

very, very good and concise way. But do not lecture us on budget. Go somewhere else. Argue the philosophical. That is a fair shot. The gentleman and I philosophically disagree apparently on the direction that this ought to be. That is a fair shot, and we will argue that. But this amendment does not bust the budget. It offers some, we hope, constructive suggestions; and I hope that the House will in an overwhelming vote say to the conferees, we believe this has merit, take a look at it, and let us pass it.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is not what is important. It is what comes back, because that is what is, in fact, going to be affecting lives. And in rural areas, this is a critical difference from a hospital's standpoint. If we cannot do what this amendment does, we are going to continue to have real problems in rural areas, and anybody that represents a rural area needs to take a good hard look and hopefully join in support of this amendment.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the order of the House of earlier today, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

**MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004**

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1588 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in subtitle F of title VI of the Senate amendment (relating to naturalization and family protection for military members).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) and a member from the majority party each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my support for the brave

men and women who are risking their lives to defend our Nation. I rise to urge my colleagues to express that support by voting in favor of my motion to instruct conferees.

When hostilities broke out in Iraq, the first military member to die in combat was Marine Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez, an immigrant from Guatemala who volunteered to serve his adopted country. He died an American hero, but he did not die an American citizen.

Lance Corporal Gutierrez was only the first of 13 noncitizen soldiers killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Thousands of noncitizen soldiers are currently serving in Iraq, and only 37,000 are noncitizen soldiers who serve in the Nation's Armed Forces.

The motion I am offering today expresses the continued support of the House for the Armed Forces Naturalization Act which passed, by the way, on June 4 by a vote of 414 to 5. The House has already gone on record in support of the bill to give immigrants serving in our Armed Forces more rapid naturalization and to establish protections for their families if they are killed in action.

The 37,000 immigrant soldiers have already met the same rigorous evaluation as U.S. citizens before their enlistment. In fact, the military's criteria are more challenging than the naturalization requirements demanded by the Department of Homeland Security.

Besides meeting the qualifications for military service, noncitizen soldiers have passed an even more important test: they have proven their loyalty to the United States by pledging to defend our Nation and our values with their bodies, their minds, and their lives. Their service in defense of our Nation and our country and their willingness to put their lives on the line speaks to their devotion to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this small token of gratitude as a demonstration to these 37,000 Americans who are brave soldiers, to show that we appreciate their patriotism.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees addresses the military naturalization provisions that were included in the Department of Defense authorization bill.

On June 4, this Chamber passed H.R. 1588, the Armed Forces Naturalization Act of 2003, with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle. This military naturalization measure has a number of good provisions. It was sent to the Senate for consideration where it was passed favorably out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. While the Senate has not taken up H.R. 1588, similar provisions were included in the Senate-passed DOD authorization bill.

The motion before us today urges conferees to adopt the provisions contained in the Senate-passed DOD authorization bill. I think this motion underscores the importance of this military naturalization legislation to both Houses and to Republicans and Democrats alike.

However, the Senate should move this bill separately rather than include it in the DOD authorization. This would give the committees with relevant jurisdiction an opportunity to fully examine the differences between the House- and the Senate-passed version and to make informed decisions about these naturalization provisions.

Most of us agree that we should expedite the naturalization process for those who have served our country and provide immigration benefits to family members of those who died. I believe H.R. 1588 accomplished those goals.

I would like to point out, however, some of the reasons why I am concerned about supporting the Senate version contained in the DOD authorization bill. First, H.R. 1588, as passed by the House, grants permanent resident status to the immediate relatives of U.S. citizen soldiers and soldiers granted posthumous citizenship if they die as a result of injuries incurred during active duty. The provisions supported by this motion to instruct conferees would only grant benefits to immediate family members if a soldier died in combat. The family of a soldier who died in training or in being transported to the front would not be granted these citizenship provisions.

Second, H.R. 1588, as passed by the House, allows the spouse of a soldier granted posthumous citizenship to immediately naturalize. This is another important provision omitted from the Senate provisions supported by this motion.

