United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2003 No. 137

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHAW).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 1, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable E. CLAY SHAW, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Imam Hassan Qazwini, Leader, The Islamic Center of America, Detroit, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

Respected Congressmen and Women, I would like to greet you with the greeting of Islam. Peace be with you in the name of Allah, the Compassionate, the Merciful.

Glory be to Allah, the Lord of Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad. As we commence our legislative day in this 108th Congress, we ask You to bestow Your blessing upon us and help our legislators enact that which pleases You and ensures the interest of our people. Lend Your infinite wisdom to this Congress and allow them to embrace what is right, not what is popular.

As our Nation faces many challenges, we beseech Your guidance. And as we pursue those who intend harm to our country, let us seek justice rather than revenge. Guide our leaders to use the influence of their power as an instrument for the betterment of all humankind and peace throughout the world.

Oh, Allah, endow the people of this great land with a growing trust in one another and an increasing faith in You. Help us all uphold our God-given rights of freedom and equality. Allow us never to evoke Your law by embracing color or creed as tools for superiority. As You say in the Holy Koran, ''Oh people, We had created you from one male and one female, and made you into nations and tribes so that you may know one another. Verily, the best amongst you are those who are the most pious.''

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CONYERS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1925. An act to reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 1261. An act to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1680. An act to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

WELCOMING IMAM HASSAN AL-QAZWINI

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend the greetings of the House of Representatives to my constituent and friend, the Imam Hassan Al-Qazwini of the Islamic Center of America of Dearborn, Michigan, as our guest chaplain.

Imam Qazwini's life is a testament to the greatness of our Nation and its devotion to freedom of religion, freedom of conscience, and universal liberty. His life story is remarkable and moving, and his dedication to his adoptive homeland should make us all proud.

Imam Qazwini was born to a prominent religious family in Karbala, Iraq, and became a student at the Islamic Seminary in Qum, Iran. His family in Iraq were Shiites, and actively opposed the tyranny of Saddam Hussein. For their courage they were persecuted. Fourteen of his relatives were either executed or imprisoned by the Ba'athists.

Imam Qazwini has become a leading voice for Muslims in America. He has spoken movingly of the need for reconciliation, for tolerance, and for the recognition of our shared humanity. He has worked with leaders in both the Christian and the Jewish communities to help bridge the differences between us and to dispel prejudice. His work has touched Muslim and non-Muslim alike, and his devotion to our State and our community of Dearborn has been recognized by the mayor, the governor, and by President Bush.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, Imam Qazwini's life is a statement on

Printed on recycled paper.

the greatness of our Nation. In only a few years, he has become a leader in our Nation's religious life, and he has met twice with President Bush.

I am proud that he is here today and was able to give this body a moving start to our day.

Imam, you have been most welcome here today and we are honored that you are with us.

SUPPORTING BAN ON PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, partial-birth abortion is a horrific and heinous procedure which attacks the very dignity of women at the most fundamental level. As a mother and as an ardent human rights activist, I have fought tirelessly to ensure that all are guaranteed the most basic of human rights, the right to life. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the fundamental international document on human rights, states that ''Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.''

Some of my colleagues who support partial-birth abortion are the first ones to rightly advocate the prohibition of cruelty against others or even against helpless animals. But how can some cringe in horror when an animal is tortured, yet they do not think twice about the unspeakable suffering of an innocent baby being killed through this so-called medical procedure?

I urge my colleagues to finally pass the bill outlawing this act and send it to the President for his signature.

WELCOMING IMAM HASSAN QAZWINI

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

Mr. CONYERS. To my colleagues this morning, I am very delighted to entertain Imam Hassan Qazwini and seven other members from the Muslim community in Detroit and Dearborn, Michigan. He and I are very good friends and I am honored that the Islamic Center of America is located in my congressional district. I am also proud of the fact that they are building what might likely be the largest religious center for Muslims in the United States, which will be in Dearborn, Michigan, which my colleague and the dean of the House, Mr. DINGELL, and I both represent.

The important point I would leave with you in extending my welcome is that Imam Qazwini has worked tirelessly with those of us Christians, Muslims and Jews to continue a dialogue that has taken place more than a dozen times in Detroit and in the District of Columbia with the help of my former staffer, Ms. Alexia Smokler, and my current general counsel of the Committee on the Judiciary, Burt Wides. We have worked together with Congressman DINGELL to continue the discussion that is so necessary for us to come together, understand each other's cultures and also be amazed at the similarities of concerns that we raise.

It is in that spirit that I too join in the welcome to the House of Representatives on this day to Imam Qazwini.

GOOD FISCAL NEWS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, good news on the fiscal front from Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania Secretary of Revenue Greg Fajt said this week that State revenues for September were up 6.4 percent, higher than expected. In fact, every revenue source has reported an increase for the fiscal year. Sales tax, corporate income tax, personal income tax and even the realty transfer tax and the inheritance tax have produced unexpected dollars for the State treasury. For the entire year, the cash has come in at 2.9 percent or $134.9 million over the estimate.

In addition, the Small Business Survival Committee has ranked Pennsylvania's tax code 17th in the Nation for its friendliness to small business. That ranking was based on being last in corporate income taxes, 10th in personal income, 21st in property taxes and 2nd lowest in bureaucrats per 100 residents.

I hope what is happening in Pennsylvania is symptomatic of what is happening in other States in our country as we seek to make Pennsylvania and America a better place to provide jobs and raise our families.

TIME FOR U.S. TO GET OUT OF IRAQ

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

Mr. KUCINICH. It is time for the United States to get out of Iraq. It is time to get the U.N. in and the U.S. out, to bring our troops home and to end this sorry exercise in preemption and unilateralism.

America can ill afford to spend $87 billion on top of $179 billion in support of a war which has no end, no exit, no logic and no sense. It is time to come up with a plan to get the U.N. in and the U.S. out. We must work with the world community on this.

Today the administration will tell Congress that it was deceived by Saddam Hussein into thinking that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction. Let this Congress not be deceived by an administration that took this Nation into a war we did not have to fight. Bring our troops home.

Vote against the $87 billion; U.N. in and U.S. out of Iraq.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT'S WAR ON TERRORISM SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President George W. Bush's supplemental request of $87 billion for the war on terror. This will support our troops who were historically successful in combat and helped develop Iraq so that we can win the peace.

After World War II, America led the effort in the Marshall Plan to rebuild Germany. We prevented Germany from becoming a breeding ground for Communists and we defeated communism. Today we can redevelop Iraq and prevent it from becoming a breeding ground for terrorists and we will defeat terrorism. This funding is mutually beneficial for the people of America and Iraq.

We cannot abandon the newly freed people of Iraq and allow the terrorists to regain strength. We can either fight the terrorists overseas or on the streets of America.

I believe that every dollar of this supplemental is a weapon which will help save American lives. I encourage Members to stand firm in our promise to win the fight in the war on terror.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

IMMIGRANT WORKERS FREEDOM RIDE

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the hundreds, if not thousands, of workers that will be converging on Washington, D.C. today as part of the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride. The Freedom Riders are construction workers, cooks, farmworkers, landscapers, nurses, janitors, and even nannies. They work hard and they pay taxes. Like the Freedom Riders of 1961, today's Freedom Riders are advocating an end to unfair policies and unjust treatment. These policies deny millions a clear road to citizenship and make them vulnerable to abuses in the workplace.

We should enact laws that reflect the reality of our economy's labor needs and that recognize the important contribution of immigrants. That is why I have introduced a resolution today supporting Freedom Ride and urging President Bush and the Congress to reform our broken immigration system.

Over 2 years ago, President Bush pledged his support for an earned adjustment program for undocumented immigrants but has yet to deliver. Millions of immigrants and their families continue to live in the shadows, wanting to participate fully in American society.

I urge my colleagues to support my resolution and call on the President and Congress to support the policies that ensure that all workers are treated with dignity and respect.

NEWS WE DO NOT HEAR ABOUT FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Iraq with 15 bipartisan colleagues, and I learned that 90 percent of Western reporters have left Iraq. Those who remain can only get their stories out if they report injuries to Americans. We are not allowed to learn what else is happening in Iraq.

The press does not like to report on other press, but that is a story here. Iraq had only one newspaper, Uday Hussein's newspaper. Now it has over 100, like Azzaman, Ashiraa, Ibn Al-Balad, Al-Nahdhah, Al Mutamar, and an English-language newspaper, Iraq Today. But today is also the first day of school in Iraq, and we have now bookbags given to children in Iraq. This is a bookbag filled with school supplies, notes, calculators, rulers, pens, papers, that went to 1.5 million Iraqi children for the start of school. These are also things that are happening in Iraq, but we are not allowed to hear about them from our newspapers.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to the issue of national debt. It has been 874 days since this administration came into office. During that time, the national debt has increased by $1,142,246,097,598, and according to the Web site for the Bureau of the Public Debt at the U.S. Department of Treasury, yesterday at 4:30 p.m. eastern daylight time, the Nation's total outstanding debt was $6,782,571,483,957. Furthermore, in the current fiscal year we are in, 2003, which actually ended yesterday, interest on our national debt or what I call the ''debt tax'' is $304,978,878,641.

It is time for Congress to pay attention to this disturbing trend.

A SALUTE TO THE 495TH TRANSPORTATION COMPANY

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome home the more than 100 men and women of the Florida National Guard's 495th Transportation Company from Lakeland, Florida as they arrive back in the United States and return to their families. I want to thank them for their courage, their service, their bravery, and I want to thank their families for their patience through this long ordeal. The 495th took small arms fire during its tenure in the desert, luckily without casualties.

Floridians should be proud of the service and tremendous accomplishments of the 495th Transportation Company. These men and women risked their lives and made sacrifices to keep our country safe and secure and secure those same blessings for the Iraqi people.

Mr. Speaker, the men and women of the 495th Transportation Unit have each played an invaluable role in their own communities for years. They are now home again to retake their place in businesses, schools, fire stations and farms. And I believe Staff Sergeant Stephanie Miller said it best: ''I'm just glad to be home. Glad we made it back safe.''

God bless Stephanie. God bless all her colleagues, and may God continue to shower his blessings upon this great land.

URGING CONGRESS TO VOTE AGAINST PAYMENT FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me associate myself with the words of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) to welcome the Immigrant Freedom Riders who will be coming to the United States Government to petition for equality and justice similar to the movement and rise made by those who fought hard in the Civil Rights movement.

As I think about civil rights and civil justice and liberty, I cannot help but be so very proud of the young men and women who stand on the front lines in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I say to the parents and friends and family members who have lost those who gave the ultimate sacrifice, we will never forget. I also want to make mention, Mr. Speaker, of those who lay wounded in our hospitals without eyes, without limbs, and that is why I rise today to point out to the American people and to this Congress that it would be unpardonable, it would be atrocious for us to randomly vote for $87 billion that is being asked by this administration without first bifurcating the vote, voting for the troops and the resources that they need, the armor that they need, but yet looking to distinguish between the reckless dollars that they are spending in this so-called reconstruction without allies.

I am glad the children of Iraq have bookbags. The children in Houston, Texas do not have any bookbags. It is time for this Congress to take up its responsibility and not vote for the $20 billion for reconstruction and support our troops.

UNFUNDED LIABILITIES AND THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the good news is that there are indications that we are having an economic recovery. In both the third and fourth quarter, we are looking at economic expansion much greater than what was earlier predicted. But this still leaves a great obligation for this Chamber and the Senate and the White House to look at the reality of the situation where we are spending more money than what is coming into government. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the last fiscal year of 03 we will have a deficit of $562 billion. This fiscal year for 2004, we are going to have a deficit, which means spending over and above revenue of $640 billion. That does not include the $87 billion for Iraq.

We need to start looking not only at the debt burden that we are leaving our kids and our grandkids, but the unfunded liabilities. These are promises that we have made in programs such as Social Security where we do not have enough money to pay promised benefits. We need to consider all of these unfunded liabilities and the deficit along with the mounting cost of servicing this debt. And I hope my colleagues will join me in sponsoring my Social Security bill, H.R. 3055.

THE FOX INSPECTING THE HENHOUSE

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the theater of the absurd is opening a new farce. The plots of the old one, the fox, Mr. Ashcroft, is inspecting the henhouse, looking for someone who broke the law by revealing an alleged CIA employee to the press.

Does anyone believe that they are going to use all the power of the Patriot Act, that they are going to go through the library records, the medical records, the visa records of everybody in the White House to find out who committed this crime? How can this Congress sit here with a straight face and allow that to be the way this issue is revealed? There ought to be an independent counsel. There is no way you can convince the American people that John Ashcroft, whose campaign manager was Karl Rove in the last election he lost, is going to do a real investigation of who broke the law in the White House.

This Congress cannot let that go by because no intelligence agent is going

to be safe in the United States if the fox has his way.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, partial-birth abortion is a risky procedure. A doctor blindly stabbing scissors into a baby's skull leaves too much room for error. A small slip can have life-threatening consequences for the woman.

Women deserve better. They deserve better than being subjected to a procedure as horrific as a partial-birth abortion. They deserve better than enduring a painful 3-day process that puts their health in jeopardy.

But women usually do not choose to have partial-birth abortions. It is done to them because, as in the words of Dr. Martin Haskell he finds, ''dismemberment at 20 weeks and beyond to be difficult due to the toughness of fetal tissues at this stage.'' It also spares the abortionist the messy task of counting baby body parts.

And contrary to what many Americans think, a partial-birth abortion may be legally performed up until the day a healthy baby is born for virtually any reason.

I oppose this violent procedure for many reasons, but everyone should oppose it for this reason alone, because women deserve much better. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting this week to ban partial-birth abortions forever.

VOTING AGAINST PAYMENT FOR RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to support the President's request for $87 billion to continue the war in Iraq. We asked him to continue the inspections, he chose to do a preemptive strike. And now he is telling us that we have got to pay for the reconstruction of Iraq. I am not going to support that. They told us that the oil that they would get, revenues that they would get from Iraq, would support the reconstruction. Now, we have colleagues coming on the floor, telling us what a wonderful job they are doing and showing us bookbags that they have for the children of Iraq. I want the Members to know children in my district do not even have books to put in bookbags, and we have Members on the other side of the aisle who do not support more Federal funding to local school districts. They say it is a local school district problem.

Give me a break, Mr. President. The covers are off. He has mismanaged this war. He has made promises. The only one who is benefitting from this war is Mr. CHENEY's company, Halliburton, that is getting contracts that were not competitive. The President will not get a vote from me for $87 billion.

SUPPORT THE AMERICAN DREAM DOWN PAYMENT ACT

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for a bill that will be on the floor later this afternoon, H.R. 1276, the American Dream Down Payment Act. Good quality housing is crucial to the strength of our communities and our Nation. Today more Americans own their homes than ever before; yet despite this success, the lack of homeownership in some of our low-income communities has become a crisis.

For everyone to be able to live the American dream, we should look at providing programs that address the unique housing needs of all people. The goal of H.R. 1276 is to increase the ownership rate among minorities and to revitalize and stabilize our communities. For many low-income households, the down payment is one of the major barriers to homeownership. The American Dream Down Payment Act will benefit these families by helping them realize the American dream of homeownership.

I urge my colleagues to provide hope by supporting the gentlewoman from Florida's (Ms. HARRIS) bill on the floor today. Support H.R. 1276, the American Dream Down Payment Act.

TAX CUTS AND OUR ECONOMIC SITUATION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the economy in my part of the country continues to drift; yet Congress and the President continue to fiddle. Three and a half million jobs lost since President Bush took office. Two and a half million manufacturing jobs have vanished, one out of ten manufacturing jobs in this country. It simply disappeared; most moved overseas in the last 2½ years. Plant closing after plant closing. Now, the President asks us for $87 billion with no accountability, $87 billion to Iraq.

□ 1030

Yet the President at home is cutting education, is cutting spending on health care, will not provide a prescription drug benefit, and even is cutting veterans benefits. Why? For the simple reason that he wants this war on the cheap and the simple reason that he wants to continue to give tax cuts to the most privileged people in this society.

Forty-two percent of the tax cuts have gone to the richest 1 percent of people in this country. That means a millionaire gets a $93,000 tax cut. Half of my constituents got nothing.

CELEBRATING FREEDOM FOR IRAQI CHILDREN

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today marks another watershed moment in the liberation of the Iraqi people. Today, the children of Iraq return to school. Only this year, things will be much different. When they enter their schoolroom, for the first time in their lives, they will not have their oppressor staring at them from a picture on the wall. Nor will they be subject to torture and prison for not swearing allegiance to that oppressor. For the first time they will be free to learn. They will be focused on reading, writing and arithmetic, not on hate, incitement, and brutality forced on them by the former dictator.

Operation Iraqi Freedom has brought freedom to the children of Iraq. They will now be free to learn, free to achieve, and free to help build a new society based on freedom, which is now a reality.

For all of those who question whether we have been successful in Iraq, I ask that they look at the faces of the Iraqi children who will be tasting freedom for the first time in their young lives and ask if they would be better off with Saddam staring at them from a wall.

Today is a day to celebrate the freedom of Iraqi children and the hope for a new generation.

NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO DESERT OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are about half way, maybe not half way, but we are at a critical juncture in our mission in Iraq; but the Democrats want to bail out now. They want to pull the rug out from under the President of the United States so badly that they are willing to strand the people in Iraq and even endanger our soldiers. I think it is outrageous.

If we listen to the Presidential debates on the Democrat side, Dean, Kerry, Clark, it does not really matter what they say today, because tomorrow they will be saying the opposite thing. It is like a jam session of the first amendment without any responsibility to what your words are.

But let us look at the situation in Iraq. We have a very successful military operation that is on balance. I do not want another American soldier or any soldier or any citizen to get killed, obviously. But we have done a remarkable job, and we have secured the country.

Look at the situation of the citizenry. They are standing forward, they are in power, they are getting police forces in each town, they are getting a militia going. Look at the infrastructure of freedom that is emerging: 150 newspapers, health care benefits, electricity and water. All of this is happening. It is not the time to retreat and pull the rug out from under the people of Iraq or our military. Let us pass the supplemental.

9–11 HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH ATTACK ON IRAQ

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it really is time for us to admit the truth. Mr. Speaker, 9–11, 2001 had nothing to do with the unilateral first strike on Iraq. We think that when we mention the word ''terrorist'' that it is a buzzword and we all are supposed to understand that that is the reason why the attack came to Iraq. That is not true. It never has been true. It is not true now.

Each time we talk about the cost of this war, we mention 9–11. It has nothing to do with that. It has more to do with trying to take over a country because you disagree with the leader, just like somebody could take this one over because they disagree with our leader, and boss it, steal their oil, or whatever. But we need to tell the truth about it. It is not the truth that it has anything to do with 9–11.

Mr. Speaker, we are taking our public to be stupid when we continue to say that 9–11 is connected with the Iraq attack. If that had to do with it, we would have the support of the U.N. We do not, because we made unilateral, first strikes without a reason, because we were not under immediate danger.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

AMERICAN DREAM DOWNPAYMENT ACT

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1276) to provide downpayment assistance under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1276

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Dream Downpayment Act''.

SEC. 2. DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE UNDER HOME PROGRAM.

(a) DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.—Subtitle E of title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12821) is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle E—Other Assistance

''SEC. 271. DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE.

''(a) GRANT AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may make grants to participating jurisdictions to assist low-income families to achieve homeownership, in accordance with this section.

''(b) ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts made available under this section may be used only for downpayment assistance toward the purchase of single family housing by eligible families. For purposes of this title, the term 'downpayment assistance' means assistance to help a family acquire a principal residence.

''(2) ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible family' means a family who—

''(A) is a low-income family and a first-time homebuyer; or

''(B) notwithstanding the income limitation under section 215(b)(2)—

''(i) includes a uniformed employee (which shall include policemen, firemen, and sanitation and other maintenance workers) or a teacher who is an employee, of the participating jurisdiction (or an agency or school district serving such jurisdiction) that is providing the downpayment assistance under this section for the family; and

''(ii) has an income, at the time referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 215(b)(2), as appropriate, and as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families, that does not exceed 115 percent of the median income of the area, except that, with respect only to such areas that the Secretary determines have high housing costs, taking into consideration median house prices and median family incomes for the area, such income limitation shall be 150 percent of the median income of the area, as determined by the Secretary with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

''(c) HOUSING STRATEGY.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section for a fiscal year, a participating jurisdiction shall include in its comprehensive housing affordability strategy under section 105 for such year—

''(1) a description of the use of the grant amounts;

''(2) a plan for conducting targeted outreach to residents and tenants of public housing, trailer parks, and manufactured housing, and to other families assisted by public housing agencies, for the purpose of ensuring that grant amounts provided under this section to a participating jurisdiction are used for downpayment assistance for such residents, tenants, and families; and

''(3) a description of the actions to be taken to ensure the suitability of families provided downpayment assistance under this section to undertake and maintain homeownership.

''(d) FORMULA ALLOCATION.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary shall allocate any amounts made available for assistance under this section for the fiscal year in accordance with a formula, which shall be established by the Secretary, that considers a participating jurisdiction's need for and prior commitment to assistance to homebuyers. The formula may include minimum allocation amounts. In considering a participating jurisdiction's prior year's commitment to assistance to homebuyers, the formula shall consider amounts committed to such purpose under the HOME investment partnerships program, the community development block grant program, mortgage revenue bonds, and prior year's funding from State and local governments, provided that the data underlying such funding is uniform, verifiable, and accurate by the State and local government, and shall consider other factors that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

''(e) REALLOCATION.—If any amounts allocated to a participating jurisdiction under this section become available for reallocation, the amounts shall be reallocated to other participating jurisdictions in accordance with the formula established pursuant to subsection (d), except that if a local participating jurisdiction failed to receive amounts allocated under this section and is located in a State that is a participating jurisdiction, the funds shall be reallocated to the State.

''(f) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, grants under this section shall not be subject to the provisions of this title.

''(2) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—In addition to the requirements of this section, grants under this section shall be subject to the provisions of title I, sections 215(b) (except as provided in subsection (b)(2)(B) of this section), 218, 219, 221, 223, 224, and 226(a) of subtitle A of this title, and subtitle F of this title.

''(3) REFERENCES.—In applying the requirements of subtitle A referred to in paragraph (2)—

''(A) any references to funds under subtitle A shall be considered to refer to amounts made available for assistance under this section; and

''(B) any references to funds allocated or reallocated under section 217 or 217(d) shall be considered to refer to amounts allocated or reallocated under subsection (d) or (e) of this section, respectively.

''(g) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Notwithstanding section 212(c), a participating jurisdiction may use funds under subtitle A for administrative and planning costs of the jurisdiction in carrying out this section, and the limitation in section 212(c) shall be based on the total amount of funds available under subtitle A and this section.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $200,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005.''.

(b) RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE.—Subtitle F of title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is amended by inserting after section 290 (42 U.S.C. 12840) the following new section:

''SEC. 291. RELOCATION ASSISTANCE AND DOWNPAYMENT ASSISTANCE.

''The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 shall not apply to downpayment assistance under this title.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1276 and to insert extraneous material thereon.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act. There are many people that we need to thank for the point that we have gotten to today to have this tremendous piece of legislation here on the floor of the House. This was a commitment made by President Bush to do this piece of legislation, and Secretary Mel Martinez brought this to our committee when I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity.

I have to also directly thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), our ranking member of the subcommittee, for all of her work, her bipartisan spirit, and her concern for housing for all people from all walks of life, from the rural and urban areas across the United States. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) above all, who is chairman of the full committee, for his dedication to this important piece of housing legislation, and obviously also to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member of the full committee. Also on our side of the aisle, and I am sure it will be recognized on the Democrat side of the aisle, but Bob Foster, Carter McDowell, and Peggy Peterson of the gentleman from Ohio's (Chairman OXLEY) staff, and also the staff of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity: Clinton Jones, Cindy Chetti, Tallman Johnson, Bob Weisberg, and Hugh Halpern. Again, I want to thank all of these individuals for coming together to support the American Dream Downpayment Act.

This bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS). This initiative is designed to assist thousands of low-income families realize the American dream of homeownership. Moreover, this new group of homeowners is expected to boost the American economy with an infusion of roughly $256 million.

The benefits of homeownership for families, communities, and our country are obviously profound. When our citizens own homes, they establish roots and therefore have a greater stake in their community's growth, safety, and development.

While the national homeownership rate has steadily risen and is at an all-time high of 60 percent, there are sectors of our population, Mr. Speaker, for whom homeownership remains unattainable. In fact, the homeownership rate for African Americans and Hispanics is less than 50 percent. Clearly, this is unacceptable. More can and should be done to help all of our citizens realize the true benefits of owning a home.

If the persistent gap in minority homeownership is to be substantially narrowed, the structural barriers to homeownership, particularly the lack of capital for downpayments and closing costs, must be addressed. I believe this is one of the major points to the bill. I can remember when my father was able, finally, after 20 years of saving for a downpayment, was able to acquire a house. I was about 10 years old. It was the greatest day of our lives. But I do not think people ought to have to wait 5, 10, 15 years to try to get the downpayment. They will struggle to make the mortgage payment, they will work two jobs to do it, families will; but that downpayment is a serious problem for many people. This legislation eliminates that barrier for families struggling to save for a downpayment, but otherwise would qualify for homeownership. Many low-income Americans, particularly in minority communities, can meet a monthly mortgage payment, but they cannot afford the downpayment and closing costs associated with a standard residential loan.

Improving the ability of Americans to make the transition to homeownership will be an important test of the Nation's capacity to create economic opportunity for minorities and immigrants and to build strong and stable communities. In most cases, the purchase of a home will be the largest and most significant investment an individual will make. Therefore, the home equity created by the home purchase represents a significant share of home household net worth for most American families.

This legislation will provide communities throughout America with $200 million in grants for each year in fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2005. An estimated 40,000 low-income families each year will achieve first-time homeownership. Each qualifying family will be given an average of $5,000 to be used toward downpayment and closing costs.

The American Dream Initiative will be administered as part of HUD's HOME investment partnerships program, known as HOME, an existing program that helps communities expand the supply of affordable housing for low and very low income families by providing grants to States and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1276 included language that would allow HUD to place a maximum cap on the amount of funds certain urban areas could receive under the American Dream program. During this consideration of this legislation in the full committee markup, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) expressed concern that this language would limit the amount of funds areas would be able to receive.

I would want to note, Mr. Speaker, we have removed the word ''maximum'' on page 5 of the bill as reported out of the committee. The removal of the word ''maximum'' makes the proposed formula in H.R. 1276 consistent with the pattern and practices of other programs under HUD such as HOME and CDBG, and assures that no arbitrary limit is placed on the amount of funds any particular area may receive.

I again want to thank everybody involved with this bill and Secretary Martinez for his personal involvement. I also want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) for their leadership on this important piece of legislation. Without their diligent support, this legislation would not have been possible.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to note that when the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) came to us at the beginning of the session, she said she wanted to be on the Subcommittee on Housing to make a difference for all Americans from all walks of life. I want to note to my colleagues today that she surely has made that difference. Through the leadership of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), a lot of people across this Nation are going to have, for the first time in their lives, the opportunity to have a home in a family setting.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this initiative.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act, a bill to assist low-income families in achieving homeownership by providing downpayment assistance under the HOME Investments Partnership Act.

I would like to thank the chairman of our Subcommittee on Housing, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), for his leadership. I would like to thank him for his evenhandedness in the management of the committee that helps to bring us all together in support of legislation that makes good sense for all of the Members of this Congress.

I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and tell her how fortunate she is as a new Member to have the support of her administration in seeing to it that she is able to have a bill that will truly do something for American families that we would all like to do. Normally, this bill would be thought of as a liberal bill. This is the kind of bill that the Democrats would normally roll out, if we were in power, because it is talking about spending money, it is talking about spending money for poor people who want to have homeownership, but cannot afford that downpayment.

□ 1045

Downpayments are very tough. Many people who pay their bills regularly, who have never missed paying their utility bills, they pay their rent on time, they work every day, just cannot manage to come up with that 10 percent or 15 percent or whatever is being required in those markets for downpayments. And so that is why this bill is so important.

It would create a new subtitle within the Home Investment Partnerships Act to authorize grant by formula to States and localities for the exclusive purpose of providing downpayment assistance to low-income first-time home buyers; families, that is, with 80 percent or lower of local median income, the formula to be established by HUD, based on a grantee's need for and prior commitment to assistance to home buyers.

The bill authorizes $200 million in funding in each of the next 2 fiscal years. The administration projects that $200 million in funding would assist 40,000 low-income home buyers. The downpayment assistance authorized under this will be administered by the Home Investment Partnership Program that is referred to as HOME. HOME is an existing grant program that helps communities nationwide expand the supply of housing for low- and very low-income families.

The House appropriated $125 million for this program in funding year 2004 VA-HUD appropriations bill approved by the House earlier this summer. This is an increase from the $75 million appropriated in the funding year 2003 VA-HUD budget for the program contained in the omnibus appropriations bill for funding year 2003 passed in February of this year.

Unfortunately, HUD is still writing regulations for this downpayment assistance program and has not yet released the funding year 2003 funding.

According to HUD study, entitled Barriers to Minority Home Ownership, the overall home ownership rate is 68 percent, while home ownership rates for African Americans and Latinos are 48 and 46 percent, respectively. The HUD report established that one of the most persistent barriers to minority home ownership is the lack of capital for downpayment and closing costs.

Without going into a lot more detail, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that this is a bill that will get support from both sides of the aisle. Democrats have been advocating for a long time for these kinds of expenditures to deal with the housing crisis in America, and so I expect that we will have unanimous support for this bill.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), the author of the bill.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act.

As our Nation continues to confront daunting threats both at home and abroad, we cannot neglect the most basic security of all, and that is a safe, clean, adequate place to live. Across our Nation, families and individuals are consigned to deplorable conditions in substandard housing. In a Nation that enjoys a level of wealth and material comfort that is unprecedented in human history, this state of affairs is unconscionable.

We have the power to address this obligation of a decent, compassionate society today. Better yet, we can attack the housing crisis besetting our Nation by attacking the poverty that underlies it.

H.R. 1276 constitutes the first step in fulfillment of President Bush's plan to create 5.5 million new minority home owners by the end of the decade. This visionary initiative will add $256 billion to the American economy.

As I have consulted with housing advocates throughout my district, I have repeatedly heard that a great number of low-income Americans could meet their monthly mortgage payment, but they cannot surmount that initial obstacle of a downpayment and closing costs. Thus, a steep entry fee is all that stands between many low-income Americans and the dignity, the stability, and the economic empowerment of home ownership.

The resulting home ownership gap, which disproportionately impacts African Americans and Hispanic Americans, has staggering economic and social consequences. Studies show that the average worth of a low-income person, about $900, skyrockets to $70,000 when they own a home. In 1998, owner-occupied property constituted 21 percent of all household wealth as well as more than 71 percent of all tangible wealth.

Moreover, the home ownership gap dramatically impacts the lives of our children. Statistics show that children of families who own their own home experience a 13 percent higher graduation together with a 7 percent accelerated rate in math achievement and reading recognition. Additionally, such children complete almost one half year more of education.

For the young people who live in homes their families own, they enjoy a greater level of self-esteem while receiving an indispensable educational exercise in the proper maintenance of personal property.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1276 empowers tens of thousands of low-income Americans to overcome this striking inequality in our land of opportunity. As a compassionate society, we have a moral obligation to empower individuals and families and communities with the tools to build their own prosperity. By authorizing a total of $400 million in grants to communities throughout America over fiscal years 2004 and 2005, this bill will enable 80,000 low-income Americans to purchase their first home.

As we proceed to a vote on this revolutionary bill, I would like to recognize the Bush administration and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS) for their continued commitment to extending quality, affordable housing to every American, as well as for their tremendous creativity in developing solutions that can help us achieve this goal.

Further, I wish to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) of the Committee on Financial Services, as well as my deepest appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) who has assisted me daily with this bill, and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity for their outstanding leadership in shepherding H.R. 1276 through the legislative process.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the support of the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), as well as my dear friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) for his extraordinary bipartisanship. Their passionate dedication to fulfilling this moral imperative of quality affordable housing for every American continues to inspire us all.

