradley (NH)	Gillmor	Matheson
Brady (PA)	Gingrey	Matsui
Brown (OH)	Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)
Brown (SC)	Goode	McCarthy (NY)
Brown-Waite,	Goodlatte	McCotter
Ginny	Gordon	McCrery
Burgess	Granger	McDermott
Burns	Graves	McGovern
Burr	Green (TX)	McHugh
Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McInnis
Butterfield	Grijalva	McIntyre
Buyer	Gutierrez	McKeon
Calvert	Hall	McNulty
Camp	Harris	Meehan
Cantor	Hart	Mica
Capito	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Capuano	Hayworth	Millender-
Cardin	Hensarling	McDonald
Cardoza	Herger	Miller (FL)
Carson (IN)	Herseth	Miller (MI)
Carson (OK)	Hill	Miller (NC)
Carter	Hinchey	Miller, George
Case	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Castle	Hobson	Moore
Chabot	Hoeffel	Moran (KS)
Chandler	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Chocola	Holden	Murphy
Clay	Holt	Musgrave
Clyburn	Honda	Myrick
Coble	Hooley (OR)	Nadler
Cole	Hostettler	Napolitano
Collins	Houghton	Neal (MA)
Conyers	Hoyer	Neugebauer
Cooper	Hulshof	Ney
Costello	Hyde	Northup
Cox	Inslee	Norwood
Cramer	Isakson	Nunes
Crane	Israel	Nussle
Crenshaw	Issa	Obey
Crowley	Istook	Ortiz
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Osborne
Culberson	Jackson-Lee	Ose
Cummings	(TX)	Otter
Cunningham	Jefferson	Owens
Davis (AL)	Jenkins	Oxley
Davis (CA)	John	Pallone
Davis (FL)	Johnson (IL)	Pascarell
Davis (TN)	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson, Sam	Paul
DeFazio	Jones (NC)	Payne
DeGette	Jones (OH)	Pearce
Delahunt	Kanjorski	Pelosi
DeLauro	Kaptur	Pence
DeLay	Keller	Peterson (MN)
DeMint	Kelly	Petri
Deutsch	Kennedy (MN)	Pickering

Pitts	Schiff	Thompson (MS)
Platts	Schrock	Thornberry
Pombo	Scott (GA)	Tiahrt
Pomeroy	Scott (VA)	Tiberi
Porter	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Portman	Serrano	Toomey
Price (NC)	Sessions	Towns
Pryce (OH)	Shadegg	Turner (OH)
Putnam	Shaw	Turner (TX)
Quinn	Shays	Udall (CO)
Radanovich	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Rahall	Sherwood	Upton
Ramstad	Shuster	Van Hollen
Regula	Simmons	Velázquez
Rehberg	Simpson	Visclosky
Renzi	Skeltton	Vitter
Reynolds	Slaughter	Walden (OR)
Rodriguez	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wamp
Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Waters
Rohrabacher	Smith (WA)	Watson
Ross	Snyder	Watt
Rothman	Solis	Waxman
Roybal-Allard	Souder	Weiner
Royce	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Ruppersberger	Stearns	Weldon (PA)
Rush	Stenholm	Weller
Ryan (OH)	Strickland	Wexler
Ryan (WI)	Stupak	Whitfield
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Wicker
Sabo	Tancredo	Wilson (NM)
Sánchez, Linda	Tanner	Wilson (SC)
T.	Tauscher	Wolf
Sanchez, Loretta	Taylor (MS)	Woolsey
Sanders	Taylor (NC)	Wu
Sandlin	Terry	Wynn
Saxton	Thomas	Young (AK)
Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—46

Ackerman	Greenwood	Miller, Gary
Ballenger	Gutknecht	Murtha
Boehlert	Harman	Nethercutt
Boswell	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Brady (TX)	Hayes	Olver
Brown, Corrine	Hefley	Peterson (PA)
Cannon	Hunter	Rangel
Capps	Johnson (CT)	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kilpatrick	Rogers (MI)
Davis, Tom	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal (GA)	Lipinski	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (KY)	Stark
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCollum	Sullivan
Dunn	Meek (FL)	Tauzin
Emanuel	Meeks (NY)	
Foley	Menendez	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1740

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, for the purpose of informing us of the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. Speaker, next week 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. We may also consider one or more motions to go to conference. Any votes called on those measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, it is likely that we will consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules. We also expect to consider three bills under a rule: S. 878, the Bankruptcy Judgeship Act; H.R. 5107, the Justice For All Act; and H.R. 10, the 9/11 Commission Implementation Act.

