

Every one of you who has ever worked paid Medicare taxes. The money is supposed to be set aside to help pay your health care bills when you get older. If you could find the so-called lock box, all you are going to find is an IOU for \$263 billion, a thousand times a thousand times a thousand times 263. That is your money that they have taken and stolen, because it is borrowed if they have a plan to pay it back, but if you have no plan to pay it back, and there is no plan to pay it back, it is stolen.

Mr. Speaker, you have now been speaker for 1,355 days and you will not let this House vote to balance the budget. You will not allow a vote on a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution, and you do not deserve to be speaker, but the American people deserve to know the truth.

#### LONELY IN THE QUEST FOR PEACE

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. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the well of the House is lonely in both appearance and the substance of which one comes to speak. Today I speak about a matter that has troubled me from the time that the first pronouncements came from the White House as we moved toward the summer recess and then went home to our respective districts to be with our constituents and to listen to their viewpoints and to do their bidding; from that moment in June, I stood on the floor of the House and asked for concern and reconciliation on issues dealing with Iraq. In February of 2001 I stood on the floor to ask that we not abandon the crisis in the Mideast and, to my dismay, for 9 months, there was no attention to the proliferation of suicide bombings and killings, and even in the last 24 hours tragedy occurred in the State of Israel, our friend, with the suicide bombing. The war of terrorism still wages in Afghanistan, and President Karzai is depending upon the United States remaining strong and fighting against terrorism, building the Nation, helping the men and women and children that want democracy in Afghanistan. Based on the resolution that I supported after the terrorist acts, the horrific acts, and my own personal visit to Afghanistan visiting with the people, walking the streets, seeing the landmines and the devastation, I remain committed to fighting terrorism.

But it costs \$1 billion a month, and we realize that the horrific act, as we have just seen, that occurred on September 11 occurred because we needed to do some things better, intelligence-sharing and information, and I hope that the families will get the truth.

But now we come with a pronouncement that we are prepared to make a unilateral attack on Iraq. As I read the

resolution that the President has now offered to us, there are some things that I agree with, that Iraq persists in violating resolutions of the United Nations Security Council by continuing to engage in brutal repression of the civilian population. I agree. Whereas members of al Qaeda as organizations being housed, or the responsibility for attacks in the United States may be known to Iraq, I agree. But they may be known as well to Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

We must realize that in this determination, we are better, as Americans, if we work through this process through reconciliations and the United Nations Security Council. What are we to do when nations around the world disturb us? Is it our responsibility to, on behalf of the American people, send our young men and women into harm on a unilateral basis? Are we to continue operating on a deficit where there is no money to wage war without substance?

I ask the President, as this resolution is sent forward, let us sit down at the table and really enunciate a policy that brings no shame to this Nation. For there are no wimps in this Nation; not a one of us would shy away from a fight to defend this land. I may not be in a position to go, but you could ask any one of us who would accept to go, but those young men and women are already on the frontline. I have seen them. I have seen the body bags in Afghanistan. Those of us who know history know how we left the marine troops in Lebanon where 200-plus died. Those of us who know history know about Vietnam and the body bags, 56,000 that came home.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intent to argue against an administration that wants to do what is right for America; I want to follow the Constitution that says this body must declare war.

This resolution in its language allows the President the opportunity to do unilateral attack on Iraq with no support from our multinational allies and to do a preemptive attack. I will go home this weekend to hold a citizens forum to listen to the constituents of the 18th congressional district. Whoever is hearing my voice, I ask you to join around kitchen tables, PTA meetings, churches and synagogues and mosques. Begin the discussion. Do not be acted upon. This is America.

Mr. Speaker, though this is a lonely place, I would much rather stand here today on September 19, 2002 and raise my voice, for I will never forget Secretary MacNamara's words post the Vietnam War: he wished he had said something. He wished he had stood up. He wished he was counted against a war that may not have been what we all thought it could have been; not against those heroes who died, Mr. Speaker, we will always respect the Vietnam vets, but I will come to this well lonely so that we can hear the truth and that peace will survive.

#### FREE SPEECH FOR AMERICA'S RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full hour, but as we are talking about our men and women in uniform, and I want to join with the gentlewoman from Texas, that we are very fortunate to have the men and women who serve this Nation, and God bless them, and also the families of those who serve this Nation, the men that serve this Nation and the women, that we do appreciate them. That is really one of the reasons I am on the floor today, because I do appreciate and I cherish the First Amendment right of the Constitution of the United States of America, and I know that many men and women have died for that right and other rights that we enjoy based on our Constitution.