I would like to thank our extraordinary committee staff for their diligence and expertise, as well as my outstanding staff member, Miguel Romano, for his diligent work on this bill.

Today, let us reaffirm the expansiveness of the American dream by passing this vital legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me compliment my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) as the primary sponsor of this bill and let me compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) for his leadership on this issue. Let me extend compliments as well to the ranking member of the subcommittee, who is present here today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is not here.

We do a lot of things in this institution, Mr. Speaker. We argue about a lot of issues, but every now and then we manage to find something we agree on. Every now and then we manage to find something that has enormous bipartisan appeal. And that is how we have arrived at H.R. 1276. Whether it is in the district of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) or my district or the district of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), wherever you go in this country, the American dream is very much expressed in terms of whether or not people have a chance to own a home.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman NEY) said earlier, for the overwhelming majority of people in this country of ours, the only tool of wealth they will ever have, the only significant assets they will ever have is a home. We can talk about all the indices of community engagement, from whether you vote to whether or not you mow your lawn, to whether or not you participate in your neighborhood

association. The greatest correlator of community engagement is home ownership.

We look at our economy in the last 2 years, and all of us on both sides of the aisle would agree, if you take out the housing boom, if you somehow remove that from our economy, we would be deep in the throes of a 2½-year recession now.

This is very important work, and it is a compliment to the leadership on both sides of the aisle that this bill has made its way to the floor. And it is a compliment to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) that we have arrived at a consensus here today.

I want to make a few basic points. We have a lot of unfinished work on the housing front. No one on our side of the aisle would suggest that this is all that needs to be done. No one on our side on the aisle would suggest that the $200 million is the only commitment of resources that we ought to make. But rest assured that this $200 million commitment will result in over 40,000 low-income families receiving help in buying homes.

I can say briefly in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I travel around my district, we regularly do home ownership events, we regularly do housing events; and I always enjoy seeing the spark that I see in people's faces when they have a chance to finally become home owners. I enjoy seeing the spark when they know they are going to finally realize their piece of the American dream.

We have made this bill better. It was a good bill. We have made it a better bill. We have made the formula for calculating downpayment assistance a fair and better formula. We will address the unfinished aspects of this bill related to credit counseling. We will more forward on those fronts.

I encourage my colleagues, as I know they will today, to vote overwhelmingly for the American Dream Downpayment Act. I am proud to be one of the original sponsors of this bill, and I again compliment my friend from Florida for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI), a tremendous new member, but a member that has immediately gotten to work on our Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity to help the people not only of his district, but of the Nation.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), my friend, on her substantive and important bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 1276 will help tens of thousands of low-income Americans achieve the dream of owning their first home. We know equity in a home is the primary asset used by most American families to help their kids get to college. In addition, many small business owners use the equity in their home to borrow and start their first small businesses here in America, to help our growing economy and to support their growing families.

This legislation provides $200 million in grants to over 40,000 low-income families over the next 2 years. This money will assist low-income families with downpayments and closing costs.

Today, more than two-thirds of Americans own their home, but fewer than half of African American and Hispanic families are home owners and less than one-third are Native Americans. This legislation is a real help to all families. Studies have shown that math achievement and reading recognition levels are 7 percent higher for children with families who own their own home, and they complete almost a half-year more education if they have home ownership. High school graduation rates for children with families who own their own home are 13 percent higher than renting families.

Let us remove the obstacles and give deserving families a real chance. Rally around the leadership shown by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and let us work together to pass this needed legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the American Dream Downpayment Act, H.R. 1276, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and of course my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) who happens to be a Member from that area as well. His mother lives in Fontana. And of course our minority leader as well, who has been very instrumental, and that is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), in fighting to ensure that many of the poor and disadvantaged have opportunities in many different areas. This is an area that she is fighting for to make sure that individuals have an opportunity to own a home for the very first time.

Right now, Hispanics and minorities are struggling to purchase homes at a far greater rate than the rest of the Nation. In my own district, the Hispanic ownership rate is only 59 percent. That is nearly 10 percent less than the national average, and it is 15 percent less than the national non-Hispanic white average.

In my own district, which is 58 percent Hispanic, it has become increasingly difficult for Hispanics to own businesses because there is a housing boom that is causing the prices to skyrocket. In our area, we have the majority of growth which continues to move from L.A. to Orange County into our area, but it has become difficult for them to become first-time home buyers.

The median housing price in San Bernardino County went from $116,000 in the year 2002 to $207,000 in August. That is a 29 percent increase.

□ 1100

Hispanics and minorities all over the Nation are struggling to keep up. Not only do Hispanics earn less in wages than the rest of the population, but Hispanic unemployment is rising as well. Right now, Hispanic unemployment is nearly 7.8.

At the same time, we have an administration that is pushing for programs to turn Section 8 low income-housing vouchers into State blocks. In California, and States with huge budget deficits, it will hurt the low-income minority population because they will not be able to rent, let alone buy a home.

But the American Dream Downpayment Act will help Hispanics and many other minorities become homeowners. It will help low-income and first-time home buyers make downpayments on their first home. We must make sure we give them that opportunity.

I know what it was like because I come from a large family of 15, and let me tell my colleagues for the very first time that my dad was able to purchase a home, while it was very difficult, we fell under that category, but it was important for me and for my family to have stability. We had a foundation for the very first time. We were able to own a home that we never owned before because we were moving from one place or project to another project, living in the ghettos and the projects, moving from one place to another, but instability had allowed it.

This act will allow individuals to have that stability we need to say, I am going to one school, I do not have to go to four, five or six different schools as I went. It will also help increase the education amongst the kids where they have the stability in terms of going to one school, having their friends that are there and being able to take pride in their home. I know what it was like, and I took pride in my home when we had it.

Let me tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this bill. It is a good bill, and I compliment our minority leaders and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) in carrying this legislation.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER), another great member of our Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, who has been extremely active in concerns and issues of housing.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I really want to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) for doing this. This is a really, really, really good bill. I had been a builder for over 30 years in my real life before coming to government. The gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY) really has a passion for this issue. The gentleman from Massachusetts (ranking member FRANK), a good friend of mine, has really done everything he can to look for opportunities to really help people get into homes, and the

gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), who chairs the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, just has a supervision and really looks for things that are good.

Some would say, why are we doing this? I am a conservative Republican, and one would say, well, why is the government getting involved in this issue. Some real good reasons. The average homeowner has assets totalling about $70,000. Yet the average low-income renter's assets are below $1,000. Most of these people that are going to benefit from this program are already on Section 8 housing vouchers or they are in some type of government housing. So how do we create an environment where people rely on themselves and count less on government? That is to get them in a home.

If we leave people in Section 8 housing, they are going to be there. They cannot get out. They do not have the downpayment, the necessary wealth to be able to move into society, as we would say it, and have the experience of the dream of owning a home. There is nothing like selling a home to somebody, watching a person and a family move into home, they have dreams, they have anticipations, they make plans for the future.

This is a good bill. Imagine if we get a family into a home that is now receiving government subsistence, at a point in time they no longer need help from the government because they have acquired wealth in their own home. When they buy that home, their rent remains consistent. When they take and rent a home, whether it is through Section 8 or a government home, the rent increases as the years goes by. So look at a situation where a family moves into a home, 10 years from now, they are going to pay a lot more than they currently pay if they are renting a home, but if they own that home, they are paying the same 10 years from now as they are today.

Our goal in government should be to do everything we can to create the best economic environment we can for the citizens. The best way to do it is to get people into their own home. There is nothing, nothing like moving people into something that they consider their own, rather than something they consider somebody else's they are allowed to rent.

We have a situation growing in this country that I consider the new homeless, and these are people who have good jobs, the husband and wife both work, the husband might be a policeman or a fireman, the wife might be a nurse or whatever or a schoolteacher, and yet they cannot afford to live within the community within which they work. How many people do my colleagues know whose children were raised in a community they cannot afford to buy a home and live within the city in which they spent their life growing up because it has become so expensive? In many cases, government has created so many roadblocks, they have increased the cost of housing, that we need to look at every opportunity we have to eliminate the roadblocks, to decrease the restrictions and to do everything we can to move people into homeownership.

There is a huge shortage of Section 8 housing and government housing for low-income people. People are on waiting lists, and the reason is the people who currently live in those homes cannot afford to move up to the next level. They are relegated to that, and we have to change that.

This is a great opportunity. It is a bipartisan bill, and I would strongly encourage a yes vote.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume to close out the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is motherhood and apple pie. This is what public policy should be about, recognizing a need and moving to place in law some law that will indeed help those who really do need assistance to realize the American dream. This did not start today, did not start yesterday.

We have a lot of legislators who have worked on this. Congresswoman Roukema is not here anymore. She worked on this, and I think we had it in the 2003 Omnibus bill. We did not get that at that time, but it has been revisited in this way by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), and again, there will be no opposition. Truly, this is motherhood and apple pie. Homeownership, there are so many people who are desirous of owning their homes, who work every day but cannot afford that downpayment.

I am pleased that we spent time in committee thanks to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and Democrats were able to improve this bill during the committee markup by offering several amendments that were adopted, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and even an amendment that I offered to require targeted outreach programs. My amendment requires participating jurisdictions to conduct outreach to people living in public housing, Section 8 housing and manufactured housing as part of their plan to access these dollars. That means we are taking care of inner city, we are taking care of suburbia and we are taking care of the rural areas. It is not just about public housing. It is about manufactured housing, also, and so we worked to make sure that the outreach that is done is comprehensive. This outreach will ensure more residents will have an opportunity to share in the American dream and break their dependence on public housing assistance.

I am also pleased that the committee report on this bill includes report language clarifying that funds appropriated for this program should be new money and not be offset by a reduction in HOME block grants. Sometimes we come up with bills and we talk about the costs, but yet we do not appropriate new money. We reduce the money in some other pot, and we have language in this bill that will prevent that from happening.

Mr. Speaker, owning a home also can provide a sense of security and contribute to safer, stronger neighborhoods. A financial and personal stake in a residence helps the residents to create a better neighborhood where families, children and all the elderly can thrive and enjoy a better quality of life.

I am pleased to be a part of this committee. I am pleased to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) who actually carried this bill, introduced it last session, and we appreciate his support.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for all that she has done to get this bill on the floor and her leadership, and I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) very much for taking charge of this bill this session and getting it to where it was.

It was a little bit over a year ago that I stood in Detroit, Michigan, celebrating the 100th Habitat home going up with Secretary Martinez, and it was a great day for us. It was kind of a little bit chilly, a little bit rainy, but the excitement, the joy, even the tears about having that key go in that door and turning that knob was exhilarating and exhilarated a whole community as we stood under that tent together opening the door of that new home for that family. In that same crowd, there were dozens of folks who were there who had a little bit of hope to experience that very same exhilaration by sticking that key in that door and calling it theirs, calling it their home. We all know that there is a difference between a place to live and a home.

That day, that particular house, built by volunteers and the family that was going in, became a home in a community that needed all the help it could get. It had a very low homeownership rate, and what we found is that as we increased these number of homes, truancy went down, crime rates went down, investment in the community, the school overall performance went up, and that is what this bill is about, and we should not forget it.

It is about minority ownership coming up to where it needs to be, but it is about the very gift to the very family who is playing by the rules, getting up

every day, doing the right thing, paying all their bills, putting shoes on their children's feet, making their rent payments, making their utility payments, and this is the one hurdle, the very one hurdle that stops them, that puts them in the back of the tent watching somebody else put that key in the door.

For all of my colleagues that helped do this, I thank them very, very much. This will be a profound impact on thousands and thousands of American families. This is an investment in our future. I want to thank all of my colleagues for their commitment to this. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY). I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) for her leadership and Secretary Martinez for championing this cause.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON). He and his staff have been very energetic in support of this bill.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act, and I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for his leadership. I want to commend the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) for her wonderful leadership on this issue, and then my colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) who has from the beginning been such an important part as he understood and eloquently explained the bill just now.

More than two-thirds of all Americans own their own home. However, fewer than half of all African American and Hispanic families are homeowners. For these families, one of the biggest barriers to homeownership is the inability to afford the downpayment and closing costs associated with purchasing a home. This legislation seeks to help close this homeownership gap by making $200 million in grants available to more than 40,000 first-time, low-income families to help them achieve the American dream of homeownership.

This is especially important to the 2nd Congressional District of South Carolina where many families would greatly benefit from this legislation. Too often, the dream of raising your family in your own home seems far out of reach. As a former real estate attorney, I know firsthand the joy of working with first-time home purchasers, especially because I worked pro bono with the meaningful Habitat for Humanity program, along with the Home Builders Association and the Realtors Association.

Further, the American Dream Downpayment initiative will help low- and moderate-income families build wealth. Consider that the average homeowner's assets total $70,000, while the average low-income renter's assets are below $1,000. Equity in a home, the primary asset held by most American families, is the best mechanism that families have for wealth creation. We can use our homes to send our children to college, to start small businesses and to build better lives.

In short, homeownership makes family stakeholders in their communities. H.R. 1276 will increase the rights of stakeholders and bring stability and a new revitalization to our communities. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 1276.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

It is my understanding that, during committee consideration, an agreement was made between the chairman and myself to incorporate the provision dealing with financial literacy into the report on H.R. 1276. I would like this language to be included into the RECORD.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to respond, it is my understanding and I accept the language as was just stated.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, that is my colleague's understanding, and I thank the gentleman for that. I will insert that language at this point in the RECORD.

The full Committee also adopted two amendments during consideration. The first would require States and localities to ensure that families receiving the housing assistance are financially prepared to maintain ownership of their homes after the purchase by requiring recipients to complete a course of homeownership counseling. Alternatively, if this is not feasible, grantees could provide information in advance to grant recipients describing the risks and responsibilities of homeownership, providing assistance in understanding the mortgage loan process and financing options, and making recipients aware of any homeownership counseling that is available locally.

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

In closing, let me just, once again, thank our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) for his diligence and perseverance in the way he has handled the committee, to produce many good products over this session, and when it comes to housing, he has given us the backing we needed; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), our ranking member of the subcommittee, who has helped so much on this bill and also to everybody again that made this bill possible.

I just want to conclude by saying it is a dream for many Americans to have their homes, from all walks of life.

□ 1115

We are taking a step today on the floor of this House to do that. This is a bill that every Member of this House can be proud of. It is a bill that they can support, and it is a bill that is going to do something for generations to come as people establish their home, as people are able to take care of their families and be part of their communities in a very, very productive way.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in closing and in urging support, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS), who had the desire, the tenacity and definitely put in all the time needed to make sure that this bill became a reality today. Without her, we would not be here today producing this bill, which, again, will help future generations. So I urge support of the bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the American dream, as conceived by the Nation's Founders, has little in common with H.R. 1276, the so-called American Dream Downpayment Act. In the original version of the American dream, individuals earned the money to purchase a house through their own efforts, often times sacrificing other goods to save for their first downpayment. According to the sponsors of H.R. 1276, that old American dream has been replaced by a new dream of having the Federal Government force your fellow citizens to hand you the money for a downpayment.

H.R. 1276 not only warps the true meaning of the American dream, but also exceeds Congress' constitutional boundaries and interferes with and distorts the operation of the free market. Instead of expanding unconstitutional federal power, Congress should focus its energies on dismantling the federal housing bureaucracy so the American people can control housing resources and use the free market to meet their demands for affordable housing.

As the great economist Ludwig Von Mises pointed out, questions of the proper allocation of resources for housing and other goods should be determined by consumer preference in the free market. Resources removed from the market and distributed according to the preferences of government politician and bureaucrats are not devoted to their highest-valued use. Thus, government interference in the economy results in a loss of economic efficiency and, more importantly, a lower standard of living for all citizens.

H.R. 1276 takes resources away from private citizens, through confiscatory taxation, and uses them for the politically favored cause of expanding home ownership. Government subsidization of housing leads to an excessive allocation of resources to the housing market. Thus, thanks to government policy, resources that would have been devoted to education, transportation, or some other good desired by consumers, will instead be devoted to housing. Proponents of this bill ignore the socially beneficial uses the monies devoted to housing might have been put to had those resources been left in the hands of private citizens.

Finally, while I know this argument is unlikely to have much effect on my colleagues, I must point out that Congress has no constitutional authority to take money from one American and redistribute it to another. Legislation such as H.R. 1276, which takes tax money from some Americans to give to others whom Congress has determined are worthy, is thus blatantly unconstitutional.

I hope no one confuses my opposition to this bill as opposition to any congressional actions to ensure more Americans have access to affordable housing. After all, one reason many Americans lack affordable housing is because taxes and regulations have made it impossible for builders to provide housing at a price that could be afforded by many lower-income Americans. Therefore, Congress should cut taxes and regulations. A good start would be generous housing tax credits. Congress should also consider tax credits and regulatory relief for developers who provide housing for those with low incomes. For example, I am cosponsoring H.R. 839, the Renewing the Dream Tax Credit Act, which provides a tax credit to developers who construct or rehabilitate low-income housing.

H.R. 1276 distorts the economy and violates constitutional prohibitions on income redistribution. A better way of guaranteeing an efficient housing market where everyone could meet their own needs for housing would be for Congress to repeal taxes and programs that burden the housing industry and allow housing needs to be met by the free market. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and instead develop housing policies consistent with constitutional principles, the laws of economics, and respect for individual rights.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act. This bill, of which this Member is an original cosponsor, authorizes $200 million in grants to be made available as part of the HOME program to first-time low-income families for downpayment assistance. This important legislation is strongly supported by the Administration and is a priority of the distinguished Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (Mr. Martinez).

First, this Member would like to thank the distinguished gentlelady from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) for introducing this legislation. Furthermore, this Member would also like to thank both the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the Chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the Ranking Member of this Committee, for their support in bringing this measure to the House Floor.

One of the main obstacles for families who want to purchase a home is that they do not have the resources for a sufficient mortgage downpayment. As a response to this pressing need, this legislation would provide downpayment assistance grants to more than 40,000 first-time low income families.

The American Dream Downpayment Act would be administered as part of HUD's successful HOME program which currently provides grants to states and entitlement communities (over 50,000 in population) to use for affordable housing. This bill authorizes $200 million in new authorized funds to be used for downpayment assistance by states and entitlement communities. Furthermore, this bill would preserve the flexibility of the HOME program by allowing these states and localities to craft a package of downpayment assistance which meets their specific needs.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, as a Member of the House Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, this Member strongly supports H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act. This Member encourages his colleagues to support H.R. 1276.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, the House is considering H.R. 1276, the American Dream Downpayment Act. This important legislation, introduced by Reps. KATHERINE HARRIS and MIKE ROGERS, will help tens of thousands of low-income families to achieve the American dream of homeownership.

The nation's overall homeownership rate is at an all time high of 68 percent. However, the homeownership rate for African-Americans, Hispanic and other non-Hispanic minorities is approximately 49 percent. We can and must do better than this; H.R. 1276 will go a long way in helping to close this homeownership gap.

For many families, the biggest barrier to homeownership is their inability to afford the downpayment and closing costs. While they can afford the monthly mortgage payments, they are unable to save the funds necessary for the downpayment and closing costs needed to purchase their first home. H.R. 1276 addresses this barrier by providing communities across America with $200 million in grants, which is anticipated to help more than 40,000 first-time low-income families to purchase their first homes.

H.R. 1276 will be administered as part of HUD's HOME Investment Partnership Program, an existing program that helps communities increase the availability of affordable housing for families most in need through grants to state and local governments. The American Dream Downpayment Act preserves the flexibility of the HOME program, so that states can tailor assistance to best meet the needs of local citizens.

H.R. 1276 has received the endorsement of: HUD Secretary Mel Martinez; America's Community Bankers; Consumers Bankers Association; Fannie Mae; Freddie Mac; Housing Assistance Council; Manufactured Housing Institute; Mortgage Bankers Association of America; National Association of Home Builders; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials; National Association of Mortgage Brokers; and National Association of Realtors.

When families own their own home, they become stakeholders in their communities. H.R. 1276 will increase the ranks of stakeholders and bring stability and a new spirit of revitalization to our communities. By helping families purchase their own homes, we can give them the wealth-building opportunity that homeownership provides. Hard-working, low-income families across the country will finally have an opportunity to profit from both the community and economic benefits that come from owning your own home.

In addition to the many benefits for low-income families, homeownership helps to fuel the economy. People who own their homes spend money for home improvements. In fact, the housing industry itself has been one of the few bright spots in the national economy over the last three years.

Passage of the American Dream Downpayment Act represents an important step in closing the minority homeownership gap. I want to again commend Representatives KATHERINE HARRIS, MIKE ROGERS, Chairman NEY and Ranking Minority MAXINE WATERS for their hard work on this important measure and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the ''American Dream Downpayment Act.'' I thank Congresswoman KATHERINE HARRIS, Congressman ARTUR DAVIS, Congressman MIKE ROGERS and all the members of the Financial Services Committee for their hard work on this important bill.

This legislation, which I am proud to have cosponsored, will help low and moderate income families purchase their first home. As Delaware's governor, I established a Housing Development Trust Fund that helped more than 5,400 low- to moderate-income families become homeowners. I am pleased to support this program which seeks to help more than 40,000 first-time, low-income families achieve their dream of homeownership.

We can be proud of the historic levels of homeownership we have reached in this country, we must also recognize that the number of people who pay more than half of their income in housing is also rising. We need to make our existing government housing programs more efficient and expand them through responsible programs that will help our constituents realize their dreams of homeownership. Equity in a home is the primary asset held by most American families and the best mechanism that families have for wealth creation.

I have maintained a longstanding commitment to affordable housing and expanding homeownership, this legislation is a positive step in furthering that goal. Thomas Jefferson once said the happiest moments of his life were those which he had passed at home in the embrace of his family. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased we are working to bring that sentiment to all Americans and I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1276, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2608) to reauthorize the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Section 4 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

''(8) The term 'Interagency Coordinating Committee' means the Interagency Coordinating

Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction established under section 5(a).

''(9) The term 'Advisory Committee' means the Advisory Committee established under section 5(a)(5).''.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION PROGRAM.

Section 5 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704(b)) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

''(2) PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—The activities of the Program shall be designed to—

''(A) develop effective measures for earthquake hazards reduction;

''(B) promote the adoption of earthquake hazards reduction measures by Federal, State, and local governments, national standards and model code organizations, architects and engineers, building owners, and others with a role in planning and constructing buildings, structures, and lifelines through—

''(i) grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and technical assistance;

''(ii) development of standards, guidelines, and voluntary consensus codes for earthquake hazards reduction for buildings, structures, and lifelines; and

''(iii) development and maintenance of a repository of information, including technical data, on seismic risk and hazards reduction; and

''(C) improve the understanding of earthquakes and their effects on communities, buildings, structures, and lifelines, through interdisciplinary research that involves engineering, natural sciences, and social, economic, and decisions sciences.

''(3) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON EARTHQUAKE HAZARDS REDUCTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction chaired by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (referred to in this subsection as the 'Director').

''(B) MEMBERSHIP.—The committee shall be composed of the directors of—

''(i) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

''(ii) the United States Geological Survey;

''(iii) the National Science Foundation;

''(iv) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

''(v) the Office of Management and Budget.

''(C) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet not less than 3 times a year at the call of the Director.

''(D) PURPOSE AND DUTIES.—The Interagency Coordinating Committee shall oversee the planning, management, and coordination of the Program. The Interagency Coordinating Committee shall—

''(i) develop, not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and update periodically—

''(I) a strategic plan that establishes goals and priorities for the Program activities described under subsection (a)(2); and

''(II) a detailed management plan to implement such strategic plan; and

''(ii) develop a coordinated interagency budget for the Program that will ensure appropriate balance among the Program activities described under subsection (a)(2), and submit such budget to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget at the time designated by that office for agencies to submit annual budgets.

''(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Interagency Coordinating Committee shall transmit, at the time of the President's budget request to Congress, an annual report to the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate. Such report shall include—

''(A) the Program budget for the current fiscal year for each agency that participates in the Program, and for each major goal established for the Program activities under subparagraph (3)(A);

''(B) the proposed Program budget for the next fiscal year for each agency that participates in the Program, and for each major goal established for the Program activities under subparagraph (3)(A);

''(C) a description of the activities and results of the Program during the previous year, including an assessment of the effectiveness of the Program in furthering the goals established in the strategic plan under (3)(A);

''(D) a description of the extent to which the Program has incorporated the recommendations of the Advisory Committee;

''(E) a description of activities, including budgets for the current fiscal year and proposed budgets for the next fiscal year, that are carried out by Program agencies and contribute to the Program, but are not included in the Program; and

''(F) a description of the activities, including budgets for the current fiscal year and proposed budgets for the following fiscal year, related to the grant program carried out under subsection (b)(2)(A)(i).

''(5) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish an Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction consisting of non-Federal members, including representatives of research and academic institutions, industry standards development organizations, State and local government, and financial communities who are qualified to provide advice on earthquake hazards reduction. The recommendations of the Advisory Committee shall be considered by Federal agencies in implementing the Program.

''(B) ASSESSMENT.—The Advisory Committee shall assess—

''(i) trends and developments in the science and engineering of earthquake hazards reduction;

''(ii) effectiveness of the Program in carrying out the activities under (a)(2);

''(iii) the need to revise the Program; and

''(iv) the management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the Program.

''(C) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and at least once every 2 years thereafter, the Advisory Committee shall report to the Director on its findings of the assessment carried out under subparagraph (B) and its recommendations for ways to improve the Program. In developing recommendations, the Committee shall consider the recommendations of the United States Geological Survey Scientific Earthquake Studies Advisory Committee.

''(D) FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT APPLICATION.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 App. U.S.C. 14) shall not apply to the Advisory Committee.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''Federal Emergency Management Agency'' and all that follows through ''of the Agency'' and inserting ''National Institute of Standards and Technology shall have the primary responsibility for planning and coordinating the Program. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director of the Institute'';

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) support the development of performance-based seismic engineering tools, and work with appropriate groups to promote the commercial application of such tools, through earthquake-related building codes, standards, and construction practices;'';

(iv) by striking ''The principal official carrying out the responsibilities described in this paragraph shall be at a level no lower than that of Associate Director.''; and

(v) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking ''National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Standards and Technology'' and inserting ''Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Science Foundation'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking ''In addition to the lead'' and all that follows through ''Agency'' and inserting ''The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (in this Act referred to as the 'Agency')''; and

(ii) by amending clause (iii) to read as follows:

''(iii) assist the National Institute of Standards and Technology, other Federal agencies, and private sector groups in the preparation and wide dissemination of building codes and practices for structures and lifelines, and aid in the development of performance based codes for buildings, structures, and lifelines that are cost effective and affordable;'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by inserting ''and other activities'' after ''shall conduct research'';

(ii) in subparagraphs (C) and (D), by striking ''the Agency'' both places it appears and inserting ''the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology'';

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''establish, using existing facilities, a Center for the International Exchange of Earthquake Information'' and inserting ''operate, using the National Earthquake Information Center, a forum for the international exchange of earthquake information'';

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''Network'' and inserting ''System''; and

(v) by inserting after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraphs:

''(I) work with other Program agencies to coordinate Program activities with similar eathquake hazards reduction efforts in other countries, to ensure that the Program benefits from relevant information and advances in those countries; and

''(J) maintain suitable seismic hazard maps in support of building codes for structures and lifelines, including additional maps needed for performance based design approaches.'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (D), (E), and (F) as subparagraphs (E), (F), and (H), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) support research that improves the safety and performance of buildings, structures, and lifeline systems using large-scale experimental and computational facilities;'';

(iii) in subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon; and

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (F) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(G) include to the maximum extent practicable diverse institutions, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and those serving large proportions of Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian-Pacific Americans, and other underrepresented populations; and''; and

(E) in paragraph (5), by striking ''The National'' and inserting ''In addition to the lead agency responsibilities described under paragraph (1), the National''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''Agency'' and inserting ''Interagency Coordinating Committee''.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) Section 12 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7706) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

''(8) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency

for carrying out this Act $19,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; $21,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and $23,000,000 for fiscal year 2006. Of such amounts appropriated, not less than $3,000,000 shall be made available each such fiscal year for supporting the development of performance-based, cost-effective, and affordable codes for buildings, structures, and lifelines.'';

(2) in subsection (b), by adding at the end the following: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to the United States Geological Survey for carrying out this Act $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, of which not less than $30,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System established under section 13; $83,500,000 for fiscal year 2005, of which not less than $30,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System established under section 13; $93,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, of which not less than $36,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System established under section 13; such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2007, of which not less than $36,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System established under section 13; and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2008, of which not less than $36,000,000 shall be made available for completion of the Advanced National Seismic Research and Monitoring System established under section 13.'';

(3) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this Act $39,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; $44,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; and $47,500,000 for fiscal year 2006.''; and

(4) in subsection (d) by adding at the end the following: ''There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this Act $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; $9,600,000 for fiscal year 2005; and $12,500,000 for fiscal year 2006. Of such amounts appropriated, not less than $2,000,000 shall be made available each such fiscal year for supporting the development of performance-based, cost-effective, and affordable codes for buildings, structures, and lifelines.''.

(b) Section 13 of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7707) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) Section 14(b) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7708(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3) by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

''(4) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

''(5) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2005, all of which shall be available for operations and maintenance; and

''(6) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2006, all of which shall be available for operations and maintenance.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2608, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues know that I am a fiscal conservative; so in evaluating this bill, we looked at the justification for an authorized spending that is going to move us closer to being able to deal with earthquakes, to mitigate their damage.

There is no question that damaging earthquakes are inevitable however infrequent they may be. Some of our evaluation reported that annual damages from earthquakes in the United States are about $4.4 billion. This is annual. What we did in this bill is a slight reduction in the authorization; from the prior years. In California, the 1994 Northridge earthquake, the magnitude was 6.7; and it was the most costly earthquake in history, amounting to over $40 billion.

Of course, even though the State of California is very aggressive in trying to work with earthquakes and paying for some of the damages and working in their research to mitigate those damages; through FEMA, our Federal Emergency Management Agency, all of the taxpayers in the United States contribute to paying for some of the damage by earthquakes. So if we can mitigate that damage through research, which helps us engineer buildings and bridges and roadways that are less vulnerable to earthquakes, we are going to, by far, save more money than we are spending on this authorization bill.

The west coast, California, and certainly that area of the country, is assumed to be the location of earthquakes. But that is not the only part of the country that is very vulnerable. In fact, Alaska is more vulnerable than California in terms of the risk from earthquakes. The recent massive earthquake of 7.9 magnitude in Alaska was right where the Alaskan oil transline went through.

We heard testimony before our Committee on Science earlier this year that that quake went relatively unnoticed simply because of the extra precautions and wisdom of people like Lloyd Cluff, who recognized that this pipeline was being built over a vulnerable earthquake area and so he, in effect, built a flexable cradle for that pipeline. So when the earthquake happened, the pipeline was not so rigid and it withstood that huge quake. Without current technology and foresight damage to that pipeline could have cost billions.

There are 39 States that are within zones where the probability of an earthquake occurring is great, and recent research indicates that areas in the eastern and central United States are at greater risk than we ever thought. A 19th century quake in Missouri actually rang church bells in Boston. So the threat is there and the justification to be better prepared, to even possibly with new seismic technology increase the alert time by maybe 8 or 9 or 10 seconds can help us to be better prepared such as immediately shutting off gas lines, et cetera.

We are moving ahead in NEHRP, and so I commend the Democrats and Republicans for working with all of the agencies and organizations involved to develop this legislation.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of H.R. 2608. H.R. 2608 is the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2003.

This legislation will strengthen a valuable Federal program which has the important goal of improving public safety. I want to acknowledge the leadership of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), and my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), in introducing H.R. 2608. I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), for working in a bipartisan manner with this side of the aisle to further develop the bill and to move it expeditiously through the committee and to the floor.

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, often called NEHRP, was established 25 years ago to address a serious seismic hazard in the United States. The program has the major goal of determining how to lower the risk to people and to the built environment.