In addition, there are a number of potential conference reports that we are working through, including several appropriations bills, the American Jobs Creation Act, and the Department of Defense Authorization bill. Members should be aware that these conference reports may be brought to the floor at any time next week.

Finally, I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that we are expecting to consider a second supplemental request for disaster relief sometime next week. We may have additional requests resulting from Hurricane Jeanne, so we are working through these requests and trying to figure out how best to address these needs.

Obviously, we are expecting a very busy week. Members should expect to work some late nights and possibly into Friday evening or Saturday as we resolve these important pieces of legislation.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for the information. I want to assure the leader, as he says we ought to be, that the Members on this side are, in fact, prepared to spend the time necessary to address the important issues, as the leader requests. And I want to assure the leader of our cooperation in being ready to do our work.

Mr. Leader, initially, may I ask, the motions to instruct, can the gentleman give us a time when those might occur, and will they occur relatively close to the votes, the suspension votes at the end of the day? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. As the gentleman knows, we have three appropriations bills that are out there that are eligible for motions to instruct. I do not know of any others. They are available when those Members want to bring a motion to instruct, and we are trying to fit them in as best we can during the week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the leader for that information.

Mr. Leader, as all of us know, today is the end of the current fiscal year, and 12 of the 13 2005 appropriation bills have not been passed. We do not have a budget. The new fiscal year starts tomorrow. The highway program is still pending. We extended that for 8 months. The FSC bill, which is subjecting businesses in the country doing

business in Europe to an additional 11 percent tariff is still not passed. The energy bill, obviously we have not gotten to at this point in time. We have not enacted legislation on the intelligence apparatus, although I understand the 9/11 Commission Implementation Act that the gentleman speaks to.

Mr. Leader, on that, might I ask this question: there is a bill in the Senate and there is a bill that has been introduced in the House that mirrors essentially the 9/11 Commission report. Is that the bill to which the gentleman is referring, or the bill that is in the process apparently of being marked up and, apparently, at some point in time, will be put together to come to the floor? Which of those three alternatives does the gentleman refer to? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. The gentleman touched on many issues; I will take the 9/11 Commission Implementation Act first.

I do not agree with the gentleman's characterization of the Senate bill, because what I have seen in the Senate and what they are debating nowhere mirrors the 9/11 Commission Report or all of its recommendations.

□ 1745

The bill being marked up by the House all of this week does mirror every recommendation by the 9/11 Commission in one way or another, and that is why it has taken us longer to get it through all our 12 committees. It is going to take us a little longer to get it to the floor. I expect that, looking at all the work that needs to be done in order to bring that bill to the floor, we would have to pass that bill sometime next week, probably at the end of the week. I believe there is a good chance that the Senate could pass their version even this week.

Assuming that both bodies pass next week, I would expect that we could appoint conferees next week and work towards completing a conference report as soon as possible. In planning their schedules, Members should know that a conference report could be completed later in October, and that if it was completed, the House would certainly come back and vote on it.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, on that last point, I have heard a rumor or discussion about the possibility of coming back on November 1, the day before the election to vote on the conference report. Can the majority leader tell me whether there is any merit to that speculation? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman informing me of rumors, but that is a rumor that I have not yet heard nor has anyone discussed such a thing. I would hope that the conference committee could go to work immediately and complete this as soon as possible. It is important.

The conference report, as it comes out, I am sure will have many reforms that need to be implemented to keep

the American people and American families safer, and we want to get it out as quickly as possible.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the leader's assertion of wanting to keep America safe, and I think that he speaks for 435 of us in that regard. He certainly speaks for me, but I think he speaks for all of us.

In that vein, as I indicated to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) two weeks ago, as I indicated to the gentleman last week, while we apparently have a difference of opinion on the Senate bill, which is introduced here in a bipartisan fashion on this side of the Capitol, I believe that we have overwhelming support on this side for that proposition. In light of the fact that we are interested, as the gentleman says, in protecting America and implementing this legislation in as timely a fashion as possible, might it not be in pursuit of that objective advisable to allow that bill to be on the floor either in lieu of the bill that, frankly, has been marked up by my colleague's party exclusively?