But the reason I am here, Mr. Speaker, is because our churches and synagogues are denied the First Amendment rights to talk about issues such as political issues. Well, some people might not know the history, and the history is this, that from day one of the beginning of this Nation, the preachers and priests have had the freedom to talk about political issues and actually had that freedom until 1954. If this was 1953, Mr. Speaker, I would not even be on the floor, because there would be no problem. The churches had freedom of speech until 1954.

In 1954, Lyndon Baines Johnson, United States Senator and majority leader, a very strong position that he held in the United States Senate, had the H.L. Hunt family back in Texas opposed to his reelection because they were saying that Johnson was soft on communism. So the H.L. Hunt family had established 2501(c)(3) think tanks, obviously not churches, but think tanks. So Johnson, being the man that he was, put an amendment on a revenue bill going through the Senate in 1954 that was never even debated; they never debated the amendment. Basically what he said was if you are a 501(c)(3), you may not have political speech.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes sincerely that the strength of this Nation depends on our spiritual leaders having the right of free speech, whether it be a political issue that they think is important or whether it should be a moral issue that is somewhat political. What Mr. JOHNSON did was to give the authority to the Internal Revenue Service to be able to say what can be said and not said as it relates to political issues of the day.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe sincerely that the moral future of this country depends on our religious leaders having the freedom to talk about issues, should they choose.

Let me give an example. A priest in my district, the third district of North Carolina, was asked by a parishioner who is a friend of mine, his name is Jerry Shield, Jerry Shield asked the priest in October of 2000 during the presidential election, he asked his priest, Father Rudy at St. Paul's in New Bern, North Carolina, he said, Father, please just make the statement at the end of the mass that George Bush is pro-life.

Mr. Speaker, that is not an endorsement. It is a statement, it is an educational statement for those parishioners that attended that church.

□ 1645

The priest said to Jerry Shield, I cannot do that, Jerry, because it will violate the 501(c)(3) status of this church.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2357, the Houses of Worship Free Speech Protection Act. I am pleased to tell the Members that the support that we have from leaders around this Nation is really quite humbling, to be honest; people like Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention; James Dobson, president of Focus on the Family; David Barton, director of the Wallbuilders; James Martin, the 60 Plus Association; Tim and Beverly LaHaye, and we all know their fine work; and Concerned Women for America; also, the Family Research Council; the Religious Freedom Coalition, they support this legislation; also, David Keene, who is chairman of the American Conservative Union.

Dr. D. James Kennedy, one of the finest men I have ever met, from the Coral Ridge Ministries, is a strong supporter of this legislation.

Another man that I have great respect for, along with all the others that I have named, is Ray Flynn. Ray Flynn is the former ambassador to the Vatican and former Mayor of Boston, Massachusetts. Mr. Flynn supports this legislation; also, a man that I have really gotten to know by telephone who I have a tremendous respect for, Rabbi Daniel Lapin. He is a wonderful man of God, and he supports this legislation; and James Bopp, the constitutional lawyer for the James Madison Center for Free Speech. He is a strong supporter of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I have this enlargement of a letter that I received, it is from a fine man who was a Member of Congress my first year, 1995. Floyd Flake was a Member of the Congress. He is an ordained minister, as well. I talked to him about 4 or 5 months ago. I told Dr. Flake what I was trying to do: I was just trying to get the support to return the freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues. We chatted for a while, and he said, Congressman, I would be glad to write a letter of support.

I just want to read two paragraphs from this letter:

"I praise God for the stand that you have taken to defend the first amendment right of houses of worship. It is

unjust that churches and clergymen and women are unfairly targeted when they exercise their right as an American citizen. I am pleased to offer my wholehearted support with sincere prayer for passage of this important and liberating legislation."

I am very honored and pleased to have Dr. Flake support this and certainly to have his letter of support for what we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, it so happened that on May 15, the oversight committee, chaired by the gentleman from New York (Chairman HOUGHTON), held a hearing on this issue, freedom of speech in our churches and synagogues. That day, D. James Kennedy came up from Florida, flew up from Florida to testify on behalf of this legislation.

In addition to Dr. Kennedy, also Pastor Walter Fauntroy came, who is a pastor here in Washington, D.C. at the New Bethel Baptist Church. I am pleased to tell the Members that actually he was a Member of Congress and also the vice mayor of Washington, D.C., at one time.