Third, H.R. 1588, as passed by the House, does not grant expedited naturalization during peacetime to a soldier who is discharged less than honorably. I do not believe we should extend the benefits of expedited naturalization to an individual discharged less than honorably, yet the Senate language does not make this distinction.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my concerns about the provisions that benefit illegal aliens in the Senate language supported by this motion. By contrast, H.R. 1588, as passed by the House, does not grant benefits to illegal aliens. By adopting the motion to instruct conferees, we would grant benefits to those illegal aliens, and I do not think this sets a good precedent.

I am heartened that many of us agree on providing important reforms to the naturalization process for military personnel. However, it is my hope that the Senate will take up this legislation separately so that we can resolve some important policy differences between these bills in an appropriate context.

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

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for yielding me this time.

Throughout the United States' history of armed conflict, noncitizens have worn our military uniforms and fought in our battles. In fact, one of my uncles served in the Korean War while a legal permanent resident.

Today, approximately 3 percent of our military are legal permanent residents, but not citizens. Of that 3 percent, more than 37,000 noncitizen soldiers are currently serving on active duty in the U.S. Armed Forces. Many of the U.S. casualties in Operation Iraqi Freedom and many of the soldiers who continue to risk their lives to bring stability to Iraq are noncitizens.

I am a strong supporter of measures that provide opportunities for legal permanent residents serving in our military to become U.S. citizens. These individuals are making enormous sacrifices. Without being citizens and without having the protection that that status gives them, these immigrant men and women are willing to risk their own lives to defend this Nation.

□ 1700

The least we can do is give them something in return. What this motion to instruct does is instruct the conferees to accept the Senate provisions that expedite the naturalization process for members serving in the U.S. military and the selected reserves.

The Senate provision also protects spouses, children, and parents of soldiers killed in action by preserving their ability to file for permanent residence in the United States.

The provisions are an effective way to show those noncitizens serving in our Armed Services that their efforts are appreciated. The provisions provide noncitizen soldiers with the opportunity to apply for citizenship after 2 years of military service instead of the 3-year requirement currently in law.

The provisions waive naturalization fees and provide for naturalization proceeds to take place overseas. It also allows for the spouse, children, and parents of legal permanent resident soldiers killed in action to apply for citizenship.

I am pleased that the Senate provisions deem the parents of soldiers killed in action to petition for immediate family status. When the House version of this bill was considered, I was concerned that parents of legal permanent resident soldiers killed in combat were not eligible for citizenship if they were outside the United States at the time their child was killed. Those same parents would be eligible if they were here in the United States and it made no sense. A parent is a parent whether they happen to

have gone to their home country for a short time or whether they are in the process of waiting for a visa application renewal or whether some other circumstance prevented them from being in the United States when their child was killed in combat.

I am pleased the Senate provision of this bill made these provisions an important part of their bill.

Again, I support the motion to instruct conferees on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and benefit noncitizens who are serving in our Armed Services and protecting the freedoms that we hold so dear.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), who has also authored legislation in this area.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) for putting this motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1588, which I am in strong support of.

Earlier in the year several Members of this House came together to work on legislation because we knew immediately that we were seeing many of our young soldiers coming back in body bags. But one thing that differentiated some of the soldiers, and I wanted to point out a photograph of one of the soldiers that was fallen in my district, Francisco Martinez Flores. He was 2 weeks shy of his citizenship.

They granted him posthumous citizenship which means nothing. It stays there in the grave. It does nothing for his family who now has to go through hurdles to make sure that they at least get some semblance of assistance for their well-being here in our country. But if you ask their parents they did not say for one minute, son, do not go and serve your country. He took that upon himself, and they are very proud of him, and we are all very proud of him.

We want to protect all of our soldiers. But there should not be any barriers when we send young men and women, as this 19-year-old went abroad in Iraq. In the first 2 weeks he was there he fell. That was it. His tank fell over the Euphrates River there and his parents never saw him again.

We are working hard to see that these families stay whole, and one of the things that we can demonstrate through this legislation or this motion to instruct is to help preserve that family unit, that they also get the respect that their sons and daughters may not have. In this case, this young man.