I have talked to all of our ranking members on the committees that the gentleman talked to. All of them believe they have been informed of what was going on, but they were not participants in the drafting of the legislation. As a result, there may be greater contention than would be hopefully called for if, in fact, we want to pass the legislation as quickly as possible.

In addition, it is my understanding that there are substantial differences between the Senate bill and the House bill, which may require a very long conference, rather than short conference, if we do not pass something that is relatively compatible in the first instance.

I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brings up many issues.

First and foremost, I do not know if the gentleman has been advised, but I would refer the gentleman to the votes of the committees that have been marking up this bill. If I do recall exactly what the vote was, it was a very bipartisan effort. I think and I hope that the bill that is coming to the House floor is very strongly supported by both sides.

In the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for instance, I think there was a 17-to-2 vote in passing that bill out. Now, 17 to two tells me that most of the Democrats and most of the Republicans voted for that bill. So I am very encouraged by the markups that we are having and the kind of support that the Democrats and Republicans are showing for the product that is being put together.

Having said that, the gentleman may support the bill that came out of the Senate committee. I looked at it. I think it is woefully lacking in sufficient reforms, particularly in immigration policy, border security, law enforcement. It basically is a bill that creates a national intelligence director

and a counterterrorism center. There is more to protecting the American people than creating a new bureaucracy and keeping our borders safe, giving our law enforcement officials more tools to go after terrorists. There are many things that we need to be doing.

Having said that, the bill the gentleman refers to may not be the bill that comes out of the Senate because I have been informed that there are over 100 amendments, 100 amendments, filed for the debate in the other body. So who knows what that bill is going to look like when it comes out of the other body, and I think it would be highly irresponsible for this House to pick up something that came out of the Senate committee and bring it down here on the floor, unseen by most Members and not worked on by our committees, and just vote on it, up and down. I do not think that keeps the American people safer.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will simply observe that although the votes may have been bipartisan, and I will tell my colleague very honestly, there is no confusion over here on the timing of this bill. The gentleman expects Democrats to either vote for it or to be attacked about being against protecting the American people if they vote against it. We went through the creation of a bureaucracy, the Homeland Security Department. I voted against it. I think it was not what was needed. What was needed was the coordination of information. I said that at the time.

The commission in a bipartisan way has said that is what is needed. We still know that there is not the kind of coordination of information gathering, analysis and recommendation for implementation of action based upon the information gathered that we would like to have. The 9/11 Commission found that.

Furthermore, the 9/11 Commission, as I understand it, has indicated support of the Senate bill as it came out of committee.

Now, there are obviously a lot of other things that need to be dealt with, including items that are either in the PATRIOT Act or could have been in the PATRIOT Act. Those items in some respects are very controversial. One of the problems, very frankly, that we have found in getting legislation passed, as the gentleman knows, in a relatively short period of time has been the addition of very controversial items, not necessarily related directly to what the 9/11 Commission had recommended, and because of the controversial nature of those additions, as it has occurred in other legislation, will slow that legislation down.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman obviously did not read the 9/11 Commission recommendations because many of those recommendations were very general in nature, very unspecific. Yet, we took their recommendations in those areas and did actual detailed pieces of

legislation, much beyond what the 9/11 Commission even envisioned because they did not have the expertise to recommend specific items.

It is unfortunate the gentleman questions my motive, but I must tell the gentleman that ever since the 9/11 Commission has come out we have reached out to any Democrat who is willing to work on this issue. Those Democrats that have been willing to work on those issues, we have been working with them, and I have not been privy to every discussion or every meeting on this issue, particularly within the committees, but I think if my colleague will go back and check with his ranking members, those who wanted to work on the legislation were more than just informed. They have a very big part to play, particularly in the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on International Relations. So we worked with the willing Democrats that wanted to work on this issue rather than to have a political issue, and they had a very big part to play in it. I think that is reflected in the kinds of votes we are getting coming out of committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his response, and let me assure the gentleman I did not think I questioned the gentleman's motives. I may question the results of actions we take, but I do not intend to question the majority leader's motives in any event. I do not think that would be appropriate nor do I do it, and if the gentleman took it to be that, I apologize because I do not question. I may have different motives of my own and I may not agree with him, but I do not question his motives. I may question his judgment. I may question that which is for or against but not his motives.