Let me share a couple of comments that they made when they testified before the oversight committee on May 14. I want to read these two paragraphs, Mr. Speaker. This is from Pastor Walter Fauntroy. I am just going to read his 5-minute presentation that he made before the oversight committee, just two paragraphs for the RECORD:

"What I have learned as a pastor, civil rights activist, and Member of Congress over these years has led me to appear before you today in support of H.R. 2357, the Houses of Worship Political Speech Protection Act. In the 5 minutes allowed me, I want to share with you two definitions of 'politics' upon which I have acted over these years as a pastor, as a civil rights activist and a politician that inform my decision to support this legislation," H.R. 2357.

In addition, he closed this way, Mr. Speaker. I cannot read the entire testimony. I will at a later time, not today, ask that I might be able to submit this for the RECORD.

He closed his testimony, and again, this is Pastor Walter Fauntroy, pastor of the New Bethel Baptist Church here in Washington, D.C. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle know him well, as they do Reverend Floyd Flake from New York. This is how Pastor Fauntroy closed:

"So, Mr. Chairman, I know that it is not in my interest or that of the people whom I serve that certain people who are self-centered hypocrites when it comes to the basic tenets of their religions exercise their right to be wrong. But like Voltaire, I may disagree with them vehemently, but I will defend to the death their right to be wrong and their right to participate in an orderly effort to 'translate what they believe into public policy and practice.' I must not be selfish and therefore sinful; I must not demand for myself what I would deny others."

Mr. Speaker, he also closed with a Bible verse. Again, this is Pastor Walter Fauntroy, who is testifying on behalf of H.R. 2357 to return freedom of speech to our churches and synagogues, should those pastors decide that they want to talk about the issues of the day. Many times there are political issues of the day.

He closed this way by saying: ". . . save his life, shall lose it, and he that loses his life for my sake shall find it." That is Matthew 10:39. I wish I could read the entire testimony of Pastor Fauntroy. Obviously, Members would better understand the last paragraph if I had had the time to do that.

In addition, I want to read just a couple of statements from the testimony of Dr. D. James Kennedy. He and Pastor Fauntroy, along with Kobe May, and Kobe May is an attorney for the American Center for Law and Justice, they testified that day on behalf of freedom of speech in our churches and synagogues.

This is one of the paragraphs that Dr. Kennedy said during his testimony that I want to read:

"This legislation is a vitally important step in reversing a long-standing injustice whereby free speech seems to be protected everywhere except in the pulpit of our churches and other houses of worship. It will restore to churches a freedom and role that dates to the American infancy.

Nineteenth century historian John Wingate Thornton said, "In a very great degree, to the pulpit, the Puritan pulpit, we owe the moral forces which won our independence."

Mr. Speaker, that is so true. If we think about the history of this Nation, there was never any restriction of speech in our churches and synagogues, none whatsoever. Only Lyndon Baines Johnson in 1954, with an amendment that was never debated, put the IRS in the churches and the synagogues and the mosques of America.

Mr. Speaker, let me continue for just a few more minutes. I would like to say that also at that hearing was the Internal Revenue Service, and I want to read just a couple of comments made by the agents that testified. This is what one agent said when he was asked the question by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), and this was the question from the Congressman: "As a rule, do you monitor the activities of churches during the political season?" Mr. Miller, who represented the Internal Revenue Services, his answer to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) was this: "We do monitor churches. We are limited in how we do that by reason of section 7611 and because of the lack of information in the area because there is no annual filing."

Mr. Speaker, this is the point I really want to make because this is Mr. Miller's answer: "So our monitoring is mostly reciprocal of information from third parties who are looking in." Mr. Speaker, that kind of reminds me of what I think Nazi Germany might have

been in the late '30's where there are snitches that are willing to turn in somebody for what they said in a free nation. Mr. Speaker, America is better than that. America is greater than that. Our church leaders do not need to be muzzled by the Federal Government, and in this case the Federal Government is the Internal Revenue Service.

Let me give you another practical example that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) asked of Mr. Miller. The question is: "Can the minister say the following from the pulpit and not be in violation of the tax status," and this is what the preacher would be saying, "that candidate X is pro-life or candidate Y is pro-choice?"

The answer from the IRS is: "That becomes more problematic, Congressman. The pastor, the minister, the rabbi can speak to the issues of the day, but to the extent that they start tying it into a particular candidate and to a particular election, it begins to look more and more like either opposition to a particular candidate or favoring a particular candidate." So because I have a bill in, H.R. 2357, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has a bill in that speaks to the same issue, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) then asks Mr. Miller: "And would the Crane and the Jones legislation clarify the law to allow for that type of statement?" The answer from Mr. Miller is "I believe so."