Today, 75 million Americans in 39 States are directly vulnerable to a serious earthquake. The potential economic losses in a large metropolitan area due to a major earthquake could be over $100 billion. These facts alone make the justification for NEHRP self-evident, and even after 25 years the relevance of the program continues.

Most observers of NEHRP believe it has made many valuable contributions. In particular, it has increased our understanding of earthquake processes and has provided detailed information about the geographic distribution of earthquake risk. Equally important, the program has helped to improve engineering design and practice for structures and lifelines suitable for earthquake-prone regions.

Nevertheless, much work remains to be done. The NEHRP can be improved and made more effective, which became evident from the hearings before the Committee on Science. More can be done on technology transfer that will bring into practice what has been learned from the research activities about the most effective and economical ways for enhancing seismic safety of the built environment.

Also, some deficiencies needed to be addressed regarding the planning and

administration of the program. In 1993, the former chairman of the Committee on Science, Mr. George Brown, wrote the President to express concerns about NEHRP. He cited the lack of strategic planning, insufficient coordination and implementation of research results and a lack of emphasis on mitigation. Unfortunately, most of these concerns are still valid.

H.R. 2608 focuses on two aspects of the program most in need of improvement: program leadership and increased emphasis on transitioning the results of research into practice.

Leadership is addressed by designating the National Institutes of Standard and Technology, the lead agency for planning and coordinating the implementation of the interagency program. NIST is charged to convene a process to develop a strategic plan and work jointly with the other NEHRP agencies to prepare a detailed implementation plan and budget for the program for submittal to OMB during the budget formulation process.

The bill also creates an advisory committee of nongovernment experts to help guide implementation of the program and to assist the agencies in defining program priorities. Thus, H.R. 2608 puts in place mechanisms that will provide the leadership needed to ensure a well-coordinated, carefully planned, and effectively executed National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program.

In addition, the legislation authorizes the resources needed to enable NEHRP to achieve its goals. It authorizes full funding for the Advanced National Seismic System. This distributed national facility, which has been the highest priority of the earthquake hazards reduction community, was first authorized in the year 2000, but has been funded at only 10 percent of the level required. I hope that with this authorization adequate appropriations will follow so that the Advanced National Seismic System may be completed without further delay.

The bill also specifies funding needed to complete the George E. Brown Network for Engineering Simulation and to support its operation. Moreover, the funding increases authorized will enable NEHRP agencies to expand their research activities so that this powerful new research tool can be fully employed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2608 is a bill of national importance and will help improve public safety and mitigate earthquake hazards. I commend the bill to my colleagues and ask for passage by the House.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just urge that our appropriators and the Senate look carefully and hopefully will quickly adequately fund the efforts that we have put forth in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Today I rise in support of H.R. 2608, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Reauthorization Act of 2003.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards of the Committee on Science, with jurisdiction over the National Institute of Standards and Technology, more familiarly known as NIST, I want to comment on the interagency coordinating committee in section 3 of H.R. 2608.

This section designates NIST as the Chair of the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program Coordinating Committee. While I believe that NIST is more than capable of carrying out these responsibilities, and should have this position, I am concerned that the institute will not receive adequate funding to perform these duties. In the past, NIST's earthquake research activities have not received the full funding authorized for them, and this section designates additional responsibilities for NIST.

Adequate funding for NIST labs continues to be a concern. The funding levels for NIST labs in the fiscal year 2004 House Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary appropriations bill are $30 million below the administration's request and flat compared to the fiscal year 2003 appropriations.

For the building and fire research lab, where NIST's NEHRP activities are based, the funding level in the fiscal year 2004 House bill is $3 million less than fiscal year 2003 levels.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations' representations for these labs are at the administration's request level. Given that the final number will likely be somewhere between these two, this budget situation could leave many of NIST's vital initiatives underfunded. Any funding level less than the President's request would result in a reduction in force of up to 50 scientists and staff from NIST labs.

□ 1130

NIST is a world-class science institution, home to two Nobel Laureates and scores of other experts who diligently provide the scientific expertise and measurements and standards that is the basis of technologies we use every day. This Chamber has passed laws giving NIST new responsibilities for programs including voting standards, building safety, and nanotechnology. Yet, given the difficult budget climate, it has been a challenge to ensure NIST receives adequate funding to carry out these important duties. You simply cannot keep piling on additional duties without providing funding for them. I am very concerned about that trend.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate that I do support this legislation with NIST taking the lead on earthquake leadership activities. However, I intend to work with the other members of the NEHRP Interagency Coordinating Committee, the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Office of Management and Budget, and the chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies to ensure that NIST receives adequate funding and support for these additional responsibilities. I ask my colleagues to join me in this effort and in supporting H.R. 2608.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the committee totally agrees with the concerns of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). What we did in this bill is we increased the authorization of NIST from $2.5 million up to $8 million; but we will work with NIST, we will work with the appropriators because adequate funding is necessary.

The management, moving the management from FEMA, the lead agency management from FEMA to NIST, was a difficult decision in our committee; but we ended up with unanimous agreement because of the new obligations that have been put on FEMA as they go into Homeland Security. We felt that as the lead agency NIST could dedicate the kind of time and organization needed. So there is somewhat of an increased responsibility.

In conclusion, we will work with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) to try to make sure that adequate funding is available.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for all of their hard work to bring this bill to the floor today.

I represent an area in California that has been affected in the past by earthquakes. In fact, I remember very well the 6.9 Loma Prieta earthquake that shook the Bay Area in 1989. It was really an awesome experience, and I think anyone who has been through an earthquake like that can remember exactly what they were doing and how it felt. And to know that that level of earthquake is not the big one really does emphasize the need to take this whole area very seriously. That is what this bill does.

The bill is to make sure that the Federal Government provides the necessary resources and support needed by those in the earthquake research community who have dedicated much of their life's work trying to understand the causes of earthquakes, to anticipate when and where an earthquake may happen, and, most importantly,

how we can best prepare ourselves to survive the potentially devastating results of earthquakes.

The National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program was first created in 1977 in response to growing concerns about the threat of damaging earthquakes. Initially, the program focused on research in the areas of geotechnical and structural engineering and earthquake prediction. Over time, researchers acknowledging that earthquake prediction was a huge challenge and began to emphasize activities like seismic retrofitting and rehabilitation, risk assessment, public education, and outreach and code development. And the fact that San Jose, California, did not fall down in the Loma Prieta earthquake is testimony that good code enforcement and structural engineering does work and does save lives.

The program has achieved great progress since its inception and is considered by most to be a very successful undertaking. Through the efforts of those involved, we have seen a substantial decrease in the loss of life and injury. The capabilities of seismic risk assessment have improved greatly. We have learned important lessons in mitigating earthquake hazards as a result of technological advances in areas like performance-based engineering, information technology, sensing and imaging.

In the Committee on Science we were faced with many challenges in order to make this program even more helpful in our understanding of and our ability to mitigate the effects of earthquakes. Some have argued that the new knowledge and tools have not translated into a decreased overall vulnerability. The adoption by end-users of NEHRP innovations has been incremental and slower than expected. The cost of rehabilitating existing structures to be more earthquake resistant has often proved to be too high as is the cost of building new facilities to minimize risk.

We know that the private sector has not had adequate incentives and that most State and local governments lack adequate budgets to address these challenges.

I will be following these issues with great interest particularly when it comes to ensuring that the Federal Government provides sufficient funding and leadership to meet the research needs of this program. That a future large earthquake in a major U.S. urban area could result in damages of $200 billion should provide us here in the Congress with sufficient incentive to encourage our research in this vital area. This is a historic case where we know that we must not be ''penny wise and pound foolish.''

I remain concerned as to whether or not NEHRP can be reasonably expected to meet its goals at the level of funding it currently receives. And I look forward to working to increase the level of funding.

I was happy to work with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) as well as the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) in a bipartisan manner to make sure that the funding in the fiscal year 2004 was increased for the Advanced National Seismic System. I think they did a great job. And, actually, I think our committee worked well together to improve this bill. I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the rest of the committee to try to make certain that those who are doing research in the sciences have the funds and support they need from our Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for bringing us the kind of information and dedication that she has to try to make this a better bill and to try to have government do a better job in terms of mitigating the consequences of earthquakes.

And I would mention that it is not just this country that NEHRP helps. We work worldwide in trying to share the research that we have done to help reduce the consequences of earthquakes all over the world. I think it is appropriate in terms of understanding that I just give a brief background on some of the agencies that are involved.

NEHRP is a long-term comprehensive interagency earthquake hazard reduction mitigation program. It was established in Congress in 1977, and four agencies participate in this effort. We have FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency; the U.S. Geological Survey, USGS which has done a fantastic job in this area; the National Science Foundation, which is under the purview of our Subcommittee on Research because of the tremendous research efforts that we are making in this arena; and of course, NIST, the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Each agency has distinct responsibilities to undertake in support of the overall program goals. NSF, with the geoscience, the engineering, the economic and social aspects of earthquakes; USGS carries out both the basic and applied Earth science and seismic research and monitoring; and FEMA has been responsible for overall coordination of the program, education outreach and implementation of research results, and now we are asking NIST as the lead agency to take a little larger role to conduct the research and development in earthquake engineering aimed at improving building design codes and construction standards.

Also, there needs to be additional support to reducing the damages from earthquakes. In addition to our efforts in government, I would call on the insurance industry to consider lowering its insurance rates for those municipalities and for those individuals who comply and build their structures to be more resistant to earthquake damage. It seems logical that if there is extra spending of money to protect against earthquakes in the building structures, whether they are municipal bridges, highways, buildings, or residential structures, that the insurance industry should consider encouraging the effort with lower premiums.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge this bill be passed, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that we should appreciate the bipartisan support and the support of the government agencies that are involved in this program. Certainly we know that earthquakes cannot be prevented, but we can mitigate their impact; and that is what this bill does. I ask for all Members to support the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2608, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CARE SAFETY NET AMENDMENTS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2003

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3038) to make certain technical and conforming amendments to correct the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3038

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Health Care Safety Net Amendments Technical Corrections Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) HEALTH CENTERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) is amended to read as if—

(A) subparagraph (C) of the second paragraph (4) of section 101 of Public Law 107–251 had not been enacted;

(B) paragraph (7)(C) of such section 101 had not been enacted; and

(C) paragraphs (8) through (11) of such section 101 had not been enacted.

(2) AMENDMENTS PER PUBLIC LAW 107–251.—Section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''plan..'' and inserting ''plan.'';

(B) in subsection (d)(1)(B)(iii), in subclause (I), by adding ''or'' at the end;

(C) by striking subsection (k);

(D) by redesignating subsection (j) as subsection (k);

(E) by inserting after subsection (i) a subsection that is identical to the subsection (j) that appears (as an amendment) in section 101(8)(C) of Public Law 107–251;

(F) by redesignating subsection (l) as subsection (r), by transferring it from its current placement, and by inserting it after subsection (q);

(G) by inserting before subsection (m) a subsection that is identical to the subsection that appears (as an amendment) in section 101(9) of Public Law 107–251, and by redesignating as subsection (l) the subsection that is so inserted;

(H) in subsection (l) (as inserted and redesignated by subparagraph (G) of this paragraph), in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting after ''shall provide'' the following: ''(either through the Department of Health and Human Services or by grant or contract)''; and

(ii) by striking ''(l)(3)'' and inserting ''(k)(3)'';

(I) in subsection (p), by striking ''(j)(3)(G)'' and inserting ''(k)(3)(G)''; and

(J) in subsection (r) (as redesignated, transferred, and inserted by subparagraph (F) of this paragraph)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''$802,124,000'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''$1,340,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2006.'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(I) by striking ''(j)(3))'' and inserting ''(k)(3))''; and

(II) by striking ''(j)(3)(G)(ii)'' and inserting ''(k)(3)(H)''; and

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting a subparagraph that is identical to the subparagraph (B) that appears (as an amendment) in section 101(11)(B)(ii) of Public Law 107–251.

(b) RURAL HEALTH OUTREACH.—Section 330A(b)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c(b)(4)) is amended by striking ''799B'' and inserting ''799B(6)''.

(c) TELEHEALTH.—Section 330I of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–14) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking ''799B'' and inserting ''799B(6)''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''Health and Resources and Services Administration'' and inserting ''Health Resources and Services Administration''.

(d) MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES VIA TELEHEALTH.—Section 330K of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c–16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''subsection (a)(4)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(3)''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection (a)(4)(A)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(3)(A)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''subsection (a)(4)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(3)(B)''.

(e) TELEMEDICINE INCENTIVE GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart I of part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 330L. TELEMEDICINE; INCENTIVE GRANTS REGARDING COORDINATION AMONG STATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make grants to State professional licensing boards to carry out programs under which such licensing boards of various States cooperate to develop and implement State policies that will reduce statutory and regulatory barriers to telemedicine.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006.''.

(2) REPEAL.—Section 102 of the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) is repealed.

(f) HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 332 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254e) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)—

(i) by striking ''such date of enactment'' and inserting ''such date of designation''; and

(ii) by striking '', issued after the date of enactment of this Act, that revise'' and inserting ''regarding''; and

(B) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''330(h)(4)'' and inserting ''330(h)(5)'';

(C) in subsection (b)(2), by striking ''designation,.'' and inserting ''designation.''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) The Secretary shall submit the report described in paragraph (2) if the Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, issues—

''(A) a regulation that revises the definition of a health professional shortage area for purposes of this section; or

''(B) a regulation that revises the standards concerning priority of such an area under section 333A.

''(2) On issuing a regulation described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that describes the regulation.

''(3) Each regulation described in paragraph (1) shall take effect 180 days after the committees described in paragraph (2) receive a report referred to in such paragraph describing the regulation.''.

(2) REPEAL.—Subsection (b) of section 302 of the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) is repealed.

(g) ASSIGNMENT OF CORPS PERSONNEL.—Section 333(a)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254f) is amended by moving subparagraph (C) so that the margin of subparagraph (C) is aligned with the margins of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D).

(h) PRIORITIES IN ASSIGNMENT OF CORPS PERSONNEL.—Section 333A(c)(4) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254f–1(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''30 days'' and inserting ''30 days from such notification''.

(i) CHARGES FOR SERVICES.—Section 334(b)(1)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254g(b)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting ''the payment of'' after ''applied to''.

(j) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 338A(d)(1) (42 U.S.C. 254l(d)(1)) is amended by moving subparagraph (B) so that the margin of subparagraph (B) is aligned with the margin of subparagraphs (A) and (C).

(k) NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 338B(e) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254l–1) is amended by striking ''PARTICIPATION.—'' and all that follows through ''An individual'' and inserting ''PARTICIPATION.—An individual''.

(l) BREACH OF CONTRACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 338E of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254o) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1), by moving subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C), and the flush matter following subparagraph (C), 2 ems to the left; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) The amendment made by section 313(a)(4) of the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) shall apply to any obligation for which a discharge in bankruptcy has not been granted before the date that is 31 days after the date of enactment of such Act.''.

(2) REPEAL.—Subsection (b) of section 313 of the Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) is repealed.

(m) MISCELLANEOUS.—The Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in subsections (g)(1)(G)(ii), (k)(2), and (n)(1)(C) of section 224, and sections 317A(a)(2), 317E(c), and 318A(e), by striking ''330, 330(h)'' and inserting ''330'';

(2) in section 1313, by striking ''329, 330, and 330(h)'' and inserting ''329 and 330''; and

(3) in section 2652(a)(2), by striking ''section 340'' and inserting ''section 330(h)''.

(n) HEALTH CARE SAFETY NET AMENDMENTS OF 2002.—The Health Care Safety Net Amendments of 2002 (Public Law 107–251) is amended—

(1) in section 404(c)(5), by striking ''Health Care Financing Administration and the Health Research'' and inserting ''Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Health Resources''; and

(2) in section 501, by striking ''solvency for managed care networks'' and inserting ''guarantees of solvency for managed care networks or plans''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act is deemed to have taken effect immediately after the enactment of Public Law 107–251.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 3038.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 3038, the Health Care Safety Net Amendments Technical Corrections Act of 2003. H.R. 3038 introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the subcommittee chairman, makes technical and conforming amendments to the Health Care Safety Net Amendments Act of 2002.

As Members may recall, this act strengthens several public health programs for low-income and underserved populations, including community health centers and the National Health Service Corps. Just this past week, a study conducted by GW University found that community health centers have helped to reduce health disparities in areas such as infant mortality, prenatal care, TB case rates, and age-adjusted death rates. This study highlights the impact that community

health centers are making in providing underserved Americans with access to affordable, high-quality health care.

H.R. 3038 strengthens the commitment that we have already made to community health centers. These changes are indeed technical, and they should be made to properly align the U.S. Code and clarify our original intent when we passed the bill last year. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for bringing this bill to the floor today. The Committee on Energy and Commerce recently reported out a number of important bills, and I am pleased that the House will consider the passage of this bill and two others.

□ 1145

Chairman BILIRAKIS and I have sponsored the Health Care Safety Net Amendments Technical Corrections Act, and the bill is what it says it is; it makes a number of what are essentially housekeeping changes to important legislation reauthorizing America's network of community health centers.

The legislation that was passed last year was intended to help community health centers continue to serve a patient population, as my friend from Michigan said, that would otherwise fall through the cracks. Passage of these technical corrections will ensure that the bill meets this goal.

I think this bill is particularly important albeit it is a technical corrections bill, but it is particularly important as we see articles in the paper the last couple of days that the United States has 2.5 million more uninsured people than it did a year ago. I think this bill, while it is something we should do, underscores the failure of the Bush administration and of the Congress to address the important issues of the 2.5 million uninsured and all the unemployment in this country that has caused it.

Nonetheless, this bill is a step in the right direction. Community health centers are essential to take care of those who, neither through their workplace nor government, has been provided the health insurance that they should have. I ask my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member wishes to express his strong support for the Health Care Safety Net Amendments Technical Corrections Act of 2003 (H.R. 3038) and would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health, for introducing this important legislation. This Member would also like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, for their efforts to improve access to quality preventative and primary health care for the medically underserved—including the millions of Americans without health insurance coverage.

Yesterday, Nebraskans celebrated the opening of the People's Health Center of Lincoln—the first Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) in this Member's congressional district. The health center will provide valuable primary health care services to the residents of Lincoln and Lancaster County.

As the Peoples' Health Center of Lincoln becomes an established entity in the community and begins to grow in terms of size as well as patients served, this Member has no doubt that the facility will call upon the National Health Service Corps (NHSC) for assistance in meeting the critical needs of Nebraska's underserved population.

This technical corrections bill is extremely important to new and current FQHCs across the nation. The measure makes clarifying changes to reconfirm that facilities, like the Peoples' Health Center of Lincoln, automatically receive Health Professional Shortage Area (HPSA) designation, and subsequently become eligible for the placement of National Health Service Corps (NHSC) personnel. This Member would personally like to thank Representative Bilirakis and his staff for their help with clarifying the automatic HPSA language in particular.

The NHSC and the Health Centers program are both intended to address the health care needs of our nation's most underserved rural and urban communities. Previous requirements mandated that health centers and rural clinics apply for and obtain HPSA designation, even though each center already serves a Federally-designated Medically Underserved Area or population, to become eligible for the placement of NHSC personnel. This process certainly seems unnecessary and duplicative, resulting in a delay of needed practitioners at high-need health centers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 3038. Such action will reduce bureaucratic barriers and allow for the coordinated use of Federal resources in meeting the health care needs of areas that lack sufficient services.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3038.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR REGISTRY REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3034) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3034

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL BONE MARROW DONOR REGISTRY.

(a) NATIONAL REGISTRY.—Section 379 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274k) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''except that'' and all that follows and inserting ''except that—

''(A) such limitations shall not apply to the Chair of the board (or the Chair-elect) or to the member of the board who most recently served as the Chair; and

''(B) 1 additional consecutive 2-year term may be served by any member of the board who has no employment, governance, or financial affiliation with any donor center, recruitment group, transplant center, or cord blood bank.''; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''the Naval Medical Research and Development Command'' and inserting ''the Department of Defense Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program operated by the Department of the Navy''; and

(ii) by striking ''Organ'' after ''Division of'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (4), by inserting ''at least'' before ''annually'';

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and comparisons of transplant centers regarding search and other costs that prior to transplantation are charged to patients by transplant centers; and'';

(C) in paragraph (8), by inserting ''and outreach'' after ''and demonstration'';

(D) at the end of paragraph (8), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(E) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) as paragraphs (4) through (9);

(F) by inserting after paragraph (2), the following:

''(3) maintain and expand medical emergency contingency response capabilities in concert with Federal programs for response to threats of use of terrorist or military weapons that can damage marrow, such as ionizing radiation or chemical agents containing mustard, so that the capability of supporting patients with marrow damage from disease can be used to support casualties with marrow damage;''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) conduct and support research to improve the availability, efficiency, safety, and cost of transplants from unrelated donors and the effectiveness of Registry operations;

''(11) increase the number of umbilical cord blood units listed in the Registry and assist cord blood banks in the Registry program in accordance with subsection (c); and

''(12) establish bylaws and procedures—

''(A) to prohibit any member of the board of directors of the Registry who has an employment, governance, or financial affiliation with a donor center, recruitment group, transplant center, or cord blood bank from participating in any decision that materially affects the center, recruitment group, transplant center, or cord blood bank; and

''(B) to limit the number of members of the board with any such affiliation.'';

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''; including providing updates''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the availability, as a potential treatment option, of receiving a transplant of bone marrow from an unrelated donor'' and inserting ''transplants from unrelated donors as a treatment option and resources for identifying and evaluating other therapeutic alternatives'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting ''and assist with information regarding third party payor matters'' after ''ongoing search for a donor'';

(B) in paragraph (2)(F)—

(i) by redesignating clause (v) as clause (vi); and

(ii) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

''(v) Information concerning issues that patients may face after a transplant regarding continuity of care and quality of life.''; and

(C) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking ''Office may'' and inserting ''Office shall'';

(5) in subsection (g), by striking ''the bone marrow donor program of the Department of the Navy'' and inserting ''the Department of Defense Marrow Donor Recruitment and Research Program operated by the Department of the Navy'';

(6) in subsection (h)—

(A) by striking ''APPLICATION.—'' and inserting ''CONTRACTS.—'';

(B) by striking ''To be eligible'' and inserting the following:

''(1) APPLICATION.—To be eligible''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In awarding contracts under this section, the Secretary shall give substantial weight to the continued safety of donors and patients and other factors deemed appropriate by the Secretary.'';

(7) in subsection (i), by striking ''include'' and inserting ''be''; and

(8) by striking subsection (l).

(b) BONE MARROW SCIENTIFIC REGISTRY.—Section 379A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274l) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: ''The scientific registry shall participate in medical research that has the potential to improve transplant outcomes.'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''Each such report shall in addition include the data required in section 379(l) (relating to pretransplant costs).''; and

(3) by adding after subsection (c) the following:

''(d) PUBLICLY AVAILABLE DATA.—The scientific registry shall make relevant scientific information not containing individually identifiable information available to the public in the form of summaries and data sets to encourage medical research and to provide information to transplant programs, physicians, and patients.''.

(c) BONE MARROW AND MARROW DEFINED.—Part I of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274k et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 379B as section 379C; and

(2) by inserting after section 379A the following:

''SEC. 379B. BONE MARROW AND MARROW DEFINED.

''For purposes of this part, the terms 'bone marrow' and 'marrow' include bone marrow and any other source of hematopoietic progenitor cells the acquisition or use of which is not inconsistent with Federal law.''.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 379C of the Public Health Service Act, as redesignated by subsection (c), is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 379C. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $32,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2005 through 2008.

''(b) EMERGENCY CONTINGENCY RESPONSE CAPABILITIES.—In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance and expansion of emergency contingency response capabilities under section 379(b)(3).''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering today H.R. 3034, the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act to extend Federal support for a national bone marrow registry for an additional 5 years.

Bone marrow transplants are often one of the last options available to patients struggling to fight debilitating and often terminal diseases. Sadly, finding a bone marrow match is most difficult. In fact, every year nearly two-thirds of patients in need of a bone marrow transplant will not find a marrow donor match within their family and must rely on the help of strangers. The National Bone Marrow Donor Registry facilitates marrow and cord blood transplants for patients with life-threatening diseases who do not have matching donors in their families.

In addition to the 5-year reauthorization period, H.R. 3034 amends the functions of the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry to reflect new directions that the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry is undertaking to improve its capabilities. Notably, the legislation directs the registry to maintain and expand medical response capabilities, in concert with Federal programs, for responding to terrorist threats that can damage marrow. The registry is also directed to increase the number of umbilical cord blood units listed in the registry and assist cord blood banks in the registry program. This is of special importance to many minority populations who are less likely to find a bone marrow match.

H.R. 3034 also includes provisions to improve data collection and facilitate information sharing with physicians, other health care professionals and the public regarding transplants from unrelated donors.

Each month, the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry coordinates more than 150 transplants. With a diverse registry of more than 4 million potential volunteer bone marrow and cord blood donors, the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry offers hope to thousands and thousands of patients. It is important that we reauthorize this successful program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act offers significant improvements to a very successful public health initiative. I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus for taking lead roles in advancing this legislation.

Tragically, Americans in need of life-saving bone marrow transplants often face daunting odds. In fact, the chance of finding a compatible unrelated donor is only about one in 20,000. As the largest and most diverse list of potential donors, the registry is America's best chance to improve those odds. With a database of roughly 4 million potential donors, it offers hope to the thousands of Americans diagnosed every year with blood, metabolism or immune system disorders.

The registry has facilitated over 14,000 transplants since 1987, but there is much work that needs to be done. The legislation before us today permits that work to continue and expand with enhanced efforts to educate the general public about the registry, as well as significant outreach to minority populations. The bill also creates important new authority to apply the knowledge gained in treating marrow diseases to the task of preparing the Nation for radiological and chemical attacks.

I would be remiss if I did not also thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), who has done remarkable work on this issue for as long as I have been in Congress. I thank him for his participation and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) not only has a great legacy in this House for so many different issues, particularly as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but one of the issues that bonded our friendship early on was his direction and sponsorship of this issue.

I would like to say that when I was, I think, a freshman or a sophomore Member in this House, because of the battle he helped lead, I joined with so many other Members of this body to actually register myself with the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry. I

hope someday that I will be called. Thus far, I have not, but I am one of those that has voluntarily registered. I would love the afternoon that I might get a phone call to say, ''Come on down; I want to draw a sample.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me the time, and I appreciate his management of this bill and also the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

This is an important piece of legislation. We actually got this program started without an authorization bill by working it through an appropriations bill back in 1985. It has been an ongoing program and an ongoing commitment of mine for a long time.

I appreciate also the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the chairman of the subcommittee, for moving this bill and working with us to make sure that it meets all of the new, modern requirements of the bone marrow program.

I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker, and say that back in the 1980s when we determined that it was necessary to have a program of this type, those in our government who dealt with health issues said, It can't be done. They said, You'll never get maybe 20-, 30-, 40,000 people willing to be a bone marrow donor and that wouldn't work because the chances of finding a donor are about one in 20,000 of finding a donor that will actually match the patient. It is critical that the bone marrow of the patient and the donor match.

And so I am happy to report that although they said it could not be done, we have 5 million people in the registry today, and we are exchanging bone marrow and patients across the oceans with 14 other countries that have patterned bone marrow programs like ours to join with us.

It is a very successful program. We are learning more about it every day. We are saving lives every day. As the gentleman from Michigan said, this is the last resort. You do not go to a bone marrow transplant unless your disease is terminal. This procedure can be used in 60 or more types of blood diseases.

There are thousands and thousands of heroes out there who have actually made donations of their bone marrow to help save a life. It is a life-changing experience to become a bone marrow donor and know that you personally have saved the life of a young child or even an adult, and you have at least given them a second chance for life.

I would like to include in my remarks some of the early heroes like Admiral Zumwalt, who was one of the real soldiers in this battle to make this happen.

Again, I just thank the Congress for the tremendous support that we have had all the way through as we create this program, as we appropriate the money to keep it funded.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3034, legislation I have introduced to reauthorize the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry.

At the outset, let me thank the Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, my colleague from Louisiana Mr. TAUZIN, and the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, my colleague and neighbor from Florida Mr. BILIRAKIS, for helping expedite the consideration of this legislation. I have worked closely with them and with their staffs throughout the drafting of H.R. 3034 to ensure its timely and smooth passage through both the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the National Marrow Donor Program is a true modern medical miracle that save lives here and throughout the world every single day of the year. Since its establishment more than 16 years ago, the registry has grown to more than 5,000,000 volunteers. These are true volunteers in every sense of the word. They have given of their time to take a simple blood test to be listed in the national registry. For more than 16,000 who have been called upon to donate bone marrow, they have undergone a relatively simple surgical procedure to donate their bone marrow to save the life of a man, woman or child with leukemia or one of 60 otherwise fatal blood disorders.

Having had the great pleasure to meet with hundreds of donors and patients, I can tell you that donating bone marrow is a true life-changing experience. The experience of giving life to another human being is beyond mere words.

Through the National Marrow Donor Program, we have also made marrow donation a world-changing experience. On any given day, bone marrow from our registry is being flown around the world at the same time bone marrow is being flown to a U.S. hospital through our formal relationship with 14 other international registries.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation seeks to bring the nations and the people of the world closer together, to live in peace, and better understand each other, we can look to the National Marrow Donor Program as one important way to achieve these goals. There is no greater cause then to save a life, and with the ongoing support of every member of this House we can adopt this legislation today to continue to work of this program for the next 5 years.

There are many heroes who have contributed to the work and vision of this program. From the early days when we sought a home for the program, and had a few doors slammed in our faces, there was Admiral Elmo Zumwalt, Jr. and Dr. Bob Graves. There was Captain Bob Hartzman of the United States Navy who connected us with the Navy Medical Command where we appropriated the first small amount of funding to give birth to the program. There were the early medical pioneers such as Dr. Robert Good, Dr. John Hansen, Dr. Donnell Thomas, and Dr. Jerry Barbosa, all of whom helped perfect the science of marrow transplantation and who assisted us in our legislative quest to establish a federal registry.

There were Members of Congress, past and present, who stood by me as I sought funding to start up the program, to recruit marrow donors, and to perfect the marrow transplant procedures. There were my colleagues on the Appropriations and Energy and Commerce Committees who helped expedite these funding requests and the consideration of several authorization bills.

There were the members of the board of the National Marrow Donor Program and the Marrow Foundation, who have volunteered their time to establish a finely tuned international registry that quickly and efficiently matches marrow donors and patients to give them the best chance of a successful transplant. There is the staff of the NMDP, based in Minneapolis, Minnesota but with operations throughout our nation, who manage the flow of information and marrow around the world. And there is the staff and medical teams at the transplant and donor centers who use their medical expertise to complete the transplantation procedure.

Finally, there are the true heroes of the program, the patients and donors. Every patient that has sought a marrow transplant has helped the doctors and researchers perfect the marrow transplant procedure to improve the outcome for every future patient. And every donor who has rolled up his or her sleeve to sign up for the national registry and ultimately give a bit of their bone marrow has given the ultimate gift of life. They are the heroes without whom we would not have this tremendously successful national and international life-saving program.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me again thank Chairmen TAUZIN and BILIRAKIS for their ongoing support and for the support of the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee in moving this legislation so quickly. Finally, let me thank every Member of this House for their partnership in helping us continue the work of the National Marrow Donor Program. With your support, we are giving hope to thousands of patients here and throughout the world today and into the future.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, The National Bone Marrow Donor Registry, operated by the National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP), is a precious national resource that we must continue to support. I was happy to join my colleagues, Chairman BILL YOUNG and Chairman MIKE BILIRAKIS, in introducing H.R. 3034, ''The National Bond Marrow Registry Reauthorization Act.'' In particular, I am extremely pleased that we are considering this bill in an expeditious manner to ensure that there is no gap in the continuation of this important program. I am also pleased that my colleagues, Mr. FORD of Tennessee and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia have indicated their endorsement for this legislation.

Since its inception, the NMDP has worked tirelessly to build a Registry that helps Americans in need. I applaud the donors who are true American heroes. They are willing to help individuals who they do not even know by taking the time to donate their marrow, blood, or cord blood. We can all hope to emulate their generosity and selflessness.