I am not going to prolong the discussion on this because we are going to have discussion about this next week, but I would like to make one example of something that we feel strongly about that the 9/11 Commission felt strongly about, which the bill at least that we have seen does not deal with.

One of the concerns which the Commission had was that we are not moving quickly enough or effectively enough to identify and to secure materials which could be used for the production of or creation of nuclear weapons, even dirty bombs. The Commission spoke to that directly. The Senate bill speaks to that, and the bill introduced in the House speaks to that, at least at the point yesterday, and I am not sure whether markups have occurred in committees. I guess, some committees, the answer to that is yes; some no, but that was not addressed. So, at least in that one instance, and I have got about 15 others but I am not going to prolong and go through those, that was not addressed in the gentleman's bill, while some other things that the commission did not deal with are addressed, and I understand my colleague's observation.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, first of all, I do not

think this is a proper forum to debate the bill, and I am not prepared to debate the bill.

I have not personally been able to go over the volumes of work that has been done by 12 committees. So the provision that the gentleman may be speaking to, all I can tell him is that I remember in the list of things that were presented to me a day or so ago, it did address that very issue. I can go back and look at it, but the gentleman will have plenty of opportunity during the debate of this bill to debate the bill up or down, to amend it, to substitute for it, and the gentleman knows he can go before the Committee on Rules and ask for that kind of action.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leader's advice that I have the opportunity to go before the Committee on Rules. I always enjoy the opportunity to go and testify before the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and his committee.

Let me move on to some other legislation. I mentioned a number of pieces that we have not done, Defense Department authorization, I mentioned, and the Higher Education Act. My question, does the gentleman anticipate that we will leave next Friday or Saturday having accomplished some or all of those pieces of legislation?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield and repeat all the legislation he is talking about?

Mr. HOYER. Sure. We have 12 of the 13 appropriation bills we have not passed. We have not passed a budget. Highway program has not passed. The FSC bill has not passed, resulting in 11 percent additional tariffs to people. The energy bill has not passed. The Intelligence bill, we have been talking about, Defense authorization and the Higher Education Act. None of those have been done to this point.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I think I addressed in my opening remarks the Defense authorization conference. We are hoping to get that out.

The highway bill I think has been debated or talked about a lot on this floor in the last couple of days. The House is ready to go. The House is ready to negotiate with the Senate, and the House has cleaned out a lot of the brush, but it seems that the Senate is going to have a very hard time getting their members in the conference committee to support a highway bill. So that is why we did the extension today on 8 months to give them more time to work.

The FSC/jobs bill, the conferees met on that bill last night. It was a very good conference. Democrats were certainly included, and we have scheduled another meeting for next Tuesday. I believe there is a good chance that a conference report could be ready for the House to vote on later at the end of next week.

□ 1800

The appropriations process, the gentleman being on the Committee on Appropriations, knows very well, as he stated, that we passed 12 of the 13 bills. The thirteenth bill has problems. We know there is going to be an omnibus bill, and we will solve those problems in an omnibus bill, but the problem is in the other body. They are passing as many bills as they can get done, and we will go to conference on every one of those bills to try to get them done before the end of next week. That would include Homeland Security appropriation, MilCon, Foreign Ops, the Legislative Branch, and D.C., which are the only ones I know of that the Senate has passed so far.

The rest, as the gentleman knows, we did a continuing resolution until November 20. We have instructed our committees, and the Senate leadership has instructed their committees to work on those as best they can so that, when we get back in November, the Members can vote on those bills up or down.

The higher education bill, right now, I am not advised where it is, so I cannot answer the gentleman on that one.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time once again, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate, A, the majority leader's taking the time to go through those and letting us know where he thinks they may be and whether we will address them next week.

Additionally, when we leave next Friday or Saturday, can the leader tell us, for scheduling purposes, and I know we are going to have the leader's organizational meeting, I think we will schedule our organizational meeting the same week, but is it your view that we will have a lame duck session on November 15 or November 16 and days thereafter?