Then let me go further. Really this in itself is another point I want to make. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) further asks: "Just to follow up on that, say you have a candidate who was a guest speaker, was in a church speaking from the pulpit, concluding his or her remarks, and the minister walks up, puts his or her arm around that particular candidate and says, 'This is the right candidate, I urge you to support this candidate.' Is that allowable under law?"

Mr. Hawkins, another IRS person that attended and spoke at the hearing on May 14, responds, "No, that would not be allowed under the law. That would clearly be political campaign activity. It would be protected, however, under the two bills that have been introduced by Mr. Crane and Mr. Jones."

Mr. Speaker, that is the reason that I have for the last year and a half taken this on, because I sincerely believe that for America to remain morally strong, our preachers and our priests and our rabbis must not be politically handicapped by the speech patrol, in this case, the IRS, because, again, Mr. Speaker, this country is too great and too many people have given of their lives to protect the freedoms that we should be able to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that something that came to my attention as I started researching this issue is that the IRS has what they call code words, code words that they think could be used to endorse a candidate, and let me tell you what these code words are. Liberal, prolife, prochoice, antichoice, Republican, or Democrat.

Let me give you a practical example, and this is the information that they give to the people of America about what they can and cannot do and what candidates can and cannot do, and this issue that I am talking about is on Page 315 of the information that is provided by the Internal Revenue Service. It is called the "Election Year Issues." Let me read and give you the example of what they give in this documentation. This is not even a church, by the way. "If a nonprofit in Vermont runs an ad regarding a local 'liberal' candidate, the Vermont voters would know which specific candidate the nonprofit was discussing," in this case, a liberal candidate. This is a code "and in violation of Internal Revenue Service Code 501(c)(3) because oftentimes candidates are unofficially given labels that become commonly known."

Mr. Speaker, the more I got into this issue, I can honestly say that it is absolutely ridiculous, and in my opinion it is unconstitutional that Mr. JOHNSON was able to get his amendment passed without any debate, and if there had been debate, quite frankly, I still think it is unconstitutional that this Federal Government through the Internal Revenue Service would try to stifle free speech in our churches and synagogues. So that is the reason I wanted to be on the floor today. I will make a few more comments and then I will close.

We have numerous letters from religious leaders throughout this country that believe that this legislation is right, that this legislation is needed. I will give the example again, Dr. Flake had Al Gore in his church in the year 2000, and Mr. Flake is a Democrat, he is a good man, and he blessed his party and I respect that and appreciate that. So when Mr. Gore finished speaking in his church, Dr. Flake walked up in front of approximately 10,000 people, a big church in New York and he is a great minister and draws big crowds, and he said, "I believe that Al Gore is the right man for this Nation." That is all he said. He got a letter of reprimand from the Internal Revenue Service. If our preachers and ministers and priests and rabbis feel that they have a spiritual calling to help educate people in that congregation then please, please, let us not have the Federal Government determine what they can and cannot say because their role for this Nation's future is too important.

So again I have got the letter from Dr. Flake here that I read earlier, the two paragraphs, in support of this legislation. Mr. Speaker, we have 130 co-sponsors on this legislation, and I am a Republican and I am reaching out across the aisle, and I am pleased to say that we have about six or seven Democrats that have joined us. I have got three appointments next week with three members of the Democratic Party to go to their offices and sit down and talk to them about joining us in this effort to return to freedom of speech.

□ 1700

What I have found, I do not know how many radio shows across this Nation that I have had the opportunity to be on. I was on a show today in Iowa, and I was on a show two days ago in Kentucky and I am finding people of faith that really just did not know what the law was. And when they hear the history of it, again, that Lyndon Johnson, just a man of arrogance, in my opinion, that just wanted to show an opponent that he could stifle his speech, and when I tell them the history of this thing and they know the history of America and the fact that we have such freedom that our ministers and priests have never been bridled in speech until this became the law in 1954.

They are joining me in this effort. I believe the leadership will give us a chance to debate this issue on the floor of the House sometime before we leave for the elections.

Mr. Speaker, I will always remember that this country has been blessed by God; and the freedoms that we enjoy, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, are blessed by God also; and I want to return that freedom. I want to make it clear that should they have this freedom in the churches, not every minister is going to make a decision that he wants to talk about this issue or that issue that might be of a political nature. But should he not have the freedom to do so, should he or she choose to do so? I think so. And I am pleased that 130 of my colleagues think so.