We honor these men and women, of all races and ethnicities, by reauthorizing the Registry. Since 1986, there have been many scientific advances in the area of bone marrow transplants. The NMDP continues to work diligently to improve the odds of every American being able to find a match through the Registry. Its efforts have led to an increase of the number of minority donors who participate in the Registry, as well as the number of minorities who have access to these life-saving transplants.

Today, I call on my colleagues to continue their support of the NMDP and its important

mission. We should approve H.R. 3034 today so that we can ensure a timely reauthorization of the Bone Marrow Registry.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3034, the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act.

I want to commend the work of the co-sponsors of this legislation, the Representative of Florida, and Representative of New York. Your leadership on this issue has been remarkable and I commend your efforts.

It is a tragedy for Americans in need of bone marrow or stem cell donation to remain unconnected with willing donors. The National Bone Marrow Donor Registry has helped connect thousands of Americans in need of assistance with donors across the country. The additional resources this bill authorizes will help us expand this network and save even more lives.

I want to particularly commend the Registry's effort to recruit minority donors for their database. Blood diseases extract an especially heavy toll on minority populations, and improving the diversity of the donor pool should be an important part of our response to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the efforts of St. Luke's Hospital in Kansas City. Their Kansas City Blood and Marrow transplant program recruits new donors, finds matches, and coordinates the donation process. Since its inception in 1996, the Transplant Center at St. Lukes has performed over 450 transplants and connected thousands in our region with needed care. As a result of their hard work, the Center has been named a member of the United Resource Network centers of excellence program. These courageous efforts save thousands of lives each year. I congratulate them for being a model to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation is vital. I urge my colleagues to join me today in support of H.R. 3034.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3034, the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act.

Today we are able to prolong hope for so many individuals waiting for a match to their bone marrow by reauthorizing the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry for another five years. For many people waiting for a transplant due to various illnesses, the task of finding a donor is a long and costly process. Each year two-thirds of patients awaiting bone marrow transplants are unsuccessful in finding a match within their family. This is why the establishment of a national registry was crucial.

About seventy percent of leukemia and other blood disorder patients do not find a match within their family. A match would be someone with certain white blood cells, called antigens, which are similar or identical to the patient's. These transplants enable patients the opportunity to live a full life, whereas without the transplant they would have little or no chance of survival.

From the organization of a donor registry through the United States Navy in 1986 to this current extension of the National Registry, it is clear that Congress takes this issue to heart. Each member of this House has someone in their district who has been touched by one of the debilitating diseases that need a bone marrow transplant, often as a last option.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Chairman YOUNG for his leadership on the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry Reauthorization Act. Because of his family's own experience with the seriousness of bone marrow transplants, he has emerged as a leader in the issue and is committed to the cause. I urge all my colleagues to support this important reauthorization.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3034 which reauthorizes the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry. I commend Chairman YOUNG for his leadership in this critical program. Through his efforts in establishing the National Bone Marrow Donor Registry he has given countless people another chance at life.

Through the recruitment of the National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP), which manages the Registry, patients there are over 5 million potential donors. Through NMDP outreach efforts in 19 countries, patients have access to an additional 2.5 million potential donors. In fact, approximately 40 percent of transplants facilitated by NMDP involves a U.S. patient receiving stem cells from an international donor or an international donor receiving stems cells from a U.S. donor.

The importance of the Registry cannot be overstated and I commend and fully support the efforts of the National Marrow Donor Program for their recruitment efforts, especially for their efforts to recruit potential donors from diverse racial or ethnic groups.

The critical need for donors of African-American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaska Native descent was made clear to me by the story of a five-year-old little girl from Guam whose life was cut short by leukemia.

Her name was Justice Taitague. Her best chance for life was a marrow transplant from a member of her ethnic group. The donor list at the time could not provide a match, but everyone involved in her care would not give up. Through the efforts of Dr. Thomas Shieh, the Guam Medical Society, and the National and Hawaiian Marrow Donor Programs, the first ever marrow drive on Guam was held on her behalf. This ''Drive for Justice'' registered thirty-four hundred volunteers in just three days.

Tragically, she passed away less than a week after the drive. But her life has given hope to others of Asian/Pacific Island descent needing a stem-cell transplant and helped us to understand the importance of the National Marrow Donor Program.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support H.R. 3034 to reauthorize the National Marrow Donor Registry. There is still a critical need for donors from the Asian, Pacific Islander and other minority communities to give the gift of life. Join the Registry.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3034, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANIMAL DRUG USER FEE ACT OF 2003

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1260) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a program of fees relating to animal drugs.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1260

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Animal Drug User Fee Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Prompt approval of safe and effective new animal drugs is critical to the improvement of animal health and the public health.

(2) Animal health and the public health will be served by making additional funds available for the purpose of augmenting the resources of the Food and Drug Administration that are devoted to the process for review of new animal drug applications.

(3) The fees authorized by this title will be dedicated toward expediting the animal drug development process and the review of new and supplemental animal drug applications and investigational animal drug submissions as set forth in the goals identified, for purposes of part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, in the letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate as set forth in the Congressional Record.

SEC. 3. FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS.

Subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 379f et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following part:

''PART 4—FEES RELATING TO ANIMAL DRUGS

''SEC. 739. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subchapter:

''(1) The term 'animal drug application' means an application for approval of any new animal drug submitted under section 512(b)(1). Such term does not include either a new animal drug application submitted under section 512(b)(2) or a supplemental animal drug application.

''(2) The term 'supplemental animal drug application' means—

''(A) a request to the Secretary to approve a change in an animal drug application which has been approved; or

''(B) a request to the Secretary to approve a change to an application approved under section 512(c)(2) for which data with respect to safety or effectiveness are required.

''(3) The term 'animal drug product' means each specific strength or potency of a particular active ingredient or ingredients in final dosage form marketed by a particular manufacturer or distributor, which is uniquely identified by the labeler code and product code portions of the national drug code, and for which an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application has been approved.

''(4) The term 'animal drug establishment' means a foreign or domestic place of business which is at one general physical location consisting of one or more buildings all of which are within 5 miles of each other, at which one or more animal drug products are manufactured in final dosage form.

''(5) The term 'investigational animal drug submission' means—

''(A) the filing of a claim for an investigational exemption under section 512(j) for a new animal drug intended to be the subject of an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application, or

''(B) the submission of information for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to evaluate the safety or effectiveness of an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application in the event of their filing.

''(6) The term 'animal drug sponsor' means either an applicant named in an animal drug application, except for an approved application for which all subject products have been removed from listing under section 510, or a person who has submitted an investigational animal drug submission that has not been terminated or otherwise rendered inactive by the Secretary.

''(7) The term 'final dosage form' means, with respect to an animal drug product, a finished dosage form which is approved for administration to an animal without substantial further manufacturing. Such term includes animal drug products intended for mixing in animal feeds.

''(8) The term 'process for the review of animal drug applications' means the following activities of the Secretary with respect to the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions:

''(A) The activities necessary for the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(B) The issuance of action letters which approve animal drug applications or supplemental animal drug applications or which set forth in detail the specific deficiencies in animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, or investigational animal drug submissions and, where appropriate, the actions necessary to place such applications, supplements or submissions in condition for approval.

''(C) The inspection of animal drug establishments and other facilities undertaken as part of the Secretary's review of pending animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(D) Monitoring of research conducted in connection with the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(E) The development of regulations and policy related to the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(F) Development of standards for products subject to review.

''(G) Meetings between the agency and the animal drug sponsor.

''(H) Review of advertising and labeling prior to approval of an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application, but not such activities after an animal drug has been approved.

''(9) The term 'costs of resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications' means the expenses incurred in connection with the process for the review of animal drug applications for—

''(A) officers and employees of the Food and Drug Administration, contractors of the Food and Drug Administration, advisory committees consulted with respect to the review of specific animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, or investigational animal drug submissions, and costs related to such officers, employees, committees, and contractors, including costs for travel, education, and recruitment and other personnel activities,

''(B) management of information, and the acquisition, maintenance, and repair of computer resources,

''(C) leasing, maintenance, renovation, and repair of facilities and acquisition, maintenance, and repair of fixtures, furniture, scientific equipment, and other necessary materials and supplies, and

''(D) collecting fees under section 740 and accounting for resources allocated for the review of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions.

''(10) The term 'adjustment factor' applicable to a fiscal year refers to the formula set forth in section 735(8) with the base or comparator year being 2003.

''(11) The term 'affiliate' refers to the definition set forth in section 735(9).

''SEC. 740. AUTHORITY TO ASSESS AND USE ANIMAL DRUG FEES.

''(a) TYPES OF FEES.—Beginning in fiscal year 2004, the Secretary shall assess and collect fees in accordance with this section as follows:

''(1) ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION AND SUPPLEMENT FEE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Each person that submits, on or after September 1, 2003, an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application shall be subject to a fee as follows:

''(i) A fee established in subsection (b) for an animal drug application; and

''(ii) A fee established in subsection (b) for a supplemental animal drug application for which safety or effectiveness data are required, in an amount that is equal to 50 percent of the amount of the fee under clause (i).

''(B) PAYMENT.—The fee required by subparagraph (A) shall be due upon submission of the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application.

''(C) EXCEPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY FILED APPLICATION OR SUPPLEMENT.—If an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application was submitted by a person that paid the fee for such application or supplement, was accepted for filing, and was not approved or was withdrawn (without a waiver or refund), the submission of an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application for the same product by the same person (or the person's licensee, assignee, or successor) shall not be subject to a fee under subparagraph (A).

''(D) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION REFUSED FOR FILING.—The Secretary shall refund 75 percent of the fee paid under subparagraph (B) for any animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application which is refused for filing.

''(E) REFUND OF FEE IF APPLICATION WITHDRAWN.—If an animal drug application or a supplemental animal drug application is withdrawn after the application or supplement was filed, the Secretary may refund the fee or portion of the fee paid under subparagraph B if no substantial work was performed on the application or supplement after the application or supplement was filed. The Secretary shall have the sole discretion to refund the fee under this paragraph. A determination by the Secretary concerning a refund under this paragraph shall not be reviewable.

''(2) ANIMAL DRUG PRODUCT FEE.—Each person—

''(A) who is named as the applicant in an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application for an animal drug product which has been submitted for listing under section 510, and

''(B) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application;

shall pay for each such animal drug product the annual fee established in subsection (b). Such fee shall be payable for the fiscal year in which the animal drug product is first submitted for listing under section 510, or is submitted for relisting under section 510 if the animal drug product has been withdrawn from listing and relisted. After such fee is paid for that fiscal year, such fee shall be payable on or before January 31 of each year. Such fee shall be paid only once for each animal drug product for a fiscal year in which the fee is payable.

''(3) ANIMAL DRUG ESTABLISHMENT FEE.—Each person—

''(A) who owns or operates, directly or through an affiliate, an animal drug establishment, and

''(B) who is named as the applicant in an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application for an animal drug product which has been submitted for listing under section 510, and

''(C) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application,

shall be assessed an annual fee established in subsection (b) for each animal drug establishment listed in its approved animal drug application as an establishment that manufactures the animal drug product named in the application. The annual establishment fee shall be assessed in each fiscal year in which the animal drug product named in the application is assessed a fee under paragraph (2) unless the animal drug establishment listed in the application does not engage in the manufacture of the animal drug product during the fiscal year. The fee shall be paid on or before January 31 of each year. The establishment shall be assessed only one fee per fiscal year under this section, provided, however, that where a single establishment manufactures both animal drug products and prescription drug products, as defined in section 735(3), such establishment shall be assessed both the animal drug establishment fee and the prescription drug establishment fee, as set forth in section 736(a)(2), within a single fiscal year.

''(4) ANIMAL DRUG SPONSOR FEE.—Each person—

''(A) who meets the definition of an animal drug sponsor within a fiscal year; and

''(B) who, after September 1, 2003, had pending before the Secretary an animal drug application, a supplemental animal drug application, or an investigational animal drug submission,

shall be assessed an annual fee established under subsection (b). The fee shall be paid on or before January 31 of each year. Each animal drug sponsor shall pay only one such fee each fiscal year.

''(b) FEE AMOUNTS.—Except as provided in subsection (a)(1) and subsections (c), (d), (f), and (g), the fees required under subsection (a) shall be established to generate fee revenue amounts as follows:

''(1) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR APPLICATION AND SUPPLEMENT FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in animal drug application fees under subsection (a)(1)(A)(i) and supplemental animal drug application fees under subsection (a)(1)(A)(ii) shall be

$1,250,000 in fiscal year 2004, $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2005, and $2,500,000 in fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

''(2) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR PRODUCT FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in product fees under subsection (a)(2) shall be $1,250,000 in fiscal year 2004, $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2005, and $2,500,000 in fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

''(3) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR ESTABLISHMENT FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in establishment fees under subsection (a)(3) shall be $1,250,000 in fiscal year 2004, $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2005, and $2,500,000 in fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

''(4) TOTAL FEE REVENUES FOR SPONSOR FEES.—The total fee revenues to be collected in sponsor fees under subsection (a)(4) shall be $1,250,000 in fiscal year 2004, $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2005, and $2,500,000 in fiscal years 2006, 2007, and 2008.

''(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(1) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—The revenues established in subsection (b) shall be adjusted by the Secretary by notice, published in the Federal Register, for a fiscal year to reflect the greater of—

''(A) the total percentage change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers (all items; United States city average) for the 12-month period ending June 30 preceding the fiscal year for which fees are being established; or

''(B) the total percentage change for the previous fiscal year in basic pay under the General Schedule in accordance with section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, as adjusted by any locality-based comparability payment pursuant to section 5304 of such title for Federal employees stationed in the District of Columbia.

The adjustment made each fiscal year by this subsection will be added on a compounded basis to the sum of all adjustments made each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004 under this subsection.

''(2) WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT.—After the fee revenues are adjusted for inflation in accordance with subparagraph (1), the fee revenues shall be further adjusted each fiscal year after fiscal year 2004 to reflect changes in review workload. With respect to such adjustment:

''(A) This adjustment shall be determined by the Secretary based on a weighted average of the change in the total number of animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications for which data with respect to safety or effectiveness are required, manufacturing supplemental animal drug applications, investigational animal drug study submissions, and investigational animal drug protocol submissions submitted to the Secretary. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register the fees resulting from this adjustment and the supporting methodologies.

''(B) Under no circumstances shall this workload adjustment result in fee revenues for a fiscal year that are less than the fee revenues for that fiscal year established in subsection (b), as adjusted for inflation under subparagraph (c)(1).

''(3) FINAL YEAR ADJUSTMENT.—For fiscal year 2008, the Secretary may further increase the fees to provide for up to 3 months of operating reserves of carryover user fees for the process for the review of animal drug applications for the first 3 months of fiscal year 2009. If the Food and Drug Administration has carryover balances for the process for the review of animal drug applications in excess of 3 months of such operating reserves, then this adjustment will not be made. If this adjustment is necessary, then the rationale for the amount of the increase shall be contained in the annual notice setting fees for fiscal year 2008.

''(4) ANNUAL FEE SETTING.—The Secretary shall establish, 60 days before the start of each fiscal year beginning after September 30, 2003, for that fiscal year, animal drug application fees, supplemental animal drug application fees, animal drug sponsor fees, animal drug establishment fees, and animal drug product fees based on the revenue amounts established under subsection (b) and the adjustments provided under this subsection.

''(5) LIMIT.—The total amount of fees charged, as adjusted under this subsection, for a fiscal year may not exceed the total costs for such fiscal year for the resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications.

''(d) FEE WAIVER OR REDUCTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall grant a waiver from or a reduction of 1 or more fees assessed under subsection (a) where the Secretary finds that—

''(A) the assessment of the fee would present a significant barrier to innovation because of limited resources available to such person or other circumstances,

''(B) the fees to be paid by such person will exceed the anticipated present and future costs incurred by the Secretary in conducting the process for the review of animal drug applications for such person,

''(C) the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application is intended solely to provide for use of the animal drug in—

''(i) a Type B medicated feed (as defined in section 558.3(b)(3) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) intended for use in the manufacture of Type C free-choice medicated feeds, or

''(ii) a Type C free-choice medicated feed (as defined in section 558.3(b)(4) of title 21, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)),

''(D) the animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application is intended solely to provide for a minor use or minor species indication, or

''(E) the sponsor involved is a small business submitting its first animal drug application to the Secretary for review.

''(2) USE OF STANDARD COSTS.—In making the finding in paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary may use standard costs.

''(3) RULES FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.—

''(A) DEFINITION.—In paragraph (1)(E), the term 'small business' means an entity that has fewer than 500 employees, including employees of affiliates.

''(B) WAIVER OF APPLICATION FEE.—The Secretary shall waive under paragraph (1)(E) the application fee for the first animal drug application that a small business or its affiliate submits to the Secretary for review. After a small business or its affiliate is granted such a waiver, the small business or its affiliate shall pay application fees for all subsequent animal drug applications and supplemental animal drug applications for which safety or effectiveness data are required in the same manner as an entity that does not qualify as a small business.

''(C) CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall require any person who applies for a waiver under paragraph (1)(E) to certify their qualification for the waiver. The Secretary shall periodically publish in the Federal Register a list of persons making such certifications.

''(e) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY FEES.—An animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for filing by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. An investigational animal drug submission under section 739(5)(B) that is submitted by a person subject to fees under subsection (a) shall be considered incomplete and shall not be accepted for review by the Secretary until all fees owed by such person have been paid. The Secretary may discontinue review of any animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application or investigational animal drug submission from a person if such person has not submitted for payment all fees owed under this section by 30 days after the date upon which they are due.

''(f) ASSESSMENT OF FEES.—

''(1) LIMITATION.—Fees may not be assessed under subsection (a) for a fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2003 unless appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for such fiscal year (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) are equal to or greater than the amount of appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Food and Drug Administration for the fiscal year 2003 (excluding the amount of fees appropriated for such fiscal year) multiplied by the adjustment factor applicable to the fiscal year involved.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—If the Secretary does not assess fees under subsection (a) during any portion of a fiscal year because of paragraph (1) and if at a later date in such fiscal year the Secretary may assess such fees, the Secretary may assess and collect such fees, without any modification in the rate, for animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, investigational animal drug submissions, sponsors, animal drug establishments and animal drug products at any time in such fiscal year notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) relating to the date fees are to be paid.

''(g) CREDITING AND AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Fees authorized under subsection (a) shall be collected and available for obligation only to the extent and in the amount provided in advance in appropriations Acts. Such fees are authorized to be appropriated to remain available until expended. Such sums as may be necessary may be transferred from the Food and Drug Administration salaries and expenses appropriation account without fiscal year limitation to such appropriation account for salary and expenses with such fiscal year limitation. The sums transferred shall be available solely for the process for the review of animal drug applications.

''(2) COLLECTIONS AND APPROPRIATION ACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The fees authorized by this section—

''(i) shall be retained in each fiscal year in an amount not to exceed the amount specified in appropriation Acts, or otherwise made available for obligation for such fiscal year, and

''(ii) shall only be collected and available to defray increases in the costs of the resources allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications (including increases in such costs for an additional number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services to be engaged in such process) over such costs, excluding costs paid from fees collected under this section, for fiscal year 2003 multiplied by the adjustment factor.

''(B) COMPLIANCE.—The Secretary shall be considered to have met the requirements of subparagraph (A)(ii) in any fiscal year if the costs funded by appropriations and allocated for the process for the review of animal drug applications—

''(i) are not more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); or

''(ii)(I) are more than 3 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii), and fees assessed for the fiscal year following the subsequent fiscal year are decreased by the

amount in excess of 3 percent by which such costs fell below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii); and

''(II) such costs are not more than 5 percent below the level specified in subparagraph (A)(ii).

''(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fees under this section—

''(A) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

''(B) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

''(C) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

''(D) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

''(E) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2008;

as adjusted to reflect adjustments in the total fee revenues made under this section and changes in the total amounts collected by animal drug application fees, supplemental animal drug application fees, animal drug sponsor fees, animal drug establishment fees, and animal drug product fees.

''(4) OFFSET.—Any amount of fees collected for a fiscal year under this section that exceeds the amount of fees specified in appropriations Acts for such fiscal year shall be credited to the appropriation account of the Food and Drug Administration as provided in paragraph (1), and shall be subtracted from the amount of fees that would otherwise be authorized to be collected under this section pursuant to appropriation Acts for a subsequent fiscal year.

''(h) COLLECTION OF UNPAID FEES.—In any case where the Secretary does not receive payment of a fee assessed under subsection (a) within 30 days after it is due, such fee shall be treated as a claim of the United States Government subject to subchapter II of chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code.

''(i) WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR WAIVERS, REDUCTIONS, AND REFUNDS.—To qualify for consideration for a waiver or reduction under subsection (d), or for a refund of any fee collected in accordance with subsection (a), a person shall submit to the Secretary a written request for such waiver, reduction, or refund not later than 180 days after such fee is due.

''(j) CONSTRUCTION.—This section may not be construed to require that the number of full-time equivalent positions in the Department of Health and Human Services, for officers, employees, and advisory committees not engaged in the process of the review of animal drug applications, be reduced to offset the number of officers, employees, and advisory committees so engaged.

''(k) ABBREVIATED NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

''(1) to the extent practicable, segregate the review of abbreviated new animal drug applications from the process for the review of animal drug applications, and

''(2) adopt other administrative procedures to ensure that review times of abbreviated new animal drug applications do not increase from their current level due to activities under the user fee program.''.

SEC. 4. ACCOUNTABILITY AND REPORTS.

(a) PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY.—

(1) CONSULTATION.—In developing recommendations to Congress for the goals and plans for meeting the goals for the process for the review of animal drug applications for the fiscal years after fiscal year 2008, and for the reauthorization of sections 739 and 740 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as added by section 3), the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') shall consult with the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, appropriate scientific and academic experts, veterinary professionals, representatives of consumer advocacy groups, and the regulated industry.

(2) RECOMMENDATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(A) publish in the Federal Register recommendations under paragraph (1), after negotiations with the regulated industry;

(B) present the recommendations to the Committees referred to in that paragraph;

(C) hold a meeting at which the public may comment on the recommendations; and

(D) provide for a period of 30 days for the public to provide written comments on the recommendations.

(b) PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—Beginning with fiscal year 2004, not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under part 4 of subchapter C of chapter VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report concerning the progress of the Food and Drug Administration in achieving the goals identified in the letters described in section 2(3) of this Act toward expediting the animal drug development process and the review of the new and supplemental animal drug applications and investigational animal drug submissions during such fiscal year, the future plans of the Food and Drug Administration for meeting the goals, the review times for abbreviated new animal drug applications, and the administrative procedures adopted by the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that review times for abbreviated new animal drug applications are not increased from their current level due to activities under the user fee program.

(c) FISCAL REPORT.—Beginning with fiscal year 2004, not later than 120 days after the end of each fiscal year during which fees are collected under the part described in subsection (a), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the implementation of the authority for such fees during such fiscal year and the use, by the Food and Drug Administration, of the fees collected during such fiscal year for which the report is made.

SEC. 5. SUNSET.

The amendments made by section 3 shall not be in effect after October 1, 2008, and section 4 shall not be in effect after 120 days after such date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, as the lead sponsor of the Animal Drug User Fee Act of 2003, I am very pleased that we are taking up this bill on the House floor today. Closely modeled after the very successful Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 for human drugs, the Animal Drug User Fee Act is designed to give the FDA's Center for Veterinary Medicine the resources and incentives needed to significantly improve the animal drug review process.

This bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Energy and Commerce and is supported by a broad coalition of veterinary and producer groups, including the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Farm Bureau, to name just two of the coalition members.

We would not be here on the floor today were it not for the strong bipartisan support that this legislation received in our committee. I would like to especially acknowledge my original cosponsor and author of the bill, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), committee chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), our Subcommittee on Health Chair, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who is here today, as well as the Members on both sides of the aisle who have cosponsored this legislation.

I am grateful, too, for the hard work of our committee staff, Brent Delmonte, Patrick Ronan, and John Ford and for the assistance we have received from the FDA and the Animal Health Alliance, particularly my staff, Jane Williams.

This legislation is sorely needed. Despite a statutory review time of 180 days, the average new animal drug application review currently takes about a year and a half and it may drag on for even longer. The slowdown in review time is jeopardizing the supply of new, safe and effective animal drugs needed to keep our pets, flocks and herds healthy and help provide American consumers with a safe and wholesome food supply.

Under this proposal, H.R. 1260, the additional revenues generated from fees paid by the pioneer animal drug industry would be dedicated for use in expediting the testing and review of new animal drugs in accordance with the performance goals that have been mutually agreed upon by the FDA and the animal drug industry.

As FDA Commissioner Mark McClellan has noted, a faster, more predictable review process is expected to spur more spending on research and development by the industry, promoting animal health by increasing the availability and diversity of new, safe and effective products.

I encourage my colleagues to vote for this much-needed bipartisan bill.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the Animal Drug User Fee Act. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) for their excellent work on this bill, especially the work that the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) did as the author of this legislation.

H.R. 1260, Mr. Speaker, builds on a successful program for fee-funded expedited review of new human drug applications authorized in 1992 by something called the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, known as PDUFA, the congressional acronym that we are wont to do around here.

□ 1200

We also reauthorized PDUFA some years ago. Congress has done a generally good job in speeding the approval process through the Prescription Drug User Fee Act. We have done not quite as good a job on expediting the approval of generic drugs, something that we need to work with the FDA to accelerate. It takes oftentimes as long as 18 months for a generic drug, something that costs consumers money by the slowness of the approval process.

I think this legislation on animal drugs is almost as important as those other two in terms of what it does with pets, what it does with zoos, and especially what it does with cattle and poultry. We have found, Mr. Speaker, in terms of an issue of antibiotic resistance where we have drugs that are on the market to cure animals, and sometimes those drugs have lost their effectiveness, as they have in the human population, and it is important that this legislation, H.R. 1260, the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. UPTON) bill, get through Congress because it does, in fact, help to put more drugs on the market, more antibiotics in some indications to deal with the problems of antibiotic resistance.

We have had debates on the House floor that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) has been part of on this whole issue of antibiotic resistance. We have seen the use of nontherapeutic drugs given for prophylactic purposes to cattle and poultry, given for growth treatments for cattle and poultry where there has been some residue from those drugs in the human population that have caused problems with antibiotic resistance, both in the animals and, after human consumption, in human beings. And it is especially important in light of the fact that we really have not fixed that problem. We still use far too many drugs for nontherapeutic purposes for cattle and poultry. It is important that this legislation passes because I think H.R. 1260 will help us deal with that.

I again ask for support for this legislation. It matters for our pets. It matters for zoos. It matters for production of cattle and poultry, and it ultimately matters in human health. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 1260.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS), my friend and an important supporter of this legislation, a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague, who is chairman of the Telecommunications and the Internet Subcommittee and has been very active in this, for yielding me this time.

I obviously rise in support of H.R. 1260, the Animal Drug User Fee Act. By funding more FDA drug reviewers, Mr. Speaker, this act will help accelerate approval of important veterinarian drugs, resulting in the comfort and treatment of countless companions, pets, zoo animals and livestock.

This is very important. I am proud of the major veterinary school in my congressional district. The College of Veterinary Medicine in the University of Florida, Florida's only veterinary college, offers comprehensive service to the public through a fourfold mission: teaching, research, extension to the community, and patient care. And I am proud, Mr. Speaker, to be wearing a University of Florida tie in honor of their efforts and their leadership this morning. In fact, at this school, no creature is too small, too large, too pesky, or too dangerous for these fine veterinarians to treat, such as the endangered Florida panthers or even some exotic tropical birds. They have a Performance Animal Physiology Clinic, a Pharmacology and Disease Division, which, in fact, studies humane treatment of equine and greyhound species, athletes among pets. All of these animals, all of them, will benefit from innovative pharmaceuticals that are brought to the market in a more expedited manner.

In addition, one of the Nation's foremost thoroughbred horse industries is located in my hometown of Ocala, Florida. We are actually known as the horse capital of the world. We have 460 horse farms located in Ocala and in Marion County. The Florida Thoroughbred Breeders' and Owners' Association, Florida Thoroughbred Charities, and other equine-related concerns all serve a tremendously important part of our economy and this Nation's entertainment.

Do they demand the best medicines available in the world, available as quickly as possible for their pets and their assets? Absolutely. This bill will help, and that is why I am pleased to support this, and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for his very energetic work on behalf of this, and, of course, for my vet school and horse-owning friends in Florida's 6th Congressional District.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), author of the bill.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my thanks to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for taking the lead on this important piece of legislation and also for his diligence in making sure that it was brought to the floor today and the leadership on both sides of the aisle of the House subcommittee of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is always a pleasure to write and pass a bill with full bipartisan support.

The bill will improve the public's health, the efficiency of FDA's drug approval process, and perhaps most importantly to some, the health of the family pet and of our livestock in this country. In our society, pets have become even more important to Americans, and just like with humans, pharmaceuticals have helped improve the quality of our pets lives. My sister has a 16-year-old dog that is on insulin and several antiinflammatory drugs for arthritis just like senior citizens in this country, and her pet's health has been helped by these drugs, and thereby her family's situation has been improved, and they are happy to have their pet.

Unfortunately, up until now, drugs have not been able to be approved with speed like they are for humans, and the Animal Drug User Fee Act is closely modeled after the Prescription Drug User Fee Act, which was enacted 10 years ago. The purpose of this legislation is twofold: to increase resources available to the FDA so that it may speed up the approval process for pharmaceuticals, and also to maintain monitoring of the safety and efficacy of all pharmaceuticals. Decreasing delays of the approval process is a necessary step to keeping up with medical innovation, and this applies to drug for animals as well as for humans. The monitoring is an essential function that safeguards the public's health.

Ensuring the safety and efficacy of pharmaceuticals is of paramount importance. I am well aware of some of the issues with PDUFA, some of which were discussed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), but I feel strongly that we must increase the FDA's work capacity. This bill has been carefully crafted on both sides of the aisle to avoid the problems of the past, and as my colleagues have heard, it was unanimously passed by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

This bill, ADUFA, requires the Center for Veterinary Medicine at the FDA to meet performance standards in exchange for a 5-year infusion of funds.

By collecting fees from animal drug manufacturers, the FDA will be able to decrease the review time of new drug applications. These delays, which have been considerable in the past, prevent pharmaceuticals from entering the market. I am very pleased that the FDA has also worked very closely with us on the bill and is willing to implement the new program.

Increasing access to animal drugs not only helps lengthen and improve the lives of the family pet, but it will also, and perhaps more importantly, have a wide-ranging impact on our Nation's food supply and will improve prevention of food-borne disease epidemics. For example, for more than 40 years, antibiotics have played a critical role in keeping our Nation's food animals healthy. Without such treatments, illness would be transmitted to humans,

and the livestock market would be more susceptible to devastation. Therefore, we must continue to develop new treatments and quickly bring them to market, but we cannot do that without the speedy approval of the FDA.

I am particularly concerned about the food and medicine supply of this country. This commitment to safety that we are showing today through this legislation starts with the FDA's examination and approval of new pharmaceuticals and continues as these legal drugs are manufactured and distributed throughout the Nation. Commitment to safety must always be a part of the system.

The benefits of this bill are substantial, and, therefore, I am very pleased to cosponsor the bill. Vote yes on H.R. 1260, the Animal Drug User Fee Act.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, animal medicines are used to assist livestock producers raising and maintaining healthy, high quality stock and ultimately, in delivering safe and wholesome food to American dinner tables. They are also used to keep pets healthy, which contributes to the quality of life for millions of companion animal owners.

The Food and Drug Administration's Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) is currently experiencing unprecedented delays in its review of new product submissions. The delays are severe and problematic for the submission sponsors, for CVM, and for veterinarians, livestock and poultry producers, and pet owners in need of new and innovative products to combat animal disease—at a time when animal disease around the world is capturing headlines. The deadlock at the Center also has a chilling effect on the animal health industry's investment in important research and development, threatening the pipeline of products that will be important to livestock and poultry producers in managing their production in the future. The lack of these tools imperils not only animal health but also has implications for the food supply and food safety.