I have another picture over here that illustrates a family who is also in that predicament. They have a son who is serving right now in Iraq. The parents

are not totally naturalized but they are going through the process. If their son is not returned, who knows what their fate will be as well. But we have thousands of soldiers like that.

Our bill that we had originally proposed would have covered 37,000 men and women who are legal permanent residents that are currently serving in the war, and a good number of our soldiers are also serving as reservists, over 23,000. Nobody is asking them why is it that you are serving? You are not here legally.

They are here legally. They have their green cards. But one thing differentiates them. They do not have that citizenship. They leave their jobs as teachers, as firefighters, as plumbers, as people who helped to build our country. They do not know if they are going to come back and their families are contacting us.

What we would like to see is that there is some assurance, that there is some guarantee for them and their families that they are granted the ability to become naturalized citizens. When I hear the word "illegal" it breaks my heart because we do not ask these soldiers to come forward whether or not they are illegal. They were legal residents. They are technically legal residents. And if their families give us the opportunity for their sons and daughters to serve, should we not at least give them the opportunity to grant them some protections that our great country can offer because they are fighting for our freedom every single day. At this moment we know that there are many that are in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) from the Committee on the Judiciary for his work in recognizing this issue. We worked very hard with several other Members of this House on a bipartisan level, and I would like to thank him for his concerted effort in working with us.

I am also concerned now that this bill or components of the bill are now being placed on hold. And I would ask that Members of our House consider the bigger picture here, and that is these soldiers that are waiting to see that we take action on this motion, and that we do something, that we do the right thing. We sent them out in harm's way, and now it is time for us to take care of them.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time with the understanding that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) has the right to close.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity first of all to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH). I want to appeal to him. I know that even in the case of the example that I had indicated and that is Marine Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez, who came here illegally, who was one of the

first killed, he came here illegally. We also have another young man, the majority of who are here, by the way, legally.

We have another young man, and I want to pinpoint in case because this is a sad story. This is Army Private Juan Escalante. It just came out in the paper in Seattle. The young man served in Iraq, and I want to give the gentleman a copy of the article because I think it is important to note. He is a 19-year-old. And I will read part of this.

He is like many of the other soldiers, sailors and airmen settling into civilian life except for the one key fact that Private Escalante is an illegal immigrant. Unlike the tens and thousands of noncitizen soldiers, of which we have 37,000 soldiers that have served our country with so-called green cards, military folks, President Bush has also praised their service, by the way, according to the newspaper. And Escalante fits into an entirely new separate area and I would hope that you would kind of take these cases into consideration.

Here we have a soldier who at the age of 4, at the age of 4 he was brought here by his parents. So he has been here and he is now 19 serving our country in Iraq. He has gotten the combat patch and the whole thing. And now his parents and himself are being looked at for being sent back.

When he graduated from high school he bought a fake green card and joined the Army. And you might say, well, that is fraudulent. But we have had a lot of other fraudulent cases in which people have joined the Army and lied about their age. And he trained as a mechanic, and he later on was deployed to Iraq. Escalante says that he has volunteered and he has enjoyed the work and is extremely proud to have served our country during Iraq and during that particular war. And now he finds himself in a situation where his family is being sent back.

Immigration lawyers and experts argue that the law has long allowed noncitizens who have served honorably during a time of combat, and I know the gentleman is familiar with this, to be eligible for naturalization under Executive Order 13269 signed by President Bush on July 3, 2002. It provides for expedient naturalization for those active during Operation Enduring Freedom.

I would ask the gentleman on that particular case that he please look at and see if he can help that young man, in addition to helping the 37,000 that are here. But I would also want to just go back and say that Mr. Escalante indicated that in the dialogue on this issue is something that is extremely of concern to a lot of other veterans that are out there.