We receive faxes and e-mails just about every day from a minister from across this Nation. We got one yesterday from a minister in Missouri who said in the e-mail, "Thank you for what you are trying to do. I am going to encourage the members from our State to join you in this effort."

I was on the Jerry Falwell Show last Friday in Lynchburg, Virginia, and he is in 50 States, and we talked about this issue. Mr. Speaker, part of the problem is that the IRS says they cannot enforce this law, anyway. They acknowledged in the testimony on May 14 that they know there are some churches that do not abide by the law. And yet Barry Lynn, who is a man that is on the extreme left, and the reason I will say that is because he applauded the Ninth Circuit Court's decision when they said to remove "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance, so to me he is an extreme liberal; and he is opposed to this legislation. In fact, in the year 2000 he sent to 285,000 churches a letter that coerced and intimidated the preachers to have any discussion of the politics of September and October of the year 2000.

So I am very hopeful that we can continue to garner support for this legislation so that the men and women who serve our Lord as preachers and priests and rabbis and clerics can have the freedom, should they choose to talk about these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close if I can with a letter, and this will be towards

the end, from Richard Lynn. Richard Lynn again is the Southern Baptist Convention Ethics and Religion Commission. He is head of that commission for the Southern Baptists. And he says in his letter, "Dear Congressman Jones: H.R. 2357 is consistent with the constitutional principle that the church should be separated from the State. The government should not have the power to define what the church believes or practices in principle or in effect. With the unbridled discretion given to the Internal Revenue Service to selectively target those it wishes to silence or threaten, this principle is not currently being protected."

So, again, what Dr. Lynn is asking is that there not be any restriction of speech in the churches and synagogues throughout this great Nation that we all love and respect.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am now going to close the way I close every time I speak publicly. I was on the floor this week and will be a couple of times next week. This country appreciates the men and women in uniform. And as some of my colleagues from the other side were talking about the possibility of war in Iraq, which none of us know for sure what will happen, but I have three military bases in my district. I have Camp Lejeune Marine Base. I have Cherry Point Marine Air Station. I have Seymour Johnson Air Force Base. And I have gotten to know a lot of those men and women in uniform, from the privates up to the base commanders. And I tell you the truth, I love and respect all of them.

So I close my comments today, Mr. Speaker, by saying, most sincerely, God, please bless our men and women in uniform. God, please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. I have asked God to please bless the President of the United States, that the President might make the best decisions and the right decisions for the future of America. I ask God to bless my colleagues here in the House and the Senators across the aisle so that they might do what is right in the eyes of our Lord and Savior.

Mr. Speaker, I close this way because I say it three times because I mean it from the bottom of my heart. Please, God, please, God, please, God, continue to bless America.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family business.

#### 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. FRANK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. BERKLEY, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. KUCINICH, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.  
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1308. An act to provide for the use and distribution of the funds awarded to the Quinault Indian Nation under United States Claims Court Dockets 772-71, 773-71, 774-71, and 775-71, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4687. An act to provide for the establishment of investigative teams to assess building performance and emergency response and evacuation procedures in the wake of any building failure that has resulted in substantial loss of life or that posed significant potential of substantial loss of life.

H.R. 5157. An act to amend section 5307 of title 49, United States Code, to allow transit systems in urbanized areas that, for the first time, exceeded 200,000 in population according to the 2000 census to retain flexibility in the use of Federal transit formula grants in fiscal year 2003, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1834. An act for the relief of retired Sergeant First Class James D. Benoit and Wan Sook Benoit.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, September 23, 2002, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

9240. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRP) Program — received September 17, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9241. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rehabilitation Research and Training Center (RRTC) Program — received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9242. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revisions to Regulations for Control of Air Pollution by Permits for New Sources and Modifications [TX-104-L-7401a; FRL-7378-7] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9243. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Carbon Monoxide Implementation Plan; State of Alaska; Anchorage [AK-02-001; FRL-7253-4] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9244. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Utah; New Source Performance Standards [SIP NO. UT-001-0043a, UT-001-44a; FRL-7376-7] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9245. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Denver PM 10 Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes [CO-001-0067; FRL-7261-3] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9246. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program; Utah County [UT-001-0021a, UT-001-0041a; FRL-7264-7] received September 12, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9247. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 27-02 which informs you of our intent to sign Amendment One to the Future Air Capabilities Memorandum of Understanding (FAC-MOU) between the United States, France, Germany, the United Kingdom and Italy, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

9248. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 26-02 which informs you of our intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning Aegis Combat System Test and Evaluation on U.S. and Spanish Aegis Ships between the United States and Spain, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.