In 1966 Congress, with industry support, enacted the Animal Drug Availability Act to streamline drug review and approval procedures. Contrary to Congressional intent and despite additional resources, it is now more difficult than ever to get new products approved. Unfortunately, this situation is detrimental to veterinarians, to livestock and poultry producers, to food producers and to the public. As a result, it is important for Congress and the Administration to take action to ensure that the CVM can better manage its resources and personnel and make institutional changes to fulfill its mandated mission and responsibilities.

Modeled after the successful Prescription Drug User Fee Act, the Animal Drug User Fee Act will increase efficiencies in review times for new animal pharmaceuticals by providing CVM with additional resources to allow for improved communication between FDA and product sponsors and more expeditious FDA actions on applications.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Congressman UPTON for his leadership and that of the full Committee on Energy and Commerce for bringing this important legislation to the floor today and urge all Members to support it.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1260.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING FORT DETRICK ON 60 YEARS OF SERVICE TO U.S.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 271) congratulating Fort Detrick on 60 years of service to the United States, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 271

Whereas April 10, 2003, was the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Army installation in Frederick, Maryland, named Fort Detrick;

Whereas Fort Detrick is designated as an Army Medical Installation and is home to the United States Army Medical Research and Materiel Command (USAMRMC), one of two campuses of the National Cancer Institute (NCI-Frederick), and 36 other organizations of the Department of Defense and other Federal departments;

Whereas the primary missions of the organizations at Fort Detrick include biomedical research and development, medical materiel management, and global telecommunications;

Whereas throughout that installation's 60-year history, the personnel and organizations assigned to that installation have contributed scientific breakthroughs and medical solutions for the Armed Forces and the Nation;

Whereas Fort Detrick is a focal point for the Nation's biomedical scientific leadership and has contributed extensively to protecting and improving public health in the United States;

Whereas Fort Detrick has been home to preeminent researchers in bacteriology, microbiology, clinical and preventative medicine, biochemistry, neurology, botany, virology, and genomics;

Whereas the research program at Fort Detrick was a pioneer in the laboratory facility designs, equipment, and procedures that are used for infectious disease research in laboratories worldwide;

Whereas researchers at Fort Detrick have improved public health throughout the world through the creation of botulinum antibodies, which have been used to treat both infant and adult victims of botulism;

Whereas the Venezuelan equine encephalitis vaccines, which were created at Fort Detrick, have been used to control human and animal outbreaks of Venezuelan equine encephalitis, and the Rift Valley Fever vaccines, which were also created at Fort Detrick, have been used to protect people in Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and other countries who are at high risk of Rift Valley Fever;

Whereas, on January 27, 1969, the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army established the United States Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as the ''Institute''), which is located at Fort Detrick and is the Department of Defense's lead laboratory for medical aspects of biological warfare defense;

Whereas when outbreaks of hantaviral disease began in the southwestern United States in 1993, the Institute was called upon by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and by various State health departments for consultations;

Whereas when the Ebola virus was first carried to the shores of the United States in late 1989 by a primate colony found in Reston, Virginia, it was researchers at the Institute who diagnosed and contained the outbreak;

Whereas the Institute also played a key role in the identification of and response to the initial outbreak of West Nile virus in New York;

Whereas the Institute continues its life-saving work by collaborating with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health on the development of diagnostics and the evaluation of antiviral drugs for Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome;

Whereas the Institute created a vaccine against hemorrhagic fever in the 1980s, which has possibly saved thousands of lives in Argentina, including the lives of agricultural workers at risk for exposure to this hemorrhagic fever virus;

Whereas the Institute was the only Federal laboratory to maintain a continuous diagnostic reference capability on a 24-hour per day basis after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and provided expertise in medical diagnostics and decontamination that was key to ensuring that congressional office buildings were safe to reoccupy after the anthrax mail attacks in the fall of 2001;

Whereas leading vaccine candidates for anthrax, plague, tularemia, and botulinum neurotoxins were all originally developed at the Institute;

Whereas the basic research program at the Institute is responsible for some of the most promising medical countermeasures against the leading biological threats that are on the ''A'' List of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

Whereas the Institute has established a partnership with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health to collaborate and accelerate biodefense research that will protect all Americans against the threat of biological and chemical attacks by terrorists;

Whereas in 1974, the United States Army Medical Materiel Agency was relocated to Fort Detrick and the Navy, Air Force, and Army all now conduct medical logistics planning and management at Fort Detrick in support of global military operations;

Whereas the Foreign Disease-Weed Science Research Unit of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has conducted high-priority research in the Plant Pathogen Containment Facility at Fort Detrick for over 30 years, providing the agricultural community with basic epidemiological information and rapid diagnostic assays for exotic threatening and emerging crop diseases, such as Karnal bunt of wheat, soybean rust, potato late blight, and plum pox virus;

Whereas Company B, 4th Light Armored Reconnaissance Battalion, 4th Marine Division, United States Marine Corps Reserve, which has been assigned to Fort Detrick since October 1987, had a mission of reconnaissance and security in support of a Marine Air/Ground Task Force and received the Meritorious Unit Citation for its service during Operation Desert Storm;

Whereas the Army's 1108th Signal Brigade at Fort Detrick provides important strategic

communication support to the White House and the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and

Whereas the National Cancer Institute-Frederick at Fort Detrick, one of two campuses of the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health, is an internationally recognized center for scientific excellence in the prevention, detection, and treatment of cancer and AIDS: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates Fort Detrick, Maryland, on 60 years of service to the Nation; and

(2) commends the military and civilian personnel of the Army, other elements of the Department of Defense, and other Federal departments and agencies who have worked diligently at Fort Detrick since its founding—

(A) to defend the United States against biological and chemical attack; and

(B) to develop vaccines for all types of illnesses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As the cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 271, I rise to congratulate Fort Detrick on 60 years of outstanding service to our Nation. Fort Detrick, located in Frederick, Maryland, employs men and women who are among the Nation's most preeminent researchers in bacteriology, microbiology, clinical and preventive medicine, biochemistry, neurology, botany, virology, and genomics. These scientists and technicians have an unparalleled record protecting the men and women in America's Armed Forces from the scourge of biowarfare.

They have also led the world's fight against many infectious diseases. Today workers at Fort Detrick are helping to protect and improve the health of all Americans, as well as people around the world.

During the height of World War II, in 1943, scientists converged at Camp Detrick when the War Department began to address the threat of biological warfare. In 1956, the U.S. Army Medical Unit was formed to develop medical countermeasures which included rapid and effective diagnostic and identification procedures. Throughout the Cold War, Fort Detrick developed and matured many of the standard protocols and technology utilized in biomedical research.

In 1969, the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, USAMRIID, was established to continue America's defense against biological agents.

Of today's top six biological threats, the CDC's ''A'' list, the leading candidate countermeasures for at least five of the six have come from the basic research program at USAMRIID. Leading vaccine candidates for anthrax, plague, and neurotoxins were all originally developed at USAMRIID. The technology used to develop a new smallpox vaccine was first demonstrated at USAMRIID. The National Cancer Institute-Frederick is an internationally recognized center for scientific excellence in the prevention, detection, and treatment of cancer and AIDS. Three billion dollars in congressionally directed research into breast and prostate cancer have been done at the NCI, which is located at Fort Detrick.

Fort Detrick is also a home of the 1108th Signal Brigade, the U.S. Army Medical Material Agency, and the 4th Light Armored Vehicle Battalion of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. The Foreign Disease-Weed Science Research Unit of the Department of Agriculture is also located at Fort Detrick and has conducted high-priority research in exotic threatening and emerging crop diseases for over 30 years.

The National Institutes of Health will be constructing an integrated biomedical research facility at the post to support the biodefense mission of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. The Department of Homeland Security is considering joining NIAID and USAMRIID in an expanded biodefense campus at Fort Detrick. Fort Detrick is the logical location because of the 60-year record of accomplishments, the existing facilities and the productive partnerships already in place between the military and many civilian agencies of the Federal Government.

Fort Detrick is a focal point for America's biomedical scientific leadership. I congratulate all of the thousands of former and current employees for their outstanding service to our Nation.

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

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

(Mr. ORTIZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) in support of this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

Fort Detrick is one of the most important lines of defense should we ever be attacked with a chemical or biological weapon. Since 1969, it has been our Nation's lead laboratory for the medical aspects of biological warfare defense.

□ 1215

The September 11 attacks used civilian airplanes as weapons of mass destruction; but it raises the specter of a terrorist attack that would use a chemical, biological, or nuclear weapon against us. I hope such an attack never occurs; but if it does, the men and women of Fort Detrick are devoted to improving the ways to quickly detect the use of chemical or biological weapons, halt the spread of chemical and biological agents as quickly as possible, and treat the victims of the attack.

But the mission of Fort Detrick goes beyond just protecting against chemical or biological attack. Fort Detrick has played a leading role in protecting our Nation and other nations against all types of infectious diseases. They helped identify the West Nile Virus several summers ago, and they created a vaccine in the 1980s that probably saved the lives of thousands of Argentinians from an agricultural virus. Fort Detrick has been a world leader in research of microbiology, biochemistry, botany, and other scientific disciplines that are necessary to understanding how to detect and treat lethal viruses.

Fort Detrick also serves as home to one of the two campuses of the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health. This NIH campus is internationally recognized for its contribution to cancer and AIDS research.

The mission of Fort Detrick goes beyond research as well. Since 1974, all medical logistical support of global military operations is planned and managed by Fort Detrick. This is an extremely important mission as our troops are flung worldwide in the global war on terrorism. And as my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), mentioned, the Army's 1108th Signal Brigade at Fort Detrick provides strategic communications support to the White House and the joint chiefs.

This is just a symbol of the accomplishments and missions of Fort Detrick, not an inventory of what they do. They do a great job.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, as Congressman from Maryland's Second Congressional district home to Aberdeen and Fort Meade . . . I know what it means to represent our brave military men and women who continue to defend this nation abroad and here at home.

Many who protect us do so with weapons . . . and many protect us in otherways. . .

Fort Detrick is the premier military base for medical and biological research. The men and women that work at the Detrick have led the way in infectious disease and chemical warfare research.

Detrick began as a chemical research facility housing the research branch of The Army Chemical Warfare Service. It is also the home

to the Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center (AFMIC).

Detrick is also home to U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Disease (USAMRIID). These state of the art laboratories are continuing to develop vaccines and treatments to defend against offensive bioweapons. USAMRIID also has a large staff dedicated to finding cures for cancer.

I am proud that the United States has dedicated a military base to these problems and I am proud it is in the my home state of Maryland. It is imperative in this day of terrorism to be prepared for the new chemical and biological weapons. Today I am happy to honor the 60 years of research that Detrick has provided for the National Security of this Nation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 271, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution congratulating Fort Detrick, Maryland, on 60 years of service to the Nation.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2691, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2691), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. DICKS

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DICKS 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. 2691 be instructed to provide an additional $400,000,000 of emergency funding for fiscal year 2003 forest fire suppression costs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

This motion would instruct the conferees to agree to the additional $400 million of emergency firefighting funds in the Senate version of the fiscal year 2004 interior appropriations. These funds are desperately needed to repay the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service accounts that have been emptied to fight forest fires during the current fiscal year. We need this additional money. In fact, the agencies estimate that we need $171 million more than was provided by the Senate.

The decision of Chairman BURNS in the Senate to add an additional $400 million was in response to new agency estimates that show a shortfall of $860 million for fire. While the other body's amount does not fully address the problem, it would go a long way towards repaying the construction and land acquisition accounts of these agencies that have been pillaged, all because the administration did not request enough to fight fires.

My colleagues from the West understand this problem all too well, but I hope everyone is aware that other areas beyond the West face similar fire risks from record low rainfall. The National Fire Center reports that as of today, more than 3.1 million acres have burned. Nineteen large fires are still burning, affecting more than 350,000 acres.

The Forest Service and the BLM have already spent the money; they had no choice. But unlike other agencies, FEMA, for example, that get reimbursed, the Forest Service and BLM are forced to cancel construction projects, land acquisition, reforestation programs in our national forests, endangered species work, processing of grazing fees, and many other activities. These agencies simply cannot function and cannot do the work Congress directs them to do if year after year their accounts are drained for fires that we already know will occur, and if Congress does not reimburse these accounts.

In 2002, the Forest Service and BLM spent nearly $1.2 billion fighting fires. The administration requested repayment of $825 million, leaving $334 million still owed to the Forest Service and the BLM. This borrowing is over the amounts that Congress had previously appropriated. This cannot happen again and again. These cuts have real impacts and, in some cases, only compound the problems we have in our forests if the agencies do not have the money to do the thinnings and fuel-load reduction work that is necessary to avoid fire risk in the first place.

We all know this money is needed and that it is needed now. The conference should agree to the additional $400 million added by the Senate. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this motion.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with the comments of my good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS). We have had a hard fire season this year. We just passed $289 million, the President just signed it yesterday, so we have added that amount in. We are working with the administration on the new amount, and I have no objection to the recommendation the gentleman has to the committee.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DICKS. So when this comes back up, I have to be here to ask for a recorded vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At that point the Chair will put the question de novo.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the Chair.

□ 1230

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for 10 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess for 10 minutes.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASE 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. 1 be instructed as follows:

(1) The House recede to the Senate on the provisions to guarantee access to prescription drug coverage under section 1860D–13(e) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 101(a) of the Senate amendment.

(2) To reject the provisions of section 501 of the House bill.

(3) The House recede to the Senate on the following provisions of the Senate amendment to improve rural health care:

(A) Section 403 (relating to inpatient hospital adjustment for low volume hospitals).

(B) Section 404 (relating to medicare disproportionate share adjustment for rural areas), but with the effective date applicable under section 401(b) of the House bill.

(C) Section 404A (relating to MedPAC report on medicare disproportionate share hospital adjustment payments).

(D) The following provisions of section 405 (relating to critical access hospital improvements):

(i) Subsection (a), but with the effective date applicable under section 405(f)(4) of the House bill.

(ii) Subsection (b), but with the effective date applicable under section 405(c)(2) of the House bill.

(iii) Subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(E) Section 414 (relating to rural community hospital demonstration program).

(F) Section 415 (relating to critical access hospital improvement demonstration program).

(G) Section 417 (relating to treatment of certain entities for purposes of payment under the medicare program).

(H) Section 420 (relating to conforming changes relating to Federally qualified health centers).

(I) Section 420A (relating to increase for hospitals with disproportionate indigent care revenues).

(J) Section 421 (relating to establishment of floor on geographic adjustments of payments for physicians' services).

(K) Section 425 (relating to temporary increase for ground ambulance services), but with the effective date applicable under the amendment made by section 410(2) of the House bill.

(L) Section 426 (relating to appropriate coverage of air ambulance services under ambulance fee schedule).

(M) Section 427 (relating to treatment of certain clinical diagnostic laboratory tests furnished by a sole community hospital).

(N) Section 428 (relating to improvement in rural health clinic reimbursement).

(O) Section 444 (relating to GAO study of geographic differences in payments for physicians' services).

(P) Section 450C (relating to authorization of reimbursement for all medicare part B services furnished by Indian hospitals and clinics).

(Q) Section 452 (relating to limitation on reduction in area wage adjustment factors under the prospective payment system for home health services).

(R) Section 455 (relating to MedPAC study on medicare payments and efficiencies in the health care system).

(S) Section 459 (relating to increase in medicare payment for certain home health services).

(T) Section 601 (Increase in medicaid DSH allotments for fiscal years 2004 and 2005).

(4) The House insist upon the following provisions of the House bill:

(A) Section 402 (relating to immediate establishment of uniform standardized amount in rural and small urban areas).

(B) Section 403 (relating to establishment of essential rural hospital classification).

(C) Subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e) of section 405 (relating to improvements to critical access hospital program).

(D) Section 416 (relating to revision of labor-related share of hospital inpatient pps wage index).

(E) Section 417 (relating to medicare incentive payment program improvements).

(F) Section 504 (relating to wage index classification reform).

(G) Section 601 (relating to revision of updates for physician services).

(H) Section 1001 (relating to medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) payments).

Mr. CASE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to instruct be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

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

Mr. Speaker, by my calendar, we now have 16 days until the October 17th deadline announced by the President and the Senate majority leader for completing the pending conference on the so-called Medicare reform bill. And still before this House, before this Chamber and the Senate and the country the unanswered question, in my mind, is: Does the current administration and does the congressional majority really care about health care for the American people?

Now, I know a lot of people around here really care about a lot of people around here that make a lot of money off of health care. And I know that a lot of people around here really care about spending money on a lot of things other than health care. I have seen that in my time here in Congress. And I have certainly heard a lot of talk, a lot of talk about health care. I have certainly heard a lot of talk about Medicare. But the question is: Do they really care? What do their actions demonstrate? Do they care about the people at the end of this food chain?

It is a long food chain from the halls of this Congress through the Federal Government and out through the health care community and down into the communities where people live, work and get sick. Do they really care about the people at the end? All of us do not just want affordable and available health care; we need it, and it has to be available and affordable.

When we look at where the people of our country live, who most want and most need health care, and when we look at where the assistance of our Federal Government should go, it is in the rural areas of our country, our small cities, our small towns, our hamlets, our isolated outposts, out where people live away from these urban centers where we live and do our work. And the reasons for that need are well documented, and I do not think anybody else has to tell us any more.

We all know why health care is so important to the rural areas of our country. First of all, we have less available preventive care throughout life, so when people get sick younger, they get sick worse in the rural part of our country. In the rural parts of our country today and down the road, people are older than in the urban parts of our country; they need health care more.

□ 1245

In the rural parts of our country people have lower incomes, higher unemployment, and when we have lower income and higher unemployment, health care suffers.

In the rural parts of our country, it always has been true that there has been less access to medical care and specialization, and that is getting worse.

Finally, in the rural parts of our country, there is simply less availability and coverage of health care insurance.

These are not just abstract thoughts. We can read about these in Federal reports. We can debate them here in Congress, but let us talk about real America, what happens out there in these communities, and let me talk about my community, the community that I represent, because I represent rural Hawaii. I do not represent downtown Honolulu. I represent the rural parts of my State, islands all of them, islands that are rural, islands with small cities, small towns, hamlets and outposts every bit as rural as the rest of our rural country, every bit as prone to all of these problems. They may have different names, but the concerns are the same.

Let me give my colleagues just a couple of examples of areas of my District which are just like any part of our country in terms of health care. Let us talk about the Hamakua Coast on the island of Hawaii, my home. The Hamakua Coast is about as rural as one can get in Hawaii. It is an agricultural-based economy. Its largest crop, sugar, failed along that coast 10, 15, 20 years ago. And these small towns now have people that grew up in the sugar industry and are trying to make a go of small business in agriculture in those small towns, small towns like Pepeekeo and Papaikou, Laupahoehoe, Paauilo, Honokaa, and their problem is health care.

Let us take West Hawaii, the other side of the same island, a part of my Hawaii that has some most of the rural areas of our whole State, North

Kohala, Ocean View down in South Kona and Kau. They want those rural communities to survive. West Hawaii used to have a surgeon that qualified for Medicare reimbursements. That surgeon is no longer there. There is no surgeon in West Hawaii at the moment for Medicare people.

So when I walk into the coffee shops, when I walk into the small family stores and small post offices of my district, when I go into the bon dances that are so much a part of our culture during the summer, and I sit down, and I talk to my constituents, and I ask them what is on their mind, they say health care, health care and health care.

This is not an abstract thought. They are scared about the availability of health care. They are scared about the availability of prescription drugs. They are scared about chronic disease and chronic illnesses and their ability to be able to take care of their medical needs. They are scared about long-term care, and their children are scared for their parents.

These are the realities of rural America. The availability of physicians in this part of my district is significant in the example that it shows for what is happening in rural health care. There are about two physicians per 1,000 in urban Honolulu, but if one gets out there into the rest of the communities in my district, the percentage drops well below one, down to 0.1 in communities like Molokai.

Let us talk about Molokai, because that is another good example. The island of Molokai, about as rural as one can get in America, an island, an island of 7,000 people living on it. They cannot hop a bus or a train or a boat to get to some critical access hospital when they have medical care. They have to fly, and flying is expensive. Thousands of dollars are being spent.

Hawaii is no different from the rest of rural America. I fly over rural America almost every weekend. I look down. I have been across it myself, and I look out, and I see places just like my rural Hawaii. They are their own islands. They may not be surrounded by water, but they are islands of isolation, islands of small towns, small hamlets, the prairie towns of the great plains, the mountain hamlets of the Sierra, the Rockies or Appalachia. This is our heartland, and they are scared about health care.

In rural America, health care is not an abstract thought either. It is a Federal program, Medicare. Health care in rural America is Medicare. For seniors in rural America, it is Medicare. For the disabled in rural America, it is Medicare, and because in rural America it is health care and health care is Medicare, as Medicare goes, so goes rural America.

If we do not have available and affordable medical coverage through Medicare, we have no rural America. If we do not have adequate reimbursements, no doctors, no hospitals, no clinics in rural America, we have no rural America. If we do not have adequate prescription coverage for our seniors and disabled that live in rural America through Medicare, we have no rural America.

So one of the things that it is incredibly important to realize is that the debate about Medicare is not just about Medicare. The debate about Medicare is not just about health care. The debate about America is about maintaining rural America. We have to take care of the needs of rural America, whether they are economic needs, where the manufacturing base is shrinking or whether they are land use needs, where the agricultural base is shrinking, and whether they are health care needs, where the needs are diminishing. That is the reality of Medicare.

H.R. 1, the Medicare Reform Bill, passed this House by a single vote. Like most of my colleagues on this sides of the aisle, I voted no on that bill, primarily because that bill did not help rural America. That bill did not do the job for rural America that we wanted it to do, and in fact, that bill hurt rural America, and I voted no. The motion before us today simply says this: Put your money where your mouth is.

There has been a lot of talk about helping rural America, but talk is cheap. Let us prove it. Do not get me wrong, there are some components in both the House version of Medicare reform and the Senate version of Medicare reform, there are isolated instances of help for rural America in both bills. That is not going to be good enough. As these 16 days tick by to the deadline set by our President and our Senate majority leader, our attention has to turn back to what are the best aspects of each bill for rural America, what are the best aspects of the bill that help the particular problems in rural America, what are the aspects of the bill that provide prescription drug coverage, what are the aspects of the bill that provide adequate reimbursements to hospitals and doctors.

On the island of Molokai, for example, we no longer have long-term care beds. Why? They cannot provide them under the reimbursement rate granted by Medicare. That may seem like an abstract thought, but imagine that a person has grown up their whole life on Molokai, and their family lives there, too, and it comes time for them to be taken care of in their old age, and they have to move islands, they have to leave their home because there is not the coverage available to be helpful to them if they are needy, and their family has to fly back and forth. That is not something we want to sanction.

We want to take the best of these two bills. We want to take the best of these bills on prescription drug coverage. We want to take the best of these bills on not cutting our hospital payments, and that is what this motion says.

This motion which has been brought three times now before this House by my colleagues, and I now bring it here today, simply says let us not talk anymore, let us do it. Let us take the best of these bills that we know will do the job, and let us adopt them in conference because we have the ingredients, right now, to do a good job for rural America. The question is will we do that job for rural America?

So this bill simply says, on prescription drug coverage, let us have a fall-back option. If there is no prescription drug coverage available under Medicare in our rural communities, then there is a fall-back provision on prescription drug coverage, not by the private sector, but by our government.

This motion says let us take the best of both the House and the Senate versions on reimbursing our providers. If we cannot provide basic services in our communities to those in need, there is something wrong, and we need to provide for the adequate reimbursements, and this bill says let us do that, and this bill also says that we need our hospitals, our critical access facilities in our rural areas. We need access in our rural areas.

Again, the example of Hawaii, a State that is an island State, where one cannot simply get to the urban center of Honolulu easily, where people are spending, like I said, thousands of dollars just on transportation needs because these are not available in their districts whether they be Kauai or Molokai or Maui or the Big Island, that we will provide the necessary payments to our hospitals to keep them open at a basic level of service for our rural areas. That is what this motion says, and I think it is pretty simple. It is a matter of priorities.

If our priorities are to ensure the health of our rural economies, our rural lifestyle, which is the heart land not only of our country but of our thinking, of our culture, then we need to protect these rural communities, and health care is the way to protect them.

So let us not avoid this anymore. Let us just vote on this motion, let us give our conferees direct instructions that we collectively care about rural health care and that we intend to follow through and that we will put our money where our mouth is.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes a very good case for rural health care, and I commend him for that and because we have heard the same case made time and time again, and this is why we have provided an approximately $25 billion increase in payments to rural providers.

Before I go into that, I would advise the gentleman through the Chair, if I may, that I certainly agree with him regarding wellness, preventive health care and whatnot, and for something like 60 years or 30 years after Medicare was devised, we did not have, in Medicare, provisions for preventive health

care. And it was not until a few years ago, in the 1990s, in the late 1990s, when finally a group of us got together on a bipartisan basis and finally for the first time put some preventive health care coverage reimbursement, if you will, in order to cover those areas.

In the House bill, in the House bill, the gentleman has not referred to this, we have a provision to the effect that when a person is about to go under Medicare, there is a reimbursement coverage. In other words, provided payment by Medicare, for a one-time physical. It is a voluntary type of a thing, but a one-time physical to encourage people to take that physical before they go into Medicare, and with the idea, of course, that many problems, many illnesses, prospective illnesses might be picked up at a real early stage and thus save not only an awful lot of money, of course, to the taxpayer ultimately, but certainly save an awful lot of money and inconvenience and pain for the beneficiary.

This is what is in the House bill, as I understand it. It is not the Senate bill. It is one of those provisions that we, on the Member level in conference, are going to have to address. The American Cancer Society supports that provision, and it is my idea, and so, certainly, I support it. So I agree with the gentleman about preventive health care, and it is something we are trying to do.

This is, as the gentleman indicated, the fourth time the minority has offered this motion to instruct conferees. I do find it perplexing that they continue to offer this motion, and for one reason only, and that is because by definition, by definition, it would reduce the amount of funding available for the new Medicare prescription drug benefit by 10s of billions of dollars.

So, yes, do we want to increase and are we, in fact, increasing the reimbursements to rural Medicare providers? Yes, we are doing that. If we increase that amount, we are taking it from where? We are taking it, of course, from the prescription drug benefits available to seniors.

The author would have the Medicare conferees accept every rural provider increase contained in both bills, as he indicated. I would note for my colleagues, and I have already said this, that the House has already recognized the need to ensure the rural Medicare providers are paid fairly. In fact, the House-passed bill contains a $24.9 billion increase in payments to rural providers, which will help rural hospitals and physicians, among others, continue to provide care to rural Americans. So, if the House bill goes down, or if we do not have a bill, let us say both bills go down because we want perfection, the rural hospitals will lose $25 billion as a result of that decision.

Since the authors of this motion continue to emphasize that their motion will not cause us to exceed the $400 billion laid out in the budget resolution, we would have to reallocate funds, I have already said it, away from beneficiaries and towards whom? Towards rural providers.

□ 1300

Would we like to do that? Yes. Would we like to take it away from prescription drug benefits? The answer is no. I do not support it. I think the House bill strikes the right balance between providing a meaningful prescription drug benefit and helping ensure that providers, especially those in rural areas, continue to serve Medicare beneficiaries.

This motion would also, in some cases, require a type of government-run fallback. Although the House passed legislation, both bills have a fallback. The House passed legislation has a fallback. It already guarantees that every Medicare beneficiary will have a choice of the least two Medicare prescription drug plans.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office tells us, and they are, of course, as bipartisan as you can be, that under both acts, CBO estimates that all Medicare beneficiaries would have access to prescription drug coverage. In spite of that, both bills have a fallback. They are good fallbacks. As time goes on, if, God forbid, we might have to fall back, if you will, to a fallback, and it looks like it is not working, then, of course, that is something that can be adjusted. But there really is not that much of a difference in terms of what the fallbacks are as I understand it. It is just the case of the Senate bill fallback would immediately fall back to the government picking up 100 percent of risk whereas the House bill affords flexibility, if you will, from the standpoint that one fallback may result in government picking up a certain percentage of risk in some areas and in some other areas and pick up a larger risk or smaller risk or something of that nature.

We have found that, in order to control costs, it is important that Medicare prescription drug sponsors share some of the risk associated with providing this new benefit. I am uncomfortable asking the Federal taxpayer to completely shoulder the weight of this new entitlement. That is why I do not think we need the government running prescription drug plans. But the fact of the matter is the fallback is there, and there is a guarantee in the House bill that a plan will be available for all beneficiaries.

And, finally, the motion instructs conferees to recede to the Senate and remove the hospital market-basket update adjustment contained in the House bill. I would note for my colleagues that we are not cutting hospital reimbursement. We are not cutting hospital reimbursement. We have hospitals all over, whether it be urban areas or rural areas, my area is somewhat in between, if you will, but we are not getting hospital reimbursements.

According to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, which we call MedPAC, it is the nonpartisan panel of experts that advises Congress on Medicare policy, hospitals currently make a 10 percent profit for Medicare inpatient services and a 5 percent profit, on average, for all services provided to Medicare patients.

So I have already emphasized, if you will, MedPAC unanimously advised Congress to increase payments by 3 percent, which is what the House bill does. We have gone along with basically the experts in that regard, MedPAC.

The $25 billion approximate increase in provider payments in rural areas is based on certain formulas. Iowa hospitals would receive a certain percentage, Hawaii hospitals receive a certain percentage, increases above and beyond that 3 percent I might add.

Additionally, and it has not been mentioned in the motion to instruct, but under the current law, Medicare providers would have reduced their reimbursement by 4.4 percent. The House bill increases that by 1.5 percent. You are talking about a swing of 5.9 percent to Medicare providers, M.D.-type providers, if you will, which would take place if we enact this legislation into law. If we defeat this legislation and defeat any version of this type of legislation, those providers would be hurting. The rural providers would be hurting considerably more than they are now. And obviously, the beneficiaries, to whom we have promised prescription drugs of a sort, would be hurting.

Mr. Speaker, given the progress the conferees have made toward reaching an agreement, progress is being made, it is slow, there is no question about it, but it is moving, I would hope that conferees are given the opportunity to work through their differences between both bills. After all, that is what the system is all about. There are differences between the House version and the Senate version. And conferees were appointed on a bipartisan basis in order to try to work out those differences.

Basically what we are saying to the gentleman and to the entire House is give the conferees the opportunity to work, and hopefully we will be able to successfully address the many competing issues in a satisfactory way.

And more importantly, in addition to helping the rural providers and rural hospitals, all providers, et cetera, we will be providing our seniors with a prescription drug benefit that they need so very desperately.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my colleagues, I would simply note that as to the last comment made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) on the bipartisan nature of this conference, I think it is well known within this Congress, and I hope that it is well known outside of this Chamber, that the minority party is not particularly participating in that conference and is

not particularly being consulted. And as a result, we are certainly willing and able to do that in the full glare of publicity before the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), a person who understands rural communities, understands rural concerns. He lives them.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) for his leadership in this matter. And I can say that I know that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), cares about senior citizens and their health. I know that there are many Members on both sides of the aisle that have a genuine concern about what happens to our health care system and what happens to our senior citizens. But I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, as we consider H.R. 1, and just as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE), just mentioned, every meeting of the conference committee does not include the Democrats. I do not know why that is, but that is the way it works around here.

I would probably call this H.R. 1 bill that we are working with right now, I would be more inclined to call it a fallback or a fall-off or fell-off or jump-off or some characterization like that because this bill just simply does not provide any kind of a guarantee for our senior citizens as to what it will do or a guarantee to our health care industry as to what they need to see in the way of the ability to continue to provide services and do business.

And, certainly, in rural America there are no guarantees. We lose hospitals almost on a monthly basis across this country in rural America. We have providers now that just simply do not take Medicare patients any more. Most of this is as a result of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which I proudly voted against; and it has put our health care system in great jeopardy.