I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, that is still hard to say. I can answer that question better at the end of next week. I am still hoping, against all odds, that the appropriations process could be done. Willing people coming together can get a lot of things done in a very short period of time around here. It is just a matter of finding the willing people to get it done, and we are still working on it. It could happen. Lightning could strike. And if it does, then we would not have to come back in a lame duck.

Obviously, the appropriations process is the most important. And if we cannot get all the appropriations done, then I would anticipate having a lame duck sometime in that week that both parties are organizing.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think the leader is right. I think for that to happen lightning is going to have to strike.

Lastly, Mr. Leader, we talked about the intelligence bill being on the floor next week. Can the minority be assured that we will have a substitute for that bill? The gentleman indicated there are 100 amendments pending on the Senate

floor. This is a very important piece of legislation, obviously. The bipartisan commission has spoken to this.

I have read the report, by the way. I think it is an excellent report. We are very hopeful that we not only will have the opportunity to amend any and all sections of the bill, but that we will have the opportunity to offer a substitute, not just simply a motion to recommit, but a substitute at the appropriate time. I would hope that the leader, given the importance of this legislation, would assure the minority that we would have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As the gentleman knows, the chairman of the Committee on Rules is sitting here. I think he is going to make an announcement about amendments and substitutes.

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, and I appreciate his request. The announcement I am going to be making in just a few minutes, as soon as the colloquy between the distinguished minority whip and the distinguished majority leader is completed, is one which will call for the establishment of new Federal judgeships.

At this juncture, probably on Monday, we will likely be making an announcement as we anticipate the work product that will be emerging on the 9/11 report.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the majority leader and to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, this legislation was introduced less than a week ago. It has been marked up this week. It will be on the floor next week. That is a very rapid progression.

I think, Mr. Leader, respectfully, that that calls for even greater opportunity for Members to work their will on the floor, with the ability to offer such amendments as they deem to be appropriate and would include the opportunity to offer an entire package in the form of a substitute. I would hope that that would happen.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2004, TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2004

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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO S. 878, ADDITIONAL PERMANENT JUDGESHIP IN THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of October 4, as I was just saying, to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of S. 878, a bill to create additional Federal court judgeships. The Committee on the Judiciary ordered the bill reported on September 9, 2004, and filed its report with the House on September 29, 2004.

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 2 p.m. on Monday, October 4. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which is available for their review on the Web sites of both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules.

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 sure their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

CONGRATULATIONS TO LINDA THEIL ON HER RETIREMENT

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Linda Theil on her retirement from 33 years of public service as a staff member in the House of Representatives.

When I was just starting my first term in Congress in 1993, Linda came to my staff. Her expertise and vast knowledge of education policy have been invaluable to me as a Member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. She has worked on legislation, including the Child Nutrition Act, the School Breakfast Pilot Program, Head Start, the Balancing Act, and Welfare Reform, to name only a few.

Mr. Speaker, Linda Theil is the role model for what every single staff mem-

ber should be, dedicated, hardworking, caring and devoted. Her presence will be missed but not forgotten.

Thank you, congratulations, and best wishes, Linda.

GLOBAL WARMING

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, there are two very significant things which happened today regarding global warming. The first is that the U.S. Department of Commerce's Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory in Princeton, New Jersey, announced that they had completed the largest computer simulation of what will happen in global warming and how it will affect hurricanes. They concluded that the seas being warmed by rising atmospheric concentration of gases will result in a typical hurricane intensity increasing about an extra half step on the five-step scale.

This is not good news, Mr. Speaker, particularly since our Nation, under this administration, is not doing anything significant to deal with global warming.

In contrast, interestingly, today, Russia and their parliament indicated that it is likely they will join the Kyoto Protocol to deal with global warming. This is a difficulty for our businesses if this becomes a worldwide regime and we are not part of the international effort.

We hope tonight there will be some discussion of this. And if not, one way or another, this November, Americans will vote for a president who will decide to take some action on global warming.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

SMART SECURITY AND GLOBAL CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, in the days and weeks after September 11, 2001, Americans pulled together to restore our country after the worst terrorist attack in United States history. For the rest of September that year, there were no Democrats, there were no Republicans, there were only Americans.

In those trying times in the fall of the year 2001, I believe that no American would have hesitated to make a substantial sacrifice for the good of the country, just as Americans have done