So as we postpone and continue to postpone this, it is important.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to clarify for the record that only a legal permanent resident can serve in the Armed Services. Someone who is in the country illegally cannot serve in the armed forces. They have to be a legal permanent resident. We may have given the impression that some individuals were here illegally and were allowed to serve but that is not government policy.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I know that might not be government policy, but we do have them and we do have the cases. I mentioned to the gentleman Mr. Escalante who served and defended and he has been here since the age of 4. His parents might have violated the law but he has been here since the age of 4. And wherever he came from, I am not sure if he is from Mexico or Central America or whatever, but I know that when you look at a person at the age of 4, are you going to say that he violated the law?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. If the gentleman would continue to yield, we have looked at some of those cases and have found in almost every instance they had taken advantage of some legalization program so that when they actually enlisted they were legal permanent residents. I just would not want us to give the false impression that people who were in the country illegally can expect to enlist in the Armed Services.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. I understand that, but the fact is the reality is that we do have and there is 37,000. By the way, that is nothing new. For example, similar action has been taken in past history where we had 143,000 noncitizen military participants in World War I and World War II. We had 31,000 members in the Korean War. We had an additional 100,000 who fought in Vietnam and in the Persian Gulf. These have all been noncitizens.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. If the gentleman would continue to yield, that is exactly right, but they are all legal permanent residents. They are not illegal immigrants.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. But the majority of them, those 37,000, are still not citizens.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I understand that, I acknowledge that. They are legal permanent residents. They are not citizens, but they also are not in the country illegally.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. The gentleman is correct in that, but I did want to mention this, too. But for all the others, the 37,000 that are here, the legal permanent residents that are here and fighting and defending, we want to be able to not give them anything extra except expedite what everyone else has to go through. That is to also help them through their waivers in allowing them an opportunity to waive the fees, and I think the gentleman would be supportive of that. The gentleman would also, I think, be supportive of reducing the waiting period for citizenship, and I think the gentleman would

also be supportive of allowing them to proceed as quickly as possible when they are overseas.

One of the problems when they are overseas is that they cannot move forward on their citizenship. So it is important for us to do that. I think we owe them at least that amount to be able to do that. I would hope the gentleman would help us out in that way, in terms of that.

□ 1715

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we will be happy to help out, and I have to point out to the gentleman that all of the provisions which we support were in the House-passed bill, and I am surprised that this motion we are considering now would actually endorse some provisions that I consider to be not as good for individuals who are serving in the military who we want to grant citizenship to.

I mentioned in my opening statement a while ago, for example, that the Senate bill that is endorsed by this motion requires them to have served in the military 2 years. The House bill that I support requires them to have only served 1 year. The House bill says that they could be killed while in training, while on their way to the front lines. The Senate bill that this motion endorses says they have to be killed in combat, and the Senate bill that this motion supports says they can be awarded citizenship even if they were dishonorably discharged.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I know what the differences are, but there is a game that is being played, and the reason why we are doing this is we need to push forward on this, both the Senate and the House is controlled by Republicans, and so my colleagues can make it happen. We can move forward on this, and we can push forward on this, and the importance is to look at those 37,000, and as the gentleman indicated, these are persons, the majority, with the exception maybe of one or two or three of the two that I mentioned, that are all permanent residents and here now legally but need to move forward on the citizenship.

What we are saying is we have got to go and do everything we can to help them out since they have been willing to come forward. The reason why we have this motion is to basically also indicate the importance of moving forward on this act instead of playing games with the Senate and arguing that the Senate has 2 years and we have 1 year, et cetera.

The bottom line is that will not get them the opportunity to move forward and become citizens, and we have got to make that happen.

So the responsibility falls on the leadership both in the House and in the Senate, and in this case, they are both controlled by Republicans. So it becomes real important that we move forward.

The other thing is that the Senate version contains the reservists. We

have 12,000 reservists that also fall in that category, and as my colleague well knows, we have reservists doing full-time duty now, and it is important for us to also recognize that. So we have soldiers that we have asked them to be weekend soldiers, but they are spending time down there all year. So it becomes real important that we move forward on this as quickly as possible, and I want to ask that my colleagues consider the motion and ask that we come because when all is said and done, if this does not occur, then the only ones we can hold responsible is both the House and the Senate and, in this case, controlled by the Republican party and the administration.