Now we are talking about another Medicare reform bill that would reduce payments in some cases to all hospitals, and certainly it would make it more difficult for our rural hospitals and rural providers to stay in business, and it does not guarantee any kind of a prescription drug benefit to our rural seniors who would need it the most.

So I would encourage my colleagues to look carefully at this and not do something that will hurt rural America and our seniors. It is very disappointing to think that the possibility even exists that we would not have a fallback provision that would ensure that our seniors in rural communities would have access to a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Over the last 25 years, over 470 rural hospitals have closed. Rural hospitals all over the country are in danger of being forced to shut their doors. Currently, hospitals receive full inflation market-basket payments for inpatient and outpatient services. H.R. 1 would reduce hospital payment updates for the next 3 years, costing hospitals an estimated $12 billion.

Our health care system in this country is on the verge of serious, serious problems. All we are asking for is a fair deal for rural America and a fair deal for the people that provide the services to our senior citizens through Medicare so they can stay in business.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to the gentleman, and I appreciate his comments because he is so very much concerned about health care for our seniors; but I mentioned the conference is taking place on a bipartisan basis, and the truth is it is. We have two United States Senators from the other party who are part of that conference, on an everyday basis, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for the opportunity to address this issue.

Mr. Speaker, as previously pointed out, this is the fourth time the minority has offered this motion to instruct Medicare conferees. I personally find it perplexing that they continue to offer this motion, since by definition it would reduce the amount of funding available for the new Medicare prescription drug benefit by tens of billions of dollars. The author of this motion would have the Medicare conferees accept every rural provider increase contained in both bills, both bills.

I would note for my colleagues that the House has already recognized the need to ensure that rural Medicare providers are paid fairly. In fact, the House-passed bill contains, as was previously pointed out by the chairman, almost $25 billion in increased payments to rural providers; and that will help rural hospitals and rural physicians continue to provide care to rural Americans.

Since the authors of this motion continue to emphasize that their motion would not cause us to exceed the $400 billion laid out in the budget resolution, they would have to radically reallocate funds laid out by the House bill in a manner that would disrupt the delicate balance laid out by the bill. The House bill strikes the right balance between providing a meaningful prescription drug benefit and helping provide incentives that providers, especially those in rural areas, continue to serve Medicare beneficiaries.

This motion would force the Department of Health and Human Services to offer a Medicare prescription drug plan. This is a Big Government fallback that is shortsighted and unneeded. The House-passed legislation guarantees that every Medicare beneficiary will have the choice of at least two Medicare prescription drug plans. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that under both acts estimates are that all Medicare beneficiaries would have access to prescription drug coverage.

We have found that in order to control costs it is important that Medicare prescription drug plan sponsors share some of the risk associated with providing this new benefit. The taxpayers should not be asked to completely shoulder the weight of this new entitlement, and that is why we do not think we need the government running prescription drug plans.

Finally, the motion instructs conferees to recede to the Senate and remove the hospital market-basket update adjustment contained in the House bill. I want to be very clear about how the House bill approaches the hospital issue. The House bill does not cut hospital reimbursement. According to the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, hospitals make a 10 percent profit in Medicare inpatient services, and a 5 percent profit on average for services provided to Medicare patients. The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission unanimously advised Congress to increase payments by 3 percent, which is what the House bill does.

Mr. Speaker, I think I also need to add that the gentleman from Arkansas who just spoke said that rural providers need our help. And I would submit that if the other side of the aisle wants to be helpful to rural providers, they would instruct Members of their party in the other body to take up and pass meaningful medical liability reform. A fair justice system would do more to help rural hospitals and rural providers than any other action.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, given the progress the conferees have made toward reaching an agreement, I would hope that the conferees are given the opportunity to continue to work through the differences in both bills. I am confident that we will successfully address many of the competing issues in a satisfactory way. Most importantly, we will provide our seniors with the prescription drug benefit that they so desperately need.

□ 1315

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

I would simply note, with respect to my colleague's comments, the Department of Health and Human Services under the motion would be required to do certain things; that is correct. The Department would be required to provide the reimbursements that are necessary to preserve rural health care through the hospitals.

I would also note that sometimes the Department does need to be required to do things. One of the principal issues on the Medicare Reform Bill remains whether the Department of Health and Human Services should be required to enter into basic bulk purchasing arrangements to lower the cost of prescription drugs. The bill that came out of this House would have prohibited them from doing that; and clearly, in

this instance, the Department needs to be told to do what every American knows is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) who totally understands rural America.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend and colleague from Hawaii for his passion on this issue and for reminding us that in the United States the face of rural America is not simply Southern or Western, it can even be Pacific at times.

Let me begin, first of all, by saying or by reiterating something that my friend from Arkansas said, I do not think that any of us on this side of the aisle believe that any of our able colleagues on the other side want to do violence to the interests of rural America or do not care about what goes on in the heartland of America or in the rural parts of our country. We are not having a debate about intent today or a debate about goals today, but we are having a debate about making a system that will work.

It is a fact, and it is an eventuality under the bill that the Republican leadership so narrowly pushed through this body, that over a period of time, the prescription drug benefit, that all of us want and have endorsed in some sense, will be phased out and delivered through the private sector in significant parts of our country. Now, that sounds, from a technical standpoint, like a worthy enough aspiration. I have heard my colleagues on the other side defend that kind of a world in terms of the market choices it will open up. I have heard them defend that kind of a world in terms of the choices it will generate for the consumers, for senior consumers.

The reality, as so many of us on this side of the aisle know, is this: We can travel to those places in west Alabama, whole places in the rural parts of our country where you simply do not have a private provider network that is capable or available to carry this burden. So when we are talking about expanding market choices, what a wonderful thing it would be if those market choices would be available all around this country.

Our seniors are looking to us desperately for leadership on this issue. Our seniors are desperately looking to us to give them a benefit, but not just any benefit. They want one that is fair, and one that is workable, and one that is available all around America.

I am genuinely amazed that a lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are willing to have us move into a system where, at best, we can trust the vagaries of the market to provide this benefit for our seniors. I talk as I move around my district to far too many seniors who are having to spend significant chunks of their limited, disposable income on prescription drugs. I run into too many seniors who are having to self-medicate, who are told that they have to take medicine for a certain number of days, and they chop the pills up to extend the timetable. All Members can cite those stories.

What a tragedy it would be if we had a huge ceremony and a huge fanfare, and the President stood up and said we had passed a prescription drug benefit bill, and then within 6 or 7 years from now, our seniors living in rural America saw what they expected to be a Cadillac turned out to be a much smaller, less efficient and less effective vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion not because I think the folks on the other side of the aisle have a different set of values, but because I think they misunderstand the market that we have and the choices that will be left to our seniors.

I want to address one other point several of my colleagues make. There has been a lot of talk that we are fixing the rural problem because we are addressing the disparities in the reimbursement formulas; and I compliment the other side of the aisle for recognizing that the reimbursement formulas in Medicare have disadvantaged our rural areas, but I will make a very basic point here. If the Republican leadership of this body were serious about fixing the reimbursement formula, it could do it tomorrow. Just as we came to the floor in record time last week to speak to the court that ruled on the Do-Not-Call Registry, we could come to this floor in record time to pass a stand-alone bill that fixes the unfair reimbursement formulas.

Right now, the reimbursement formula fix is being held hostage to the completion of this bill. It is nothing more than a bargaining chip at this point to try to bring conservative Democrats and moderate Republicans to the table, and we ought to expose that for what it is. If the leadership were serious about fixing this problem, it should be done tomorrow as a stand-alone piece of legislation. Let us address the hard and serious problem of getting a prescription drug benefit, but let us address, in a separate context, the very real problem of disparities in this formula that burden so many of our areas.

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

Just to respond very briefly to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS), this is my 21st year in the House. Virtually all of that time, I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Health, and the question of reimbursements to rural providers has always been there. If it were simple to correct, it could have been corrected. It could have been corrected when the other party was in charge. It could have been corrected when this party has been in charge, which is a lot less years than when the other party was in charge. It is very difficult, but it is being addressed. The conferees are spending a lot of time on that particular issue, and, hopefully, they will reach agreement.

Again, I would say to my colleagues, I have talked to members of the AARP who have come into my office back home. Yes, we have all received a seven-page letter to the effect of what they want in that bill, but they say we want a bill which will help some people now, and, hopefully, provide a foundation we can improve upon as we go on.

If all of us are just going to stand fast and say this is not in the bill or that is not in the bill, or this is in the bill and I do not like it and we want perfection, we are not going to have a bill. As I said before, at least the rural providers are receiving some benefit, some help out of this bill. That $25 billion is certainly not chicken feed.

It is significant that we have a piece of legislation that is going to be of some help to the rural providers. It may not be enough, it may not be as much as the gentleman would like, and I do not blame him. This is a representative system of government, and they are representing their people, and they are doing a good job of it insofar as wanting to help their rural communities. But again, we have to have a bill, and it is critical that we all try to work together as much as we can.

All of the conferees are not always meeting together in every conference that we have. That is unfortunate, but there are some Members who have indicated that they are against anything at all involving this type of legislation; and, consequently, I suppose those are the reasons. I do not make those decisions, but it is unfortunate. But a lot of work is being done every day at 3 p.m., Monday through Friday, on a bipartisan basis.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this subject to the floor.

I think we all, as Americans, understand this prescription drug issue very well, and I think we understand the importance of Medicare to this Nation. I like to tell my constituents back home that since the advent of Medicare 40 years ago, there has been a significant decline in the level of folks below the level of poverty. Prior to the advent of Medicare, if you reached the age of 65 in this country, there was a greater than 50 percent chance that you would be below the poverty level. Today that figure is less than 10 percent. There is a dramatic drop in poverty in this country, and we think much of that can be credited to the successful Medicare and Social Security programs we have had in place.

I think everybody knows that we need a prescription drug component because of the changes in health care and technology in the last 30 to 40 years. We have to reform the Medicare program. We all understand that. It is absolutely going to break this country as we move into the retirement of the

baby boomers if we do not do something. This Congress, both sides of the aisle, have laid aside $400 billion to deal with this issue. I want to commend the leaders of this House, including the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for his attempts to reform Medicare and bring those issues to the floor of the House and try to get a bill that we can get the President to sign.

The thing that I want to encourage, though, is that we have got to keep the provisions of the current Medicare system that work. One of the key components of the current Medicare system is that it is a defined benefit. When you reach eligibility age, everybody qualifies for it. I do not care what the situation is, if you live rural America, urban America, you qualify because it is a defined benefit, and everybody receives that. We have some Medicare+Choice-type programs within Medicare now that try to set up HMOs or insurance incentive programs to deliver prescription drugs to folks, and they do not work. They do not work in rural areas. My constituents do not get them because the insurance companies cannot make enough money on them, so they go to the larger communities, the urban communities, the big cities, where they can make money.

Mr. Speaker, I just would encourage us to keep those provisions that work, and one of them is the defined benefit, the fall-back provision which the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) is stressing here.

The House bill fails to meet the needs of one-fourth of the Medicare beneficiaries of this country that live in rural areas. The Senate bill addresses this problem by establishing a guaranteed fall-back provision. Again, we need reform, but I would encourage the leadership and the conference committee to include the fall-back provision.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this has been a good but all-too-short discussion which has highlighted some of the principal differences between the majority and the minority on the issue of Medicare.

I would like to respond to some of the points made by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS). I agree with my colleagues on the minority side that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) does care about Medicare. In fact, he reminds me of a country doctor, nice, calm, reassuring presence. And if I was the majority party, I would want a nice, calm person to stand up and talk about Medicare, and I have no doubt about his sincerity.

But I will say that in terms of the positions which have been taken by his party, the positions that have been advocated by this administration and the positions that are now pending in Congress, actions speak louder than words. Perception is not reality. We would not be standing here bringing this fourth motion, and we bring this fourth motion because we care about rural America. We care about health care in rural America, and we believe that it is at risk, serious risk right now.

□ 1330

We want people to know that so that in the 16 days remaining before the largest health care reform initiative in decades, if you want to call it reform, comes up to us for a final yes or no vote, the people of this country can weigh in. That is why we keep on bringing this motion and we will keep on bringing this motion.

I want to highlight some of the things that were said here today. First of all, much has been said about affordability. Affordability is a matter of priorities. Affordability is a matter of where you put your money. You ask any rural hospital, rural clinic, any senior living in rural America where they think that the resources of this country should be devoted and they will tell you health care, and they will be right.

So this is a box that the majority has put itself in. It has decided that there are these limits and that is all that we are going to give to this problem and then we are going to live within these limits.

When we on this side say, those limits are not accurate, those limits are not good, they say, well, you are trying to get out of the box. You bet we are trying to get out of that box. That box does not work for America.

Reforming Medicare is one thing. We all agree that Medicare needs reforming. We all agree that Medicare needs fixing, but reforming it should not be destroying it, and that is what is at risk here.

There are good ingredients in both the House and the Senate versions. All we are asking in this motion is to take the best of both the House and the Senate provisions, homogenize them, do not duplicate them. We are not asking for things to be duplicated and run up; we are saying take the best. Guarantee a prescription drug coverage where the private sector is not going to provide it if, in fact, the effort to privatize Medicare is successful. Make sure that our rural areas have basic hospitals.

We do not want a country where everybody has to take a train, plane, boat or other means of transportation to get to some big city that has some big hospital. That is not the answer to health care in this country. That is what we care about.

I would close by saying again that this motion, this issue, is not just about Medicare. It is not just about health care. It is not just about seniors. It is about rural America. And when it is about rural America, it is about the America that we live in and that we want to preserve.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion. It is a simple motion. Just take the best. Do what is necessary for rural America. Put rural America first.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). All time has expired.

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 Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

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

Mr. CASE. 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 Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous

consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, periodically when I go back to my district, one of the questions I get most frequently asked is, why do we keep turning on our C–SPAN television in the afternoon and hearing this debate on the child tax credit? Why do we keep seeing these motions brought to the floor?

I suppose the best answer that I can give, Mr. Speaker, the best answer I can give my colleagues is a very simple one. The reason that this side of the aisle continues to press this issue, the reason that this side of the aisle continues to implore our colleagues to act is because more than any other issue, any other debate we have encountered this year, this question speaks to the fundamental difference between our parties.

We continue to make these points because it speaks for, frankly, why we stand on the Democratic side as opposed to the Republican side. And while we may do this every few days, it is always helpful to look at the history of how we got here.

Late in the evening of the night that the Republican-inspired tax cut passed this body, there was a relentless effort to get inside the $350 billion number, and for all of the efforts of all of the geniuses that we have on the other side and all of the efforts that were expended on getting inside this limit, there were $3.5 billion outside of $350 billion.

One would wonder, if you had to save $3.5 billion at the last minute of a long debate, where would you turn? You might turn to the various corporations who are using offshore accounts in the Bahamas. You might turn to people who are earning over a million dollars a year and getting a tax cut. You might turn to some of the obvious examples of waste and fraud that could have been found. But rather than turn to any of those places, the Republican leadership decided to literally reach into the pockets of families earning between $10,000 and $26,000 a year, the very weakest people in our society.

We have learned just in the last few weeks that the number of children living in poverty has grown by 1 million in the last year. We have learned in just the last few weeks that after a decade of people moving from poverty to the middle class, that the trend is now in the other direction. Every single month, different numbers of families fall below the statistical line that separates deprivation in this country from some measure of success.

For all of the differences and all of the debates that we have on this floor, I can confidently say that my party would never reach into the pockets of the most vulnerable families in this country to satisfy a $350 billion tax cut number. We need to, and frankly it is nothing less than shameful, Mr. Speaker, that in the last months we have not managed to, find a way to make this simple, corrective step.

We have heard some on the other side of the aisle say, well, why give a tax credit to families earning between $10- and $26,000 a year or why expand the tax credit for them? A lot of them do not pay taxes, we have heard. Or a lot of them do not pay a lot of taxes. The reality is, of course, these individuals do pay State income taxes and in many of our States in this time of tough budget woes, those individual State tax burdens are rising.

We also know, frankly, that there has never been any controversy around the child tax credit applying to low-wage-earning families. There has never been any controversy over whether the original $600 credit applied. The controversy over this credit arose only when the majority needed to save $3.5 billion.

It is interesting that the President wants to fix this. It is striking that the U.S. Senate has voted almost unanimously to fix it, but for some reason, the Republican leadership in the House continues to be unmoved on this question. To put the cynicism in some context, H.R. 1308, the bill that was brought to this floor that purports to fix the gap in the child tax credit does not even allow the tax credit to kick in for these families until sometime next year.

There is another basic point, Mr. Speaker. We are experiencing a stagnant, slow, jobless recovery. We are experiencing a recovery where companies are saving costs by cutting back on health insurance and laying off workers. It is a very stale recovery for a lot of our people.

So the President talks about stimulus. The President talks about providing a jolt to this economy. What better way to put some life in this economy, what better way to put some energy and some spending power into this economy than by giving this credit to families who are struggling by the margins every single day to survive, the families earning between $10- and $26,000? If stimulus is the rationale for this tax cut, there is no reason that this credit should not be extended to these families.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly look forward to this debate today. I certainly invite my colleagues to finally do the right and simple thing, to spend $3.5 billion to fix a problem of fundamental fairness.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Members of the body are very familiar with the issues at stake in this motion to instruct conferees, for I believe this is the 13th time now that this body has debated the motion.

Let me say at the outset, Members on both sides of the aisle want to provide for immediate increased refundability of the child credit. That is exactly what the bill that passed the House would provide to many low-income families. But let me remind my colleagues of the families who would be disadvantaged by this motion to instruct conferees and this goes really to the heart of this debate, Mr. Speaker.

Under the motion brought by my friend from Alabama, the same low-income families who would benefit from the increased refundability of the child credit would see their credit actually drop in the year 2005, after the elections. By contrast, the House-passed bill would ensure that the child credit remains at $1,000 per child through the year 2010. Will low-income families need this crucial tax relief any less in the year 2005? Of course not.

Under the motion brought by my friend from Alabama, the marriage penalty in the child credit would be eliminated only in the year 2010. By contrast, the House-passed bill immediately eliminates the marriage penalty, which is unfair and unconscionable and discriminates against people who are married, taxpayers who are married, and denies millions of children the full benefit of the child credit simply because their parents are married. Why should a married couple anywhere, let us say a teacher and a firefighter, be denied this crucial tax relief for their children?

Under the motion also brought by my friend from Alabama, families would actually receive less tax relief, those families in the military. Let me repeat that. Military families would actually receive less tax relief under the motion brought by my friend from Alabama.

Under the House-passed bill, the child credit is not denied to military families. Military families, including those serving so bravely abroad, are already receiving a refundable child credit and will continue to receive this credit under the House-passed bill. This motion to instruct would only increase the refundable child credit for some military families by allowing them to take into account tax-free income when they compute their refundable credit. At the same time, the motion to instruct would deny over $800 million in tax relief to military families. That is a lot of money and that is real money to those troops serving us so bravely and so well.

The House bill contains the military tax relief that has passed this body a number of times. By contrast, the bill passed by the other body, which this motion to instruct would have us adopt, does not contain this essential

tax relief for the brave men and women defending our country.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind my colleagues of the military tax relief that is missing, that is absent from the other body's bill. Our House-passed tax relief bill ensures that members of the Armed Forces and Foreign Service are not denied the very important capital gains exclusion on home sales if they cannot meet the 5-year residency test because they are transferred away from home on official extended duty, which happens obviously frequently to members of both the Armed Forces and the Foreign Service.

Our bill ensures that the full $6,000 death gratuity payment received by survivors of military personnel is tax-free. Only half of the payment is tax-free under current law.

Our bill furthermore ensures that payments received by members of the Armed Forces under the home owners assistance program are tax-free. These payments compensate our men and women of the military for a drop in home values resulting from military base closures or realignments.

Moreover, our bill extends the combat zone filing rules to individuals serving in contingency operations so they are given more time to file tax returns and meet other deadlines. As I have heard from many military families who have loved ones in combat zones currently, this provision is also very important.

Further, Mr. Speaker, our bill modifies the definition of a qualified veterans organization to make it easier for veterans organizations to retain their tax-exempt status. This is very important, as members of the American Legion and VFW and the other veterans organizations have told me repeatedly.

Also, Mr. Speaker, our bill clarifies that dependent care assistance provided under a military dependent care assistance program is tax-free.

□ 1345

Further, the House-passed bill ensures that families are not hit with that dreaded 10 percent penalty for withdrawals from their Qualified Tuition Plans from Section 529 Plans or the Coverdell Education Savings Account if their children are appointed to military academies. This practice is simply wrong, and we correct that. This is the same treatment given to families whose children receive scholarships.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our House-passed bill provides an above-the-line deduction for up to $1,500, $1,500 of training expenses incurred by members of the National Guard and Reserve who serve more than 100 miles away. I am proud to say, Mr. Speaker, that this provision is based on legislation I sponsored with the help of many others on both sides of the aisle.

So let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying this, and this really is the bottom line: The House-passed bill provides more tax relief to more families. The House-passed bill provides more tax relief to more members of our military. I urge my colleagues to defeat this motion.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly agree with my friend from Minnesota that we need to correct the disparity of military families being left out of this relief. We need to correct all the omissions regarding military families, and for that reason this motion to instruct would provide coverage for families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones as an essential and critical of part this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) whose district includes so many families who would be deeply affected by this motion to instruct and who has been such a consistent advocate for children living in poverty in this country.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, for 109 days now, we have demanded fairness for the 6.5 million families that were denied their equitable share of the child tax credit provisions in the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act. These families, headed by workers who pay taxes from their paychecks and on their purchases as well as paying property taxes and excise taxes, represent 12 million children. Those families include rural families. The 12 million children are more than half of the sons and daughters of rural farmers and farm workers. They are one out of every four children of nurses and nurses' aids. They are more than half of the children of janitors, maids, and cooks. The children left out are one in ten children of teachers and teachers' aids. More than 120,000 of these children are the dependents of active military personnel.

Just as we must not leave children behind in the classroom, we cannot ignore working families and their children when the Treasury Department mails out checks. We have said it again and again and again: Tax relief for families should be fair and equitable. We must come together and provide a refundable credit to demonstrate our commitments to all working families.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Davis motion to instruct, and I urge everyone else to vote in favor of this motion.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP). The gentleman from Georgia has distinguished himself in this institution not just as a voice for fiscal prudence and fiscal sanity as a conservative Democrat, but he has also distinguished himself as a distinguished advocate for the families who are left behind in this country. His district, like mine, includes large numbers of rural families and large pockets of children living in poverty.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker I rise today in support of the gentleman from Alabama's (Mr. DAVIS) motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1308, the child tax credit, and I thank the gentleman for this very important motion because tax relief and tax fairness are the very core of what we in Congress should be doing to improve the lives of Americans in each and every community across this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to recognize the bipartisan work of the United States Senate which has already voted 94 to two to provide Americans with real and meaningful tax relief in the form of a child tax credit. The Senate knew that this was the right thing to do, and they made no bones about coming together for hard-working American families. In fact, the President of the United States, through his press secretary, said that we ought to pass this legislation, legislation that has been held hostage in this House by the Republican leadership for 111 days. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and it ought not to happen in America because tax relief for American families, a real child tax credit, is not a Democrat issue, not a Republican issue. It is a children issue.

The relief it provides is targeted to parents who need it the most, those earning between 10,000 and $26,000 a year, about 6.5 million families and 12 million children. They await relief while the Republican leadership in the House stalls on this bill.

The House version of the child tax credit also shortchanges our servicemen and women and particularly those who are putting their lives on the line in Iraq. The House Republican leadership insisted that the calculation of the allowable child tax credit be based on taxable income, that is, wages in excess of personal exemptions and deduction, rather than on total earned income. This accounting gimmick adversely affects our military personnel who are in combat because, while in combat, their pay is not treated as taxable income. For example, a stateside grade E–6 serviceman or woman earning $29,000 a year, supporting a spouse and two children, would enjoy the full $1,000 child tax credit for each of their two children. But if that servicemember is deployed in Iraq for as much as 8 months, he or she could lose the entire child tax credit. That is because two-thirds of his or her income would not be taxable and the remaining one-third would fall below the $10,500 threshold at which the refundable portion of the child tax credit begins to be calculated. In fact, some 260,000 children, one in five children of the military, in 200,000 active duty military families would be left out of this unfair House version while the

Senate version avoids this problem entirely.

Last month the census released new figures showing that the number of families and children living between below the poverty line rose by 1.3 million last year, 1.3 million more families than there were last year. Times are really tough. They need help, Mr. Speaker, and they need it now. I would like to say that help is on the way, but the truth be told, Mr. Speaker, help is going away. Our fiscal priorities are not in touch with real needs.

A recent House Committee on the Budget staff analysis reveals that the true cost of the war in Iraq and the postwar reconstruction effort will be more than $178 billion and could exceed $400 billion during the period 2003 to 2013. That is pretty big money. Who pays that bill? Hard-working Americans and their families, including the servicemen and women who have been disproportionately disadvantaged by the unfair tax policy in America today.

In May of this year, this House passed a tax cut, despite the mounting deficit and the cost of the war in Afghanistan and Iraq. I am a big supporter of tax relief, but the last round of tax cuts excluded the full benefit for most working Americans and was fiscally irresponsible.

We have before us today an opportunity to level that playing field for most American families. I hope that we will. I urge my colleagues to stand with us for tax fairness and to vote for the gentleman from Alabama's (Mr. DAVIS) motion to instruct conferees on this very important bill.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind the body that the motion to instruct brought by my friend from Alabama would deny over $800 million in tax relief to members of the military and their families.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think we may just simply have a factual disagreement between my friend from Minnesota and myself. The motion to instruct would include those families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) who has so often come to the well of this House to speak on behalf of our party and to speak on behalf of families in need in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Alabama for yielding me this time.

I want to point out I have been on this floor so many times making the same point which is that my Republican colleagues, including the gentleman from Minnesota, keep talking about the House bill, the House-passed Republican bill, and how that is so much more generous and is going to provide much more tax relief than the bill that passed the other body. But the bottom line is we know that this House bill will never become law. And the whole purpose of this exercise was to make sure that these kids and their families making between the 10- and 20-something thousand dollars a year annual income would be able to get the same kind of child tax credit or relief as the other families of higher incomes. And so the other body passed a bill that would simply do that and nothing more. It cost, I think, about $3.5 billion, and it was paid for by some kind of increased customs duty, fully paid for. It does not increase the debt.

What the Republicans in the House do, they come in and say that is not good enough. We have got to pass a much larger bill. I think it is $80 billion, but there is no money to pay for that. So when our Republican colleagues in this House keep saying they want this larger bill that is going to do all these wonderful things and provide all this additional tax relief, that is just another way of saying we do not want anything because they have not had the conference even meet. The two bodies have not gotten together. The chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means has made it quite clear that he is really not interested in having any kind of compromise or effort to reach out to the other body on this issue.

So we have a stalemate because the House Republicans refuse to have a conference, refuse to meet, and refuse to simply go along with the bill passed by the other body. So I mean this is becoming increasingly a joke.

The bottom line is the House Republicans have no intention of ever passing anything that is going to pass both houses and go to the President's desk. And unless that happens, it is just a cruel hoax on these families that they are ever going to get any kind of relief. I am not interested in hearing what is going to happen in 2 years or what is going to happen with the people that are not directly impacted by this. We have already had several tax cut bills that have provided money back to taxpayers, mostly at the high end. We just simply want to address this problem for these people in this income bracket who are working, who are paying taxes, and who need some relief. And it is a question of fairness; they should get the same $400 that everybody else gets.

I have mentioned many times, July came around, I got a $1,200 check. A Member of Congress, I guess we make about $150,000 a year. I have three children, so I got $1,200. But the other person on my block who is at the lower-income scale, still working as hard I am, they did not get the money, and it is not fair. As far as the military is concerned, they can just take up the bill that is at the desk here and provide the relief to the military families. But do not talk to us about this House bill that is more generous, is going to provide more money, provide more tax relief. That is ''pie in the sky.'' We have a $500 billion deficit. That is never going to happen.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I would just remind my friend from New Jersey that this is not a joke to many low-income families. Under the motion brought here today, the same low-income families who would benefit from the increased refundability of the child credit would see their credit actually drop in 2005, coincidentally, right after the elections. By contrast the House-passed bill would ensure that the child credit stays at $1,000 per child through the year 2010. I challenge anyone to say that low-income families would need this crucial tax relief any less after 2005. This is not a joke. This is serious business.

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

□ 1400

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we do have these debates every few days; and nothing new, frankly, has been said over the course of the last 4 months. That is depressing, in some sense; but I think, again, it speaks to the very fundamental difference between our parties.

No one has yet to come to the well of this House, and today only one speaker even bothered to come down to debate this issue from the other side; no one has yet to come to the well of this House from the Republican side of the aisle to explain why we leave behind families earning between $10,000 and $26,000 when it would not cost us more than $3.5 billion. No one has explained why we leave out of a stimulus package the families who are most in need of having their economic fortune stimulated.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is exactly right. The very leadership that brought this bill to the floor, and actually, to be perfectly correct about it, it is not a bill. The Republican leadership, rather than actually bringing a bill to the floor, brought a rule to the floor and invoked a rare procedural maneuver to take this measure directly to conference, rather than to bring it forward as a bill. Putting that aside, the very leadership that brought this rule to the floor announced a day beforehand that the child tax credit was dead. That had no intent, they have no intent, and they will have no intent to ever create this expanded relief for the families in our country who are working so hard.

I close on this note, Mr. Speaker. We wonder sometimes why so few low-income people participate in the voting process in this country. We wonder sometimes why so many low-income families feel left out and feel locked out. We wonder why they feel disengaged. When we have our town hall meetings, they do not even bother to come. We have an answer to that question with the way this issue has been

handled: because these individuals who are locked out of so many things in life turn on their television and they hear that tax relief is being passed for millionaires, they hear that tax relief is being passed for the owners of large corporations, and they hear that wider and broader and additional tax relief is contemplated. Yet they hear that they are not worthy of additional relief at all. They are told, as some of my colleagues on the other side have said, that they are welfare cases who really do not contribute to the system and really do not pay taxes anyway, so why get any kind of benefit.

We ought to recognize as elected officials, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot leave people out of the system and expect them to continue to have faith in the system. That may be a small cost to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, because a lot of these folks are not a big part of their voter base, but they are part of the America that we have. This party that I speak for today will always be proud to speak for these families, because the kids in this country who live in families earning at the edge of the poverty line and slightly above it, they cannot come to this city and have fly-in week. They cannot hold $50,000 fund-raisers. They cannot hold thousand-dollar-a-head events. Somebody has to speak for them. Somebody has to take the time to come to this floor to speak for their needs and advocate for their cause. The ones of us who do that represent the Democratic Party in America, and those of us on this side of the aisle will always be proud to be part of the party that speaks for those who have been left behind, who lack any other voice.

So with that said, I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion to instruct and to finally fix this fundamental unfairness in what was purported to be a tax fairness bill earlier this year.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. 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, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1535

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to instruct conferees previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to instruct on H.R. 2691, de novo;

Motion to instruct on H.R. 1, by the yeas and nays;

and motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2691, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the de novo vote on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2691.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 259, nays 165, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

YEAS—259

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—165

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Ehlers
English
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goss
Granger
Graves
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayes
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
McCrery
McHugh
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Taylor (NC)

NOT VOTING—9

Brady (TX)
Dreier
Eshoo
Evans
Gephardt
Hyde
Issa
Slaughter
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1601

Messrs. BOOZMAN, PORTMAN, TAUZIN, and PETRI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. REHBERG, OSE, HERGER, HEFLEY, FLETCHER, GALLEGLY, LEWIS of Kentucky, NEY, BASS, FRELINGHUYSEN, FERGUSON, LoBIONDO, MANZULLO, LaHOOD, BOEHLERT, McKEON, FORBES, QUINN, SAXTON, and SWEENEY, and Mrs. EMERSON and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1602

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of the series of votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct conferees offered by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 215, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]

YEAS—208

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—215

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Isakson
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Brady (TX)
Dreier
Eshoo
Evans
Gephardt
Hensarling
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Kirk
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1610

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 1308 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will designate the motion.

The Clerk designated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 207, nays 219, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—207

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—219

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Brady (TX)
Dreier
Eshoo
Evans
Gephardt
Hyde
Issa
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1617

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2691, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, KOLBE, NETHERCUTT, WAMP, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, SHERWOOD, CRENSHAW, YOUNG of Florida, DICKS, MURTHA, MORAN of Virginia, HINCHEY, OLVER and OBEY.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGED REPORT REQUESTING PRESIDENT TO TRANSMIT REPORT ENTITLED ''OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM STRATEGIC LESSONS LEARNED'' AND DOCUMENTS IN HIS POSSESSION ON THE RECONSTRUCTION AND SECURITY OF POSTWAR IRAQ

Mr. BEREUTER, from the Committee on International Relations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–289, Part 1) on the resolution (H. Res. 364) requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution the report prepared for the Joint Chiefs of Staff entitled ''Operation Iraqi Freedom Strategic Lessons Learned'' and documents in his possession on the reconstruction and security of postwar Iraq, which was ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The report will be received as Part 1.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, during the week of September 22, I missed several votes due to the passing of my father.

Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: On votes number 509, 510, 511, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 519, 520, 521, 522 and 523, I would have voted aye. On vote number 518 I would have voted no.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the understanding of the House and thank each Member and each of my colleagues for their kind words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has our condolences.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. FLAKE of Arizona 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. 1 be instructed within the scope of conference to include income thresholds on coverage.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 6, the energy bill.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. INSLEE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of two Houses on the

Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 6 be instructed to confine themselves to the matters committed to conference in accordance with clause 9 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives with regard to ''high-level radioactive waste'' as defined in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 and other provisions of Federal law.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1078

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1078.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1, the prescription drug bill.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of New York 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. 1 be instructed to reject division B of the House bill.

SUPPORT THE SUPPLEMENTAL

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the President has issued a supplemental appropriation request for $87 billion to go towards our continuing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Wall Street Journal recently tallied the cost to our country and the economy from the 9–11 attacks. Another similar attack will surely happen if terrorists are left to their own devices.

The terrorist attacks 2 years ago cost this country a lot of money. Here is just a sample: $78 billion lost in income for families of the victims, $21 billion to New York City for direct damage costs, $4 billion for the Victims Fund, $18 billion to clean up Ground Zero, $6.4 billion in reduced or lost wages for workers in New York City industries, $11 billion in lost business to the airline industry, and $15 billion Federal bailout of the airline industry.

Mr. Speaker, these are just a sample. The total cost, if we add all the ones that were included in the article, is $355 billion to the American people. Now we are debating this question. This would cost Americans a lot more money if we do not pass this supplemental.

Mr. Speaker, the President has issued a supplemental appropriations request for $87 billion to go towards our continuing efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Wall Street Journal recently tallied the costs to our country and economy from the 9/11 attacks. Another similar attack will surely happen if terrorists are left to their own devices. The terrorist attacks 2 years ago cost much. Here is just a sample: $78 billion in lost income for families of the victims; $21 billion to New York City for direct damage costs; $4 billion for the Victims' Fund; $18 billion to clean up Ground Zero; $700 million to repair the Pentagon; $6.4 billion in reduced or lost wages for workers in NYC industries; $150 billion in reduced GDP; $50 billion in costs to the insurance industry; $11 billion in lost business to the airline industry; $15 billion Federal bailout of the airline industry; $38 billion in costs for new border security, protection against biological threats, and emergency preparedness; $1.3 billion in costs to State governments for homeland security; and $33 billion in spending by the private sector for new protective services.

Total cost of these and others is over $355 billion to the American people. Now we are debating spending $87 billion to prevent terrorists from taking over a weak nation? If we left Iraq in the condition as it was before, or is now after, the end of the Saddam regime, we would be guilty of allowing terrorists and their power and pocketbooks to fester. This would cost Americans a lot more money, not to mention lives.

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.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to replace the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and proceed at this time.

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

There was no objection.

GOLD-PLATING AND WAR PROFITEERING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, the President has asked the United States Congress to borrow another $87 billion to finance ongoing action in Iraq, and of that, the President is asking the United States Congress to borrow on behalf of the American people $20.3 billion to engage in an extensive reconstruction of Iraq. There has already been discussion on the floor of the no-bid contracts and the favoritism and extortion prices to Halliburton and other companies, war profiteering, but now there is also, now that we have seen the list, questions about the priorities in a couple of ways.

There are questions about what they are going to spend the money on. On the list is Wifi. A lot of people do not even know what Wifi is. Iraq is a country where I do not think the average Iraqi or even the elite Iraqis own laptop computers. We are going to give emergency spending money, which the American people are going to borrow, to give them Wifi capability in Iraq, when the people in the rural parts of my district do not even have broadband. They have hardly decent telephone service, but we are going to do Wifi in Iraq.

We are going to give them Zip codes in Iraq, an American invention. We are going to give them a national 911. Is that not nice? The American people are going to borrow money to install 911 in Iraq. Why would we do that? Why is that necessary? They did not have 911 before the war. We did not destroy it with bombing. Why they are going to have it now?

Then there is the executive training. We are going to provide $10,000 for a 4-week course for Iraqi executives that exceeds the cost of sending them to Harvard University for the same period of time, let alone a community college in my district that could do a fine job for a quarter the price, but no, it is not just that. It is the fact that this is gold-plated and out of control.

Here are a couple of examples. Major General David Petraeus, in charge of North Iraq, told a congressional delegation, his engineers said and we priced rebuilding a cement plant for $15 million. Well, the Iraqis were in kind of a hurry. So they decided to do it on their own and not wait for the $15 million and the U.S. contract. They did it for $80,000, a tiny fraction of the price. So at least the American taxpayers did not get gouged for that and did not have to borrow $15 million to do an $80,000 job on a cement plant. Maybe that was isolated. Well, unfortunately, no.

We also have another instance, $25 million to refurbish 20 police stations in Basra and a member of Iraq's governing council kind of laughed at that and said, we could do it for five and still make a bunch of money.

So the American people are going to be asked to borrow $25 million for a gold-plated contract to do something that would cost something less than five. The American people are being asked to borrow money to build houses in Iraq at a price that is 10 times the value of the average Iraqi house. Maybe it would be better if we give them a little of the wherewithal, some materials and nails and cement, and let them go at it themselves. They have 60 percent unemployment. I think they would be happy to build their own houses.

But that is not the way the Bush administration wants to do this. They want to gold-plate it. They want to make the American people borrow $20 billion and pay for it the next 30 years, the gold-plate and war profiteer, for the reconstruction of Iraq.

Then, finally, there is Ahmed al-Barak, a member of the Ruling Council, very prominent, who became unpopular with this administration, although previously had been very favored by them, when he said the savings could be a factor of 10 if the Iraqis did their own work. Basically, where they spend $1 billion, we would spend a hundred million.

So I offer the 10 percent solution to this administration. Two point three billion dollars is still a lot of money where I come from, but it is a lot better than $20.3 billion, and the Iraqis could do it for that price. We could do the reconstruction, whatever we are really obligated to because of the destruction of the war, but we do not need to give them exotic things they never had before.

I have heard we have to rebuild the electrical infrastructure. We have kind of got a failing one here, and the reason was they have got boilers from the 1950s and 1960s. Guess what? Our war did not install boilers from the 1950s and 1960s, so why is it the American people have to borrow the money to give them brand new boilers or new high-efficiency turbines to generate electricity when we could use that money here at home to put Americans to work? If we spent $20.3 billion on real infrastructure projects that are underfunded by this administration in the United States of America, we could put one million Americans to work.

So, no, to the gold-plating, maybe a 10 percent solution if that is justified, but we should not be borrowing in the name of the American people $20.3 billion and indebting generations of Americans to pay for the gold-plated war profiteering in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the gentleman from Michigan's (Mr. SMITH) time.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1630

PARTISAN STRIFE WEAKENS NATIONAL RESOLVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Madam Speaker, I am relatively new to Congress. When I first came here 2½ years ago, I was surprised and somewhat disappointed by the partisanship that I encountered. I was from a competitive arena, and yet I had really never encountered anything like it. And then 9–11 came, and for 2 or 3 months I saw Congress function as it could. What we saw was unity of purpose. Welfare of the country was the primary priority. Partisanship, personal ambition was set aside.

Now here we are 2 years later and it seems as though we are drifting toward and have drifted toward business as usual. We are told that this is an election year that is coming up. Partisanship is escalating and some people say, well, we really cannot get much done next year because this is going to be an election year. Yet I would submit that the threat to our Nation is just as great as before 9–11 at this time. The battle lines are more clearly drawn. The stakes are higher. And still the internal dissension intensifies.

To me, this is a little bit mystifying. The great majority of people I have gotten to know, both sides of the aisle here in Congress, are genuinely good people. Yet that is really not the image that we project. Most people in my district are totally turned off by the discord they see. They do not seem to understand it; and they dismiss it as, well, that is just politics.

Certainly not all Democrats are tax-and-spend liberals with no moral compass. Certainly all Republicans are not heartless pawns of big business. And yet many times that is the way we portray each other. Certainly the President of the United States has not started a war to boost his approval ratings. Those types of comments are alarming, and they are very disturbing.

Unfounded congressional comments impugning motives and denigrating character only give substance to the belief we have no national resolve or unity. Where there is unity of purpose, the whole exceeds the sum of its parts. And I saw that consistently in athletics. If people were committed to a common goal, they pulled together and the dissenting factors tended to fall away. But where there is a lack of unity, the whole is less than the sum of its parts. Sometimes I feel that that is what characterizes this body as we get fragmented, as we throw rocks at each other.

It is critical at this time in our Nation's history that both parties pull together, that civility is exercised. As far as I am concerned, we are at war. It is a different type of war. At a time of war we cannot afford partisan strife that weakens national resolve.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIMEROSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, as we approach the flu season, many of my colleagues will visit the doctor's office here on Capital Hill and receive a flu shot. And before they go, I think all my colleagues ought to know that that flu shot contains mercury, which is a substance that is toxic to the human brain. That is not to say you should not get your flu shot if you want to, but there is a lot of neurological disorders that have been caused by mercury, and I think everyone should know there is mercury in that vaccine.

That is not the only vaccine that contains thimerosal. From anthrax to hepatitis, from lyme disease to DTaP, which is given to infants to protect against diptheria, tetanus and whooping cough, numerous vaccines exist that contain mercury, a harmful preservative. And parents around this country, I am sure, would be very upset if they knew that.

Scientific evidence continues to accumulate regarding the biologically-plausible connection between mercury and thimerosal, autism, and other neurological developmental disorders. Yet several well-known and firmly established pharmaceutical companies continue to put mercury into vaccines as a preservative, and it has never been tested. That is very interesting. Although the U.S. Food and Drug Administration asked vaccine manufacturers to begin removing the mercury-latent thimerosal from vaccines in 1999, they did not order them to do it. So the pharmaceutical companies continue to put that in our vaccines.

During my tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, a myriad of scientists testified at a series of hearings before the committee that mercury in vaccines is a contributing factor to developing neurological disorders, including Alzheimer's disease and autism in children. Fifteen years ago, one out of every 10,000 children were autistic. Now it is one out of 150. And many scientists believe that is because of the mercury in vaccines.

In May of this year, the California Department of Developmental Services released a report entitled ''Autistic Spectrum Disorders, Changes in the California Caseload: 1999 to 2002.'' And the findings are very alarming. California's autistic population has nearly doubled in 4 years, from 10,360 cases in 1998 to over 20,000 cases in 2002.

This growth rate represents a 97 percent increase in just 4 years and a nearly 100 percent increase in California's case law since 1999. And they are not alone. The rate of growth in the population of persons with autism across this country is really horrible, and it is very bad in States such as Georgia, Minnesota, and Massachusetts. We have an absolute epidemic on

our hands. And if this trend is allowed to continue at a constant rate, we could have as many as 4 million autistic children in America in the next 10 years.

Despite a growing body of science linking autism to mercury and thimerosal, and the protests of hundreds of thousands of concerned parents across the country, the pharmaceutical industry continues to put mercury into vaccines for both children and adults even though they know mercury is toxic to the human brain. Pharmaceutical companies are concerned that they may be held liable in potential class action lawsuits for brain damage caused by the mercury-based preservative, which is still found in childhood vaccines diptheria, hepatitis B and the flu shots. Because of these liability concerns, language was inserted at the last minute under the cover of darkness in the homeland security bill to protect the pharmaceutical industry from class action lawsuits. However, because we caught it, we were able to get it out of there because a lot of Members of the House and Senate thought it was terrible what they did.

Numerous scientists have testified there is a simple way to prevent this, and that is to go to single-shot vials. Those little glass containers. They would not have to put thimerosal or any preservative in if they did that. Moving to single-shot vials could have an enormously positive impact in helping to minimize, perhaps even eliminate, some of the cases of Alzheimer's and autism and other neurological disorders linked to mercury.

This is something that the pharmaceutical companies must address. Our Food and Drug Administration and our health agencies are asleep at the switch. They are letting children and adults be damaged day after day after day by allowing mercury to continue to be put into vaccines for adults and children.

We have a growing number of people who are becoming Alzheimer's patients, a dramatically growing number. We have one in 10,000 children 10 years ago that were autistic, now it is one in 150. And scientists before my committee say it is in large part because of the mercury in the vaccines. We have to get the FDA on the stick. They have to demand that pharmaceutical products having mercury be taken out of them very, very quickly. If not, we are going to continue to have an epidemic on our hands that America does not need and should not tolerate.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF ALTHEA GIBSON

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

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Madam Speaker, tonight I am introducing a resolution to commemorate the life of the very talented Althea Gibson. Miss Althea Gibson represents an honorable and indelible mark on the history of America and the history of African Americans.

On this day, we seek to commemorate the life and achievements of Althea Gibson, a pioneer who left an unforgettable mark on sports as she broke the color barrier in tennis in America in the 1950s and helped pave the way for future generations of black athletes.

On Sunday, September 28, Miss Gibson died at the age of 76. Though the general public had largely forgotten her name in sports, Althea Gibson will always be a giant in sports history. The eldest of five children, Miss Gibson was raised in the Harlem section of New York City. She began studying tennis privately through the support of friends while furthering her education by attending Florida A&M University where she graduated in 1953.

Althea Gibson was the first black player on the Ladies Professional Golfers Association tour. She was a self-described born athlete who broke racial barriers not only in tennis but also in the Ladies Professional Golf Association. In a capstone to her career, she toured with the Harlem Globetrotters basketball team after retiring from tennis.

Miss Gibson won the American Tennis Association's Women's Singles Tournament 10 years in a row. However, tennis tournaments outside the ATA remained closed to her until 1950. In that year, white tennis player Alice Marble wrote an article in American Lawn Tennis magazine, noting that this excellent player was not able to participate in the better-known championships for no other reason that bigotry.

So later that year, Althea Gibson entered the Forest Hills, New York, national grass court championship, the first African American player of either sex to be allowed to enter. In 1950, Gibson became the first black player to compete in the U.S. tennis championships, and she played at Wimbledon in 1951. She captured the Wimbledon and U.S. championships in 1957 and 1958, and also won the French Open, and three Wimbledon doubles titles from 1956 through 1958. Her presence helped pave the way for later stars, such as Arthur Ashe, Venus and Serena Williams, and, of course, Tiger Woods.

On this day, let us all commemorate Miss Althea Gibson's fighting spirit and championship efforts. Miss Gibson came from the depths of racism and overcame much adversity. She proved as much as anyone that desire can beat the burdens of racism.

In closing, I would like to end with a quote from Miss Gibson: ''In sports, you simply aren't considered a real champion until you have defended your title successfully. Winning it once can be a fluke; winning it twice proves you are the best.'' Today, we would like to commemorate Althea Gibson, truly one of the best.

H.R. 693, REPEALING TAX ON DEATH GRATUITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am on the floor again. I come to the floor about once a week to talk about a bill, H.R. 693, to repeal the tax on the death gratuity.

The history of this is that in 1991 the United States Congress enacted legislation that created going from $3,000 to $6,000 the death gratuity. The death gratuity is a payment to the families who have lost a loved one in uniform, whether they be training or they be in war.

A couple of years ago I heard about this tax; and I thought about how unfair, how unacceptable that any family who has given a loved one in uniform for this country should have to pay a tax on a very small amount of money known as the death gratuity of $6,000. A year ago I introduced a bill that would take care of this tax and remove it. It was put in a larger package by the House leadership, which I appreciated, and sent over to the other body; but they did not act on the legislation. So we went another year that families who lost loved ones paid a tax on their gift of that loved one to this Nation and for freedom.

Again this year, Madam Speaker, we sent a bigger bill over with this language in it that would repeal the tax, but the other body will not take it up. And I want to give some examples of this, Madam Speaker.

From September 2001 through December 2001, 292 families in America had to pay a tax on their gift, that gift being a family member in uniform. In the year 2002, 1,007 families had to pay Uncle Sam for their gift of their loved one in uniform who died fighting for freedom. Already this year it is over 300. I do not know what the total will be when we reach December 31.

Madam Speaker, let me show a photograph of a young man who is 6 years old. His name is Tyler Jordan. Tyler is holding the American flag under his arm as he is looking at his daddy's casket. Tyler's father was a gunnery sergeant named Phillip Jordan, who was killed in Iraq fighting for freedom.

□ 1645

I look at this little boy, I saw it in the newspaper and it struck me so personally, I decided to try to get a copy of this young boy's face. Tyler's mother is going to get a bill from Uncle Sam, is not giving your daddy enough without receiving a tax from Uncle Sam on a small amount of money, $6,000, the death gratuity.

I want to read an e-mail from a father who e-mailed me last week. ''Dear Representative JONES, Thank you for your support of H.R. 693. Our son, Sergeant Jacob Frazier, was killed in action on March 29, 2003, in Afghanistan. Upon being told we would be taxed on

a portion of the $6,000 benefit, I was shocked and insulted. My son was not married, but I am sure there are numerous young widows who do not need another complication in their life.

''Our country should not add to their burden with additional taxation. Let me know if there is anything I can do to help you in Illinois to get this bill passed. Speaker HASTERT is my Congressman, and I would be happy to get in touch with him.''

Madam Speaker, I am asking the House leadership to please bring to the floor H.R. 693 as a stand-alone bill and let us send it to the other body. The photographs behind me are a few of the faces of young men and one woman who have died fighting for Afghanistan in Iraq. I have written to the President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and I am calling on Republicans and Democrats. This is an issue of morality. It is the right thing to do to say to the families who have given their loved ones, you do not owe us a tax.

Madam Speaker, I thank God for the gift of our men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless them. Those who have lost loved ones I ask God to please hold in his arms and comfort those who have given their loved ones for freedom.

Let us pass this legislation before we leave in November. Let us not ask Tyler Jordan and his mother to pay a tax on the gift of his father and her husband.

God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. DAVIS of California addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHER SPEAKS OUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I was not going to speak today but I felt compelled after I heard some remarks by one of our distinguished colleagues from the other party about the spending that the United States is proposing to do in Iraq and his concerns for the deficit situation in the United States of America. And I share his concern for the deficit, but I need to clarify some facts if we are concerned about the deficit, and then we must be consistent.

Madam Speaker, that same party in this Congress, and this is my first term here, has proposed amendments to major pieces of legislation that would have increased the deficit by $890 billion. Members heard me right, almost a trillion dollars of an increase on top of the deficit that exists right now. And yet in the Committee on the Budget when the chairman proposed a 1 percent cut, just a 1 percent cut in waste, fraud and abuse, Madam Speaker, the distinguished members of the other party all, 100 percent of them, voted no. The chairman did not get one single vote to cut just 1 percent in waste, fraud and abuse in that committee.

Is it because there is no waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal Government? Is the Federal Government so efficiently run that we cannot find 1 percent in waste, fraud and abuse?

Madam Speaker, I have been mentioning lots of examples as part of the Washington Waste Watchers Group that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) and I created with a number of our colleagues, but let me mention a couple of small examples to illustrate how much waste exists.

For example, Medicaid alone paid $1.6 million to a Wisconsin transportation company for multiple round-trip billings for people that were dead or that were hospital-bound that were not moving anywhere.

There is a lot more. The Veterans Affairs inspector general has identified over 5,500 possible cases of individuals who may be defrauding the government by receiving benefits intended for veterans who have died, who are dead, who are not there, who do not exist. Totally fraudulent. Again, that is money that does not go to the real veterans that deserve it.

Over the past 5 years, 6,733 fugitives have been arrested for illegally receiving food stamps. By the way, 1,500 of those were drug offenders, 31 were murders, 45 were sex offenders and child molesters, and hundreds were wanted for assault and robbery, and yet they received benefits they are not qualified for.

And yet some will say it is not enough to cut 1 percent in waste, fraud and abuse, and we see what they request as opposed to that, and we hear time and time again, the Democrats keep saying we have to raise taxes. We have to raise taxes because there is not enough money, because the Federal Government is run so efficiently that we cannot cut 1 percent of waste, fraud and abuse.

Madam Speaker, the facts do not bear that out. The Federal Government does waste people's money. The Federal Government loses almost $20 billion a year that just evaporates, they do not know where it is. The Federal Government cannot even misspend it because it is lost. And then they still say, the Democratic side, that we have to raise the hard-working American taxpayer's taxes because there is no waste, fraud and abuse.

Madam Speaker, the American people know better. We can and we must cut waste, fraud and abuse; and clearly, the days of raising taxes on the American people have to be over, and they are.

THROWING MORE MONEY AT IRAQ IS NOT THE ANSWER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, earlier this week U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell spoke to a business forum in Detroit. His topic, the Middle East. His message, the nations of the Middle East need to transform themselves.

The Bush administration, having failed to find weapons of mass destruction, failed to find Saddam Hussein, failed to capture Osama bin Laden, failed to eradicate the Taliban, failed to implement the road map to peace between the Israelis and Palestinians, and of course failed to secure the peace in Iraq, is trying to salvage something out of its disastrous policy so they are talking about this policy of transformation.

The Bush administration is trying to get the American people to believe that throwing $87 billion more at Iraq will begin the process of transformation by building the garden spot of the Middle East and that other nations will magically follow the lead.

It will not work. Their policy is doomed to fail, throwing more money is not the answer in Iraq.

As the Detroit Free Press reported, although Secretary Powell had plenty of advice for Middle Eastern nations about how to conduct their affairs, he offered no plan for the road to peace. That is not surprising because the Bush administration has no plan for peace in the Middle East, no plan for postwar Iraq, no plan for getting the United States out of Iraq, and fundamentally, no long-term plan for energy independence for America which would give us the leverage we need to play the role of honest broker instead of dependent addict.

Secretary Powell said in Detroit that the Arab nations are plagued by poverty, alienation and despair. He said the Arab world needs to embrace free trade and democratize in order to break out of the cycle. But free trade cannot bring democracy. If that were

true, the Arab world would be a democratic paradise and have already broken the cycle of poverty, alienation and despair.

Instead, the oil oligarchies of the Middle East have already been trading for decades and decades. We trade extensively with the Bush administration's close friends in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. In fact, we have an oil trade deficit with them of over $8 billion a year. We trade extensively with the Bush family's close friends in Kuwait. We have an oil trade deficit with them of over $1 billion a year. And what about Iraq, home to the second largest set of oil reserves in the world? We had over a $3.5 billion trade deficit with them, even when sanctions were being imposed. The problem with the oil oligarchies is hardly a lack of trade.

The Detroit Free Press also ran a story ''Oil, Gas Tighten U.S. Connection to Mideast,'' and ''Alternative Fuels Dismissed at Forum.''

As reporter John Gallagher wrote, ''The U.S.-Arab Economic Forum gave a glimpse Monday at the future of American energy policy. It sure looked a lot like the past.'' And therein lies the problem. The past is filled with war and conflicts, much of it tied to the politics that come from the oil field across the Middle East. That is what the future will look like unless the United States achieves energy independence here at home.

Indeed, oppression and oil seem to go hand in hand, and it is a world that previous U.S. administrations, doing the bidding of Exxon, Chevron, Royal Dutch Shell, BP and other big oil companies have had a big hand in creating for over half a century. The United States at the dawn of this century is utterly dependent on Middle East oil. Our biggest trading partner, the Saudis, are increasingly brazen about the nature of our relationship, and their oil minister said in Detroit on Monday, ''Detroit makes a lot of cars, we produce a lot of oil; you can see the connection.'' You send us the oil, and we send them our dollars.

It is easy to see that the Saudis have George W. Bush exactly where they want him. They have DICK CHENEY exactly where they want him. They have Colin Powell exactly where they want him. And they have the American people exactly where they want us. They have us addicted to their oil and begging for our next fix. To me, that is unacceptable.

Here is what David O'Reilly, CEO of Chevron Texaco said in Detroit, ''We are in for a long period of dependence on fossil fuels.'' Well, that is no problem as long as we do not mind American dollars going to the Middle East for oil only to end up in the hands of terrorists who then kill us. The Bush administration might be comfortable with our relationship with those oil states, but I am not. That is why I have introduced the Biofuels Energy Independence Act of 2003, H.R. 130, and ask my colleagues to cosponsor it.

OIL, GAS TIGHTEN U.S. CONNECTION TO MIDEAST

(By John Gallagher)

The U.S.-Arab Economic Forum being held in Detroit gave a glimpse Monday at the future of American energy policy. It sure looked a lot like the past.

Speakers on a panel devoted to energy needs agreed that a reliance on Middle East oil and natural gas is the cornerstone of any future American policy.

Far from fostering a U.S. policy of independence from Middle Eastern producers, the panel suggested that ever-closer ties with the region and its vast oil and natural gas reserves will be needed to meet U.S. consumption.

Ali bin Ibrahim Al Naimi, minister of petroleum and mineral resources in Saudi Arabia, captured the almost cozy nature of the discussion when he quipped to the audience: ''Detroit makes a lot of cars. We produce a lot of oil. You can see the connection.''

Indeed, any stresses and strains in the energy relationship between the United States and Middle Eastern nations were simply not mentioned Monday. Panelists used the words ''partner'' and ''partnership'' multiple times. Alternative fuels such as solar and hydrogen were brought up just long enough to be dismissed.

''It's hard for people to visualize how massive the oil and gas industry is,'' panelist Lee Raymond, chairman and CEO of ExxonMobil Corp., said at one point.

Even if alternative fuels were to grow at a rate of 20 percent a year, they would still supply just 1 percent of U.S. needs while the vast, vast majority of capital in the energy industry is going into oil and gas,'' he said.

Clarence Cazalot, president and CEO of Marathon Oil Corp., underscored the point by declaring that Marathon has no projects in the works dealing with alternative sources of energy.

The panel was convened to talk about Middle Eastern oil policy, so it was not surprising that it did not take up broader energy problems.

And the business-as-usual approach probably was assured by the make-up of the panel. Two Middle Eastern oil ministers, four U.S. oil company chief executives, and former Michigan Sen. Spencer Abraham, now U.S. Secretary of Energy in President George W. Bush's cabinet.

Even so, it was surprising how little mention was made of broader energy problems. There was no discussion of this summer's surge in gas prices, except when Al Naimi declared that the war in Iraq had produced no significant increase in prices this year. Nor was there any discussion of the recent blackout that left metro Detroit, much of the Northeast and parts of Canada in the dark.

Instead, oil producers and oil company executives agreed that there was no getting around the realities of the United States being the world's biggest energy consumer and the Middle East holding the world's biggest reserves of oil and natural gas.

''We're in for a long period of dependence on fossil fuels,'' said David O'Reilly, chairman and CEO, of Chevron Texaco Corp., told the audience at the Detroit Marriott Renaissance Center.

U.S. energy consumption is expected to grow 50 percent by 2025; Al Naimi estimated, a figure that no one disputed.

Yet around the edges of the discussion Monday, a few glimpses of potential problems crept into the discussion.

If the United States is worried about a stable supply of oil and natural gas, it turns out that producing nations like Saudi Arabia and Qatar are worried at least as much about a stable demand.

Russia, Mexico and other non-Arab oil-producing nations are clamoring for more access to the U.S. markets. The panelists noted that Middle Eastern nations can't afford to make massive new investments in their facilities without assurances that the U.S. market will still be open to them.

And there was just the barest mention of civil unrest in some Middle Eastern nations, where forces of modern secular capitalism vie with religious fundamentalism. O'Reilly noted that a solid relationship with the United States is needed to help young Arab men and women meet their potential.

As if to mirror the mostly up-beat discussion Monday, gasoline prices in Michigan continued their recent slide.

The statewide average price for a gallon of self-serve, regular gasoline is down more than 10-cents from a week ago, AAA said. It marked the second straight 10-cent drop in as many weeks.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Sept. 30, 2003]

MIDDLE EAST MUST END ITS CYCLE OF TERRORISM, DESPAIR, POWELL SAYS

(By Niraj Warikoo)

The Arab world is trapped in a cycle of despair and fury that will continue to breed terrorism unless nations radically change their policies, said U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell in a toughly worded speech to business leaders in Detroit Monday night.

Powell gave few specifics on how the Middle East can bridge the gap but cautioned that if it is to survive, the region urgently needs solid jobs, along with respect for rule of the law, the individual and religious tolerance.

''It is no exaggeration to say that without a transformation of the Middle East, the region will remain a source of violence and terrorism,'' Powell said. ''We must not let that happen. We will not let that happen.''

Powell spoke at the first U.S.-Arab Economic Forum, an event designed to bring the two worlds together with the local Arab-American community acting as a conduit. Hundreds of U.S. and Arab business leaders gathered in Detroit's Cobo Center to hear him speak.

He urged the crowd to join him in transforming the Middle East into a region full of hope and where ''all people worship God in a spirit of tolerance and understanding.''

Some Arab Americans in the audience were unimpressed with Powell's speech, saying he should have announced a plan to relieve the suffering of the Palestinians.

''He brought no new ideas,'' said Ron Amen, executive assistant to Wayne County Executive Robert Ficano. ''He brought no new hope.''

Powell spoke at length about Iraq during his speech and during an earlier interview with the Free Press. He said he believes a weapons of mass destruction program will be found in Iraq.

''There is no doubt in my mind'' the United States will find evidence of Saddam Hussein's weapons program, Powell said. ''It wasn't a figment of anyone's imagination.''

Powell criticized those who questioned whether Hussein had deadly weapons before the war.

Some people thought that ''sweet Saddam Hussein, who was willing to gas 5,000 people on a spring day in 1988, was suddenly a different Saddam Hussein,'' Powell said during the Free Press interview.

''Other nations might have been willing to make that judgment, but not President Bush. He wasn't going to walk away from the challenge.''

Powell said former UN weapons inspector David Kay is going through documents and interviews in a search for a weapons program. And Powell recounted his visit earlier

this month to Iraq, saying he was touched by the northern city of Halabja.

Powell said he spoke with Iraqis whose family members were killed in that town in March 1988, when Hussein's regime used chemicals to kill an estimated 5,000 people.

He urged the American public to be patient with Iraq, reminding reporters that it took the United States more than 12 years—from 1776 to 1789—to draft a constitution.

''It isn't easy'' to draft a governing document, he said.

Besides Iraq, Powell addressed the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians. He said Palestinian Authority President Yasser Arafat ''is not a partner for peace.''

Powell said he has made it clear to Arafat that he must change his leadership approach.

Powell also questioned Israeli settlements and the way Israel is constructing a new security fence near its border.

Powell tried to quell concerns about how Arabs traveling to the United States will be treated at airports and by the government. He conceded there has to be balance between liberty and security in admitting new visitors and immigrants.

Said Powell: ''We want to be a welcoming society.''

JUMP-STARTING IRAQI ECONOMY

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, in the next few weeks Congress will be shaping and hopefully passing legislation aimed at jump-starting the Iraqi economy, hopefully laying the foundation for prosperity and democracy in that troubled land. The administration is proposing a $23 billion package out of an $87 billion program; and the question now is, what form will our support take in this first $23 billion assistance package to Iraq? Will it be given to Iraq in the form of a loan or will it be given in the form of an investment or will it be given in the form of a grant?

We are being told in Congress that it must be given in the form of a grant. We are being told that the people of the United States must give to Iraq $23 billion because if we try to give it in the form of a loan instead of a grant that it will hurt the Iraqi economy and they will not be able to prosper.

This is so much nonsense, State Department nonsense which is not taking into consideration the well-being of the people of the United States of America and taking the easy way out. Yes, let us just shovel money over there. That would not be good for the people of Iraq or the people of the United States.

□ 1700

The objection the State Department has is based on the idea that if we have any more debt accumulated on the people of Iraq, they will not prosper because they already have so much debt. In fact, their debt is estimated at $120 billion. That is no reason for us to just give away $23 billion of the money of the people of the United States. No. What we should be doing is saying, who loaned that money to Iraq? And, in fact, what we are talking about here is $120 billion given not to the people of Iraq but to Saddam Hussein, to Saddam Hussein's regime by our supposed allies, by big international banks.

Our position should not be that the Iraqi people have to repay that debt. We should be encouraging the new democracy in Iraq to repudiate the debt of countries that gave money to Saddam Hussein which he then used to buy weapons to repress and oppress his own people. Repudiation of that debt will permit the Iraqi people to prosper and permit us rather than to penalize our own people in order to repay, yes, the money is not going directly back to those big international banks, but it will be going back to them if we simply shovel our money into Iraq right now.

No, we should help Iraq establish the foundation for prosperity by insisting that the loans that were given to Saddam Hussein are not the responsibility of the people of Iraq who want a democratic government. If those big bankers in France and Germany want their loans back which they gave to Saddam Hussein, let them find Saddam Hussein and collect those loans from Saddam Hussein, not the people of Iraq. Our assistance should be based not on giving money to the people of Iraq because we have no choice because Iraq already owes so much money. What we should do is help them get out of that debt situation by repudiating that illegal debt and, instead, structure our support as loans when we can, or even investments.

Much of what is being suggested for Iraq is upgrading their post office, their water system, their oil production, their electric system. All of those things are based on services that are provided to the Iraqi people which they will pay for. Let us structure the $23 billion we give to Iraq as an investment in those things rather than just giving them the money and expecting no repayment for the American people in return. This would be actually more efficient in the end because it would put a profit-type of incentive into the mix when people are setting up the post office and the water system and the oil production and the electric system in Iraq. No, let us reconfirm to the world by supporting the repudiation of Saddam Hussein's debt; let us reconfirm the principle that anyone who loans money or does business with dictators does so at their own risk and the American people should never bail them out if that dictatorship is overthrown. We should be on the side of the democratic forces and give them an incentive to get rid of the dictator and by doing so, get rid of their debt rather than have to bear the burden of their own oppressor.

SUPPORT OUR TROOPS: $1,500 BONUS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, this week as the other body takes up the President's request for an $87 billion supplemental appropriation bill for Iraq, we must do more for our troops and their families who are under increasing duress. Specifically, Congress should grant a $1,500 bonus to all those who serve in Iraq and Afghanistan. Not since Vietnam have such a large number of troops been deployed for so long. The pressure this puts on our troops and their families is tremendous. This summer, the Department of Defense increased deployments for troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan to 1 year, and not until last week did the Department of Defense offer these troops who are living under highly primitive and stressful conditions a 2-week leave for rest and recuperation. And tragically this month, our U.S. casualties in Iraq surpassed the number of those killed in the first gulf war. We now have lost more than 300 soldiers, sailors and airmen.

Recognizing the increasing gravity of U.S. military involvement abroad, I introduced H.R. 3051 to qualify all active duty military personnel deployed for any length of time in Iraq and Afghanistan for a $1,500 bonus. This bonus proposal should be made part of the supplemental appropriation bill. As Members of Congress, we may have different ideas about the U.S. policy in Iraq, but we can all agree our service- men and -women deserve our sincere recognition for their courageous efforts. $1,500 will not only help boost morale but will send a strong bipartisan message to our troops that Congress is unified behind them.

The Bush administration is lobbying Congress for $21 billion in direct grants to support infrastructure developments in Iraq in this $87 billion supplemental appropriations bill. First of all, I see no reason why we cannot separate this $87 billion into two separate bills: one, the $66 billion defense portion, which I think we all support, and $21 billion for the reconstruction portion and then let us as a Congress require Iraqi oil to be used as collateral for international loans to finance Iraqi infrastructure projects and ensure that Iraq construction contracts are competitively bid. Either way, U.S. citizens should not be expected to support Iraqi development while many Americans are facing shortfalls in funding here at home, in health care, prescription drug coverage, schools, road construction, and other critical infrastructure improvements. Congress must continue to work to restore Iraq to a stable and self-governing state, but not at the expense of Americans here at home and our troops abroad.

I also question several items contained in the administration's supplemental bill for Iraq, like the $4 million to develop a set of telephone numbers and $150 million for a national 911 system; $100 million to build seven planned communities with 3,258 houses;

$10 million to finance 100 prison-building experts; $100 million for 2,000 garbage trucks; $20 million for Afghanistan consultants; $850 million for health facility construction and medical equipment replacement; and $900 million to import petroleum products, such as kerosene and diesel, to a country with the world's second largest oil reserves.

Instead of again coming back and dipping into the pockets of working Americans and risking veterans benefits for our troops when they return home, I support proposals to suspend the tax cut for the top 1 percent of income earners to pay for the Bush administration's $87 billion supplemental appropriation bill for Iraq. Again, I urge Congress to consider my bill, H.R. 3051, to include support for our troops in the supplemental aid package to Iraq. Again, my bill provides a $1,500 bonus to military personnel who serve under the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, National Guard and Reserves in a combat zone in Iraq or Afghanistan. In the coming year, an estimated 150,000 young men and women will not see their families. They will be deployed overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan. A record number of Reservists and Guards- men and -women will put their private sector opportunities and jobs on hold, and thousands of children from every part of America will pray for their parents' safe return.

These extraordinary times deserve an exemplary measure. I urge my colleagues to support my bill, H.R. 3051, to provide for our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and to make it a part of the supplemental appropriations bill. Give our troops the $1,500 bonus they deserve.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON WASTE WATCHERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEENEY. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to rise tonight and join the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART) as we have established the Washington Waste Watchers. Ronald Reagan once defined the American taxpayer as somebody who works for the Federal Government but does not have to take the civil service exam. Unfortunately, he was far too correct. According to Americans for Tax Reform, the average American family has to spend 193 days working to pay their total cost of government: Federal, State and local taxes and the regulatory burden. 130 of those 193 days are the cost of funding the Federal Government. Imagine working 193 days for the average American. That is more than half the year by far. It is time that our families were able to spend most of their time working for their families and themselves and not for the Federal Government, the Federal bureaucracy.

We are facing a time of a dramatically expanding new deficit. We understand the need on homeland security. We understand the aftermath of September 11. We understand the need to support our troops over in Iraq. But the bottom line is that, here at home, we have a lot of spending that is simply out of control. The best place to attack this spending, in our view, in the Washington Waste Watchers Caucus, is to go after wasteful spending, is to look at programs that simply are not being well run, are not efficient or are meaningless altogether. There are many, many examples of this. Over time, the Washington Waste Watchers will be reminding not just our constituents but we will be reminding people who are the stewards of the American taxpayers in all of the different Federal agencies that they do not want to be the next group or the next individual embarrassed because of what they have done on their watch with the taxpayer dollars.

There are lots of examples. I want to go through a few tonight. In the Pell grant program, for example, if ideally run, it helps empower many thousands of American men and women get through college. An administrator at the Beacon Career Institute in my home State of Florida, however, defrauded the Department of Education of nearly $1 million. The administrator submitted false documents to justify the disbursement of $720,000 in improper Pell grants. This money could have been used to pay for some 600 Pell grants when combined with the other $2.4 million in fraud. The Department of Education estimates that in the year 2001, some $336 million in Pell grants were improperly disbursed, given to the wrong people. That is wrong. Unfortunately, some of our friends in the Democratic Party still want to raise your taxes.

If you look at the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for example, there is a lot of fraud that is denying legitimate Indian needs out there in America. In New Mexico, for example, a Bureau of Indian Affairs bookkeeper embezzled $66,000 of Federal money intended for the Wingate High School. Also in Arizona, the neighboring State, two Bureau of Indian Affairs bureaucrats skimmed over $60,000 intended for Indian education programs. Again, a lot of our Democratic colleagues still want to raise your taxes.

In the Virgin Islands, if you look at the Office of Insular Affairs, in the Virgin Islands the Department of Health failed to effectively administer grants that total over $30.5 million. Errors included failure to engage in competitive bidding, improper land acquisition, undocumented cost claims and even the failure to complete a health clinic. Again, a lot of our Democratic friends still want to raise your taxes.

Finally, the Federal Emergency Management Administration. A lot of my colleagues understand in the aftermath of tornadoes, wind storms, and the recent hurricane that came up through the east coast, we want an emergency management agency to help people in severe need as they are rebuilding their communities. We want to make sure that police and fire and fundamental services are taken care of. But in response to the most recent wind storm, do you know what the Federal Emergency Management Administration is funding in this part of the world right outside of the Capitol here? Free stress reduction and personal growth classes as a response to the hurricane. They ask questions like, does stress make you feel unbalanced? Do you sometimes feel sad, depressed or empty? Do worrisome thoughts make you feel overwhelmed? By the way, if so, FEMA, the emergency management administration, thinks it has got an answer for you. What does it have? Multicultural initiatives, presenting a series that will allow discussion of who we are, where we are from, why we are here and how we are doing, a Federal program supposedly responding to emergencies in our States.

Multicultural town meetings. We have future workshops to address the issues of diversity, peace and violence versus nonviolence. These may be worthwhile things, but do you think that your tax dollar in the emergency management administration should be spent on them? Finally, anger management programs are being funded with your tax dollars in the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

Lastly, I will tell you that they are using your tax dollars, supposedly used to respond to emergencies, to do things like a yearlong celebration of trees, of gardens and other healing places. Ladies and gentlemen, some of them on the Democratic side still want to raise your taxes.

We are going to go after the waste in government.

THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, earlier this evening, one of our Republican colleagues, a very fine and thoughtful gentleman, came to the well here to lament the fact that the dialogue here, the discussion in the House, has become somewhat partisan lately. I have to agree with him that that is the case. He also said that earlier, after September 11, 2001, immediately thereafter, there was a sense of unity and purpose here, we were united. There is no question that that also is true. There are legitimate reasons for both circumstances.

After the attack of September 11, of course we were united. We were united as a country and the Members in this House were united purposefully to deal with the problems associated with that attack.

□ 1715

The President and the Members of Congress here identified the source of that problem. It was al Qaeda network being harbored by the Taliban in Afghanistan, and we all united together to make sure that that problem was eliminated. Some of us even went to Afghanistan to be with our military personnel to show them our support for the efforts there. That military action is over. Unfortunately, due to the lack of attention of the administration, however, it is rapidly deteriorating.

But I want to talk more about the situation that exists in Iraq because that has become the major focus of our attention, and indeed it has taken on a partisan perspective, and there are very good reasons for that because we have major differences of opinion. First of all, with regard to the rationale for attacking Iraq and, secondly, with regard to how the circumstances there are being carried out by this administration and especially by the Defense Department under this administration.

Everyone will recall that the President, when he spoke here in this House to a joint session of Congress and the American people, said over and over and over again directly and indirectly that there were ties and relationships between Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden, between Iraq and the al Qaeda network, and that was the reason why we had to go to war. Just recently the President has had to admit that that was not the case. There was no connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda or Osama bin Laden.

Then the administration was telling us that they had to go over weapons of mass destruction. They knew there were chemical and biological weapons there in Iraq, and we had to go in there because those weapons were dangerous and they had to be taken care of. We have been there now for 5 months. We have found no chemical or biological weapons, no trace of any program dealing with nuclear weapons in spite of the fact that the President, from the podium here in this House, said that he had good solid information that the Iraqis were importing enriched uranium from Niger to facilitate the development of their nuclear program. All of that has turned out to be false. And so, yes, we raised the question why did we go to Iraq? For what purpose are we there? Why did we disrupt that country? Why have we created a situation of chaos there that has resulted in the death, up to this moment, of more than 300 American soldiers and the injury, the wounding, many of them very serious, of hundreds more, not to mention the deaths of tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and others from other countries? Yes, we question that.

Now, we find out other things. For example, we have learned recently that there are now, according to General Abizaid, who is the highest-ranking American military officer in the Persian Gulf, that there are 650,000 tons of conventional weapons in Iraq, and they are essentially unguarded. The administration is running around the country there looking for so-called weapons of mass destruction. They have not paid a bit of attention to 650,000 tons of conventional weapons, grenades, surface-to-air missiles, 500-pound bombs, things of that nature that are scattered in places all over that country.

The destruction of the UN headquarters in Iraq recently, which resulted in the death of the highest-ranking United Nations official in Iraq, is something that we are all deeply concerned about and lament. What caused that? It turns out that under an FBI investigation, they found remnants of a Russian-made 500-pound bomb that, in all likelihood, came from one of these arsenals that are scattered around Iraq unguarded from which the terrorists can get all of the explosives and all of the conventional weapons they want, because we are not paying sufficient attention to them because we are looking for something that the administration has known from the beginning, based upon intelligence from the Central Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and elsewhere, that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq.

They have taken us down a blind alley. We see through it. We see the falsehood. We see the mendacity. And, of course, we have an obligation, a responsibility to speak out against it. That is why the tone has turned in this House to a more partisan nature, because the administration and the leadership in this House pulled the wool over the eyes of the American people and many of the Members of this House who voted for that war resolution back last October. And now it is evident that they did so under false pretenses. It was a fraud, and we need to take action to correct it.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3, PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 2003

Mrs. MYRICK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–290) on the resolution (H. Res. 383) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the Senate bill (S. 3) to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONCURRENT RECEIPT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I have on my desk a small card which has the words of my predecessor Congressman Ben Blaz. It says ''I am a Member of Congress, but not one of its Members.'' I read those words today, Madam Speaker, because I had them reinforced to me when I tried to sign the discharge petition here in Congress to give the veterans concurrent receipt that they deserve. We have veterans on Guam, 15,000 of them, in fact, but I was told as a Delegate, I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. More soldiers from Guam have died, per capita, in foreign wars than any other State in the Nation. But Madam Speaker, I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. Pacific Islander veterans suffer disproportionately from posttraumatic stress disorder, but I cannot put my name on that discharge petition. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 303, but I cannot put my name on that discharge petition.

What can I do? I have decided to come to the floor today to appeal to my colleagues. I urge them to sign the discharge petition, Republican or Democrat; it does not matter. Do it for the veterans in their district. Do it for the veterans of Guam. Do it for their colleague who has been denied that right. I appeal to my colleagues on behalf of the disabled veterans of America. I see them at town hall meetings in my district all the time, and it breaks my heart. Veterans like Mr. Victor Pangelinan Tabios, who is 100 percent disabled.

Madam Speaker, the people of Guam are shy people. It takes a lot of courage for them to stand up in public and to speak out their mind. So when Victor spoke to me about concurrent receipt, I listened. He served our country with duty and honor and pride, and now it is time for us to step up and do the same. If just one of my colleagues will sign that discharge petition today, they will have the deepest thanks from the people of Guam and a very grateful Delegate who cannot sign the petition.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to request to allow the gentlewoman to sign the discharge petition?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No, the Chair will not entertain that request.

Mr. FILNER. Why is that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The respective rights and privileges of the Members and Delegates are established by rules and by law; so that unanimous consent request will not be entertained.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this up because this is an insult to her constituents, it is an insult to her. I will say if the Democrats get control of the House, the right to vote and sign discharge petitions, we hope, will get back to the delegates.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his interest and concern.

THE WAR IN IRAQ AND ITS AFTERMATH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, 160 or so years ago, former President John Quincy Adams, then a Congressman, came to the House floor and shared with Members of Congress letters from his constituents, mostly from women, who at that time could not vote. In those days, the conservative leaders of the House of Representatives actually passed a House rule prohibiting, banning the discussion or the debate of slavery in the U.S. House of Representatives. John Quincy Adams, believing that slavery should be abolished first and, second, believing that the elected Representatives of our country should be allowed to debate that issue, came to the House floor day after day, night after night, week after week, sharing those letters from constituents protesting the actions of the conservative leadership in this Congress.

In that tradition, I have, night after night since July, come to this House floor sharing letters from my constituents about their concerns about the war in Iraq and about what has happened now with the President's not owning up and telling us the truth about the war and the aftermath of the war. We have faced the same problem here where this Congress has refused to debate many of the questions investigating whether the President and the administration told the truth about our reasons going into Iraq and told the truth since about the unbid contracts going to Halliburton, about how much money we are spending, about our plan to get out of the war, about how he is, in fact, taking care of our troops, something that unfortunately has been forgotten. And I want to share letters from my constituents today with Members of the House of Representatives.

I will start with Tonya who writes: ''I am a veteran, and I know better than most people what the military needs right now. I support our troops in every way possible,'' Tonya, a veteran, writes. ''They all deserve raises and increases in their hazardous-duty pay,'' something that President Bush has opposed. ''In my opinion, our troops should be brought home. Let the UN and the Iraqi people clean up the mess.'' This can be done. ''Use that same $87 billion to stimulate the economy in the United States.''

Ann writes: ''Congress must shift from the passive stance taken after September 11 and accept their constitutional responsibility of oversight. Congress has required far too little accountability from the Bush administration and allowed them far too much discretion. This President has proven to be a failed leader incapable of running this country.'' What Ann is talking about is the unbid contracts. We are spending $1 billion a week in Iraq right now. Three hundred million dollars of that has gone to private contractors, many of them the President's friends, many of them people who contributed money to the President's campaign. One of those companies that Ann is talking about is Halliburton, a company which has been beneficiary of hundreds of million of dollars in unbid contracts and just happens to be the company where Vice President CHENEY used to be the CEO, and a company that is still paying Vice President CHENEY $13,000 a month. That is Ann, a constituent.

Peter writes: ''The President and his clique should recognize the mistakes of the past and do what's fair to the Iraqi people. Let them decide for themselves, let them become a sovereign nation under the auspices of the UN. Bring back the troops, work through and with the UN. Spend the $87 billion and more at home for schools, health care, basic infrastructure. Take care of the people at home.''

George writes: ''If Bush wants his mess cleaned up by U.S. taxpayers, then he needs to concede that the tax cuts for the wealthy cannot stand.'' What George is referring to is that 42 percent of the tax cuts this Congress passed went to the 1 percent wealthiest people in this country. The average millionaire got a $92,000 tax cut, while half of my constituents got literally zero. George writes: ''Nothing good will come of this, with control passing to the UN for rebuilding.'' And, yes, we must pay for what we broke. ''The tax cuts for the wealthy should be repealed immediately.''

The last letter I will read, Barbara writes: ''We cannot leave Iraq in the mess we have created. However, if the $87 billion is to be used to rebuild, we should have contractors from Iraq do the work, not Halliburton.'' Remember, that is the company where Vice President CHENEY still receives $13,000 every month from while our Government is giving unbid contracts to that company to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars in Iraq. ''We need to turn this disaster over to the UN, if it is willing, get the world involved and turn this into a worldwide humanitarian effort. Bush has been extremely successful at raising money for his unopposed'' in the primary ''reelection campaign. Perhaps he should get out there and start requesting donations to rebuild Iraq, and let's not forget Afghanistan. I would gladly return my $400 tax rebate, and I am sure that his supporters would continue to attend the $2,000-a-plate dinners for the cause they support.''

□ 1730

Madam Speaker, it is pretty clear that people all over my district, my State, this country are unhappy with how the President has failed in supporting the troops by opposing pay raises, by cutting veterans benefits when they come home, and that my constituents are concerned about the billions of dollars we are spending in Iraq with no accountability. Madam Speaker, my constituents are concerned about the corruption coming right out of the White House where unbid contracts are going to the President's friends, the President's contributors, and the Vice President's company, which still continues, continues every month since he has been Vice President, every month since they have been given contracts in Iraq, continues to give Vice President CHENEY $13,000 every single month.

THREE SIMPLE STEPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today, as ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I am calling upon the White House to take three simple steps which would send a signal that they want to get to the bottom of the growing controversy concerning the leaking of a CIA operative's name to the press.

The first thing I would ask them to do is to call upon the Attorney General to appoint a special council. The second thing I would ask that they do is to order any and all staff advisors to comply with a lie detector test. Third, I would ask the President to order his staff and advisors to waive any journalistic privilege they have as confidential sources with regard to the press.

This probe has led to the following news breaks: NBC, Brokaw, the leak: Did someone in the White House blow the cover of a CIA agent to discredit a critic of the administration?

This is from the National Journals daily briefing on politics. CBS's Rather: The CIA scandal charges that the White House blew the cover of an undercover CIA agent. An investigation is launched.

ABC's Jennings: the President's advisor says he did not leak the name of a CIA officer whose husband criticized the President.

CNN's Jay King: the President quickly left the room after this afternoon's bill-signing, ignoring shouted questions. His spokesman says Mr. Bush sees no need for an internal White House investigation and no need for an outside investigation by a special prosecutor.

White House chief of staff Andy Carr told senior staffers Monday that anyone with information about the leak should contact the Justice Department. But at this time, there is no formal directive to the White House staff, and the President is not asking for an internal review, despite reports that the illegal leak came from within the White House.

CNBC's Seigenthaler, tonight on the news: Did someone at the White House break the law by leaking the name of a top secret CIA agent?

FNC's Hume: Washington is in a frenzy over the alleged White House leak of a CIA agent's identity, but is there any evidence that it was the White House?

NBC's Miklaszewski: At the White House today, President Bush was beginning to feel political heat.

And CBS's Roberts: the White House tried to jump out in front of the potentially damaging controversy today, insisting that it would never authorize the leaking of a CIA operative's name.

Now, my recommendation is that the President call upon the Attorney General to appoint a special council. It is the only way to ensure the American public that the investigation will be performed fairly and impartially, to call upon the Attorney General to appoint the special council.

Now, if we read the Code of Federal Regulations, volume 28 at section 600.1, the Attorney General is required to appoint a special council when a ''criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted''; and, two, the investigation ''by a United States Attorney's Office would present a conflict of interest for the Department''; and, three, ''it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside special council to assume responsibility for the matter.''

Now, it so happens all of the facts are present here. First, the allegations, if true, constitute an obvious serious criminal violation under 50 United States Code section 421. The disclosure of a name of a covert agent is punishable by up to 10 years in a Federal prison.

CONSTITUENTS EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS ON PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR $87 BILLION SUPPLEMENTAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I wanted to join my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), who, along with him, I have been reading some letters and e-mails from constituents regarding their view on the ongoing war in Iraq, and their views about the request for $87 billion. A number of these e-mails that I have gotten have been generated by moveon.org that has an online petition where hundreds of thousands of people have signed on, and many of them have written comments regarding their unwillingness to spend $87 billion, particularly while the leadership team that got us into Iraq is still in place, and as long as we fail to internationalize the effort in rebuilding Iraq.

So I thought it would be useful to read some of the letters and the e-mails that I have gotten.

Rebecca from Park Ridge says, ''This Congress has a responsibility to ensure that our tax dollars are used well, but President Bush is demanding another enormous blank check. Congress must withhold the $87 billion requested by President Bush until he dismisses the team responsible for the quagmire in Iraq, starting with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, and end the U.S. occupation of Iraq by transferring authority for rebuilding to the United Nations.''

Doralee of Evanston says, ''I beseech you as moral people who care about the survival of this world to deny Bush's request for $87 billion and fire Rumsfeld and develop a whole new approach to restoring Iraq by involving the United Nations. This is such a serious matter that you cannot give Bush blanket authority anymore. He has not handled this situation in a competent manner.''

And Barbara from Wilmette says, ''I was stunned and disheartened to read that President Bush is asking for $87 billion from Congress for an occupation in Iraq that has only lead to the death of our soldiers and Iraqi civilians and further bitterness of the Iraqi people toward the United States.''

Oletta from Chicago says, ''This war has been fiscally and morally mismanaged and should not garner any further financing without an exact budget and defined timelines. Don't let Bush and his administration continue to bankrupt America because he still doesn't know what he is doing or is going to do.''

Pamela says, and she is from Chicago, ''I believe we need to invest in rebuilding Iraq and protecting our troops, but we need to do it in a sensible way, in concert with the world, and in a way that benefits the people of Iraq. So, the quid pro quo for the money is a change in policy and in leadership.''

Cecelia, also from Chicago says, ''I don't begrudge funding, as long as I feel that the war is properly managed. I don't. Our soldiers are vulnerable, the Iraqis seem to hate us, the terrorists are picking us off, and we don't seem to have a plan to change any of this. Firing Rumsfeld would be a start.''

David from Chicago says, ''I hear story after story of parents of our men and women serving in Iraq sending regular care packages with things like sun screen because their children are not being provided these items by the military. It is clear that the money being spent is not being targeted to those in the service and apparently not to the Iraqi people who still lack power, water, food, and medical facility. It does appear that Halliburton is profiting quite nicely from its no-bid contract. I object to sending more money until Mr. Rumsfeld is removed and we get an accounting of how the money is being spent and who is getting their pockets lined with it.''

Janice from Chicago says, ''Congress must withhold the $87 billion requested by the President until he dismisses the team responsible for the quagmire in Iraq, starting with Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, and ends the U.S. occupation by transferring authority for rebuilding to the United Nations.''

Jonathan from Chicago says, ''Don't reward failure. The war in Iraq was won handily, but the Defense Department's hamfisted attempts to run things in Iraq, over the objections of the more experienced State Department, has been dismal and embarrassing. By all means, fund the continued rebuilding efforts in Iraq, but not while the architects of the current mess are still choosing how to spend our money.''

And David from Chicago says, ''Please make sure we don't alienate the rest of the world more than we already have. Please make this administration admit that it has made a misstep by not involving the world community in the Iraq situation from the outset.''

Jeffrey from Chicago said, ''This is outrageous, given the fiscal crisis our States are in, and the fact that the money would go a long way to shore up education or help programs that confront the issues of homelessness or poverty. Get up and do something about this. I'm keeping track.''

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1474, CHECK CLEARING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. OXLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 1474) to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 108–291)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1474), to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu, of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Check Clearing for the 21st Century Act'' or the ''Check 21 Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings; purposes.
Sec. 3. Definitions.
Sec. 4. General provisions governing substitute checks.
Sec. 5. Substitute check warranties.
Sec. 6. Indemnity.
Sec. 7. Expedited recredit for consumers.
Sec. 8. Expedited recredit procedures for banks.
Sec. 9. Delays in an emergency.
Sec. 10. Measure of damages.
Sec. 11. Statute of limitations and notice of claim.

Sec. 12. Consumer awareness.
Sec. 13. Effect on other law.
Sec. 14. Variation by agreement.
Sec. 15. Regulations.
Sec. 16. Study and report on funds availability.
Sec. 17. Statistical reporting of costs and revenues for transporting checks between Federal Reserve banks.
Sec. 18. Evaluation and report by the Comptroller General.
Sec. 19. Depositary services efficiency and cost reduction.
Sec. 20. Effective date.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) In the Expedited Funds Availability Act, enacted on August 10, 1987, the Congress directed the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to consider establishing regulations requiring Federal reserve banks and depository institutions to provide for check truncation, in order to improve the check processing system.

(2) In that same Act, the Congress—

(A) provided the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with full authority to regulate all aspects of the payment system, including the receipt, payment, collection, and clearing of checks, and related functions of the payment system pertaining to checks; and

(B) directed that the exercise of such authority by the Board superseded any State law, including the Uniform Commercial Code, as in effect in any State.

(3) Check truncation is no less desirable in 2003 for both financial service customers and the financial services industry, to reduce costs, improve efficiency in check collections, and expedite funds availability for customers than it was over 15 years ago when Congress first directed the Board to consider establishing such a process.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks.

(2) To foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form.

(3) To improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

(1) ACCOUNT.—The term ''account'' means a deposit account at a bank.

(2) BANK.—The term ''bank'' means any person that is located in a State and engaged in the business of banking and includes—

(A) any depository institution (as defined in section 19(b)(1)(A) of the Federal Reserve Act);

(B) any Federal reserve bank;

(C) any Federal home loan bank; or

(D) to the extent it acts as a payor—

(i) the Treasury of the United States;

(ii) the United States Postal Service;

(iii) a State government; or

(iv) a unit of general local government (as defined in section 602(24) of the Expedited Funds Availability Act).

(3) BANKING TERMS.—

(A) COLLECTING BANK.—The term ''collecting bank'' means any bank handling a check for collection except the paying bank.

(B) DEPOSITARY BANK.—The term ''depositary bank'' means—

(i) the first bank to which a check is transferred, even if such bank is also the paying bank or the payee; or

(ii) a bank to which a check is transferred for deposit in an account at such bank, even if the check is physically received and indorsed first by another bank.

(C) PAYING BANK.—The term ''paying bank'' means—

(i) the bank by which a check is payable, unless the check is payable at or through another bank and is sent to the other bank for payment or collection; or

(ii) the bank at or through which a check is payable and to which the check is sent for payment or collection.

(D) RETURNING BANK.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term ''returning bank'' means a bank (other than the paying or depositary bank) handling a returned check or notice in lieu of return.

(ii) TREATMENT AS COLLECTING BANK.—No provision of this Act shall be construed as affecting the treatment of a returning bank as a collecting bank for purposes of section 4–202(b) of the Uniform Commercial Code.

(4) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

(5) BUSINESS DAY.—The term ''business day'' has the same meaning as in section 602(3) of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

(6) CHECK.—The term ''check''—

(A) means a draft, payable on demand and drawn on or payable through or at an office of a bank, whether or not negotiable, that is handled for forward collection or return, including a substitute check and a travelers check; and

(B) does not include a noncash item or an item payable in a medium other than United States dollars.

(7) CONSUMER.—The term ''consumer'' means an individual who—

(A) with respect to a check handled for forward collection, draws the check on a consumer account; or

(B) with respect to a check handled for return, deposits the check into, or cashes the check against, a consumer account.

(8) CONSUMER ACCOUNT.—The term ''consumer account'' has the same meaning as in section 602(10) of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

(9) CUSTOMER.—The term ''customer'' means a person having an account with a bank.

(10) FORWARD COLLECTION.—The term ''forward collection'' means the transfer by a bank of a check to a collecting bank for settlement or the paying bank for payment.

(11) INDEMNIFYING BANK.—The term ''indemnifying bank'' means a bank that is providing an indemnity under section 6 with respect to a substitute check.

(12) MICR LINE.—The terms ''MICR line'' and ''magnetic ink character recognition line'' mean the numbers, which may include the bank routing number, account number, check number, check amount, and other information, that are printed near the bottom of a check in magnetic ink in accordance with generally applicable industry standards.

(13) NONCASH ITEM.—The term ''noncash item'' has the same meaning as in section 602(14) of the Expedited Funds Availability Act.

(14) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means a natural person, corporation, unincorporated company, partnership, government unit or instrumentality, trust, or any other entity or organization.

(15) RECONVERTING BANK.—The term ''reconverting bank'' means—

(A) the bank that creates a substitute check; or

(B) if a substitute check is created by a person other than a bank, the first bank that transfers or presents such substitute check.

(16) SUBSTITUTE CHECK.—The term ''substitute check'' means a paper reproduction of the original check that—

(A) contains an image of the front and back of the original check;

(B) bears a MICR line containing all the information appearing on the MICR line of the original check, except as provided under generally applicable industry standards for substitute checks to facilitate the processing of substitute checks;

(C) conforms, in paper stock, dimension, and otherwise, with generally applicable industry standards for substitute checks; and

(D) is suitable for automated processing in the same manner as the original check.

(17) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the same meaning as in section 3(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(18) TRUNCATE.—The term ''truncate'' means to remove an original paper check from the check collection or return process and send to a recipient, in lieu of such original paper check, a substitute check or, by agreement, information relating to the original check (including data taken from the MICR line of the original check or an electronic image of the original check), whether with or without subsequent delivery of the original paper check.

(19) UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE.—The term ''Uniform Commercial Code'' means the