So I would ask my colleagues for serious consideration of some passage that would allow expediting the citizenship process because they have to qualify even more so. To be in the military, they have to have had a GED or high school. They have to have, as I already indicated, the leadership and loyalty to this country and demonstrated that, and so I think we have a unique opportunity to send a real positive message to both the people that are serving our military, and both the reservists as well as the active duty, because they have all been out there for us and are willing to continue to defend our country, and we ought to be willing to move forward, and if they served honorably, then we ought to see what we can do to help them out in the process of becoming citizens and to have 37,000 people in the military that are not citizens yet and have trouble as the case that I have here before on Private Escalante, then we need to see how we can make some exceptions in those cases, and I would hope that we have that flexibility in order for that to happen.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to join my colleagues in asking the House conferees of the Defense Authorization bill (H.R. 1588) to accept the Citizenship for America's troop's provision that Senator KENNEDY included in the Senate's bill.

Ever since the war against Saddam Hussein began, politicians and commentators have noted that many brave soldiers were risking their lives for America despite the fact that they are not citizens. As many have pointed out, some of these non-citizen soldiers were among the first brave men and women to fall. Some were born in Mexico before joining the U.S. military—like Pfc. Francisco Martinez Flores, Cpl. Jose Angel Garibay and Lance Cpl. Jesus Suarez del Solar. Others were born in Guatemala—like Lance Cpl. Jose Gutierrez. But all died fighting for a country where they couldn't even cast a vote.

Of course, this is not a new problem. In the last Congress—in May of 2002, to be precise—I first introduced legislation to help remove the obstacles these brave soldiers face on their path to citizenship. And I re-introduced my bill in this Congress one week before our country went to war in Iraq.

But months and months have passed, and still this Congress has not acted. So while the citizenship provision in the Senate bill is not identical to my original legislation, I fully sup-

port it. It is the quickest way to honor the brave soldiers who have shown the willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice for the country they dearly wish to be citizens of. Members of the military who risk their lives to defend this Nation deserve better than the bureaucratic and financial burdens that now stand between them and citizenship. And they deserve better than the waiting game they've had to endure since I first proposed legislation like this more than a year ago.

So, Mr. Speaker, I again urge the House managers to not play politics with this issue. Accept the Kennedy language and do the right thing for our troops.

It is the only way to get this done in a timely fashion. Our legal permanent resident troops have already waited for far too long.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Rodriguez motion to instruct the conferees on the Defense Reauthorization Act.

I support his motion because I strongly believe that we must expedite the citizenship process for immigrants that serve in the United States military.

If they wear the American flag on their uniform everyday and proudly fight for this nation then I believe offering them citizenship is the least we can do.

Thirty-seven thousand immigrants soldiers risk their lives everyday in defense of our Nation. These patriots may be of different nationalities but they share the same commitment to defend the United States.

As a Nation, we must respect and honor those who are willing to fight and die for ideals of democracy and the ideals of the United States of America, regardless of their nationality. If we trust immigrants to die protecting this Nation then we must trust them to become American citizens.

The Senate bill has provisions to allow these immigrant soldiers to become citizens after two years, rather than three and I support that.

The Senate provision also allows immigrant soldiers to fulfill citizen requirements at U.S. facilities abroad and I support that.

Currently, immigrant soldiers serving over seas are required to take leave, spend their own money and travel back to the U.S. to fulfill their citizenship requirements. The process is slow archaic, and wrong. No one should be punished for serving this Nation.

I served this Nation proudly and I am the child of immigrants. I know the love that my parents had for this Nation, and I know the love that I have for this Nation, and no one should be punished for wanting to proudly serve this country. No one should be punished simply because they were not lucky enough to be born on United States soil.

We owe anyone who is willing to fight for this Nation the opportunity to quickly and expeditiously become a United States citizen.

We are asking something simple—allow these proud immigrants to become citizens. At a time when we are fighting enemies abroad and at home, why deny those that are the most loyal their wish to become Americans.

On behalf of the 37,000 immigrant soldiers and families, I urge my colleagues to support the Rodriguez motion to instruct.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of the time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

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

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, and the earlier order of the House of today, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2003 TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, September 18, 2003, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2003

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, September 22, 2003, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, September 23, 2003, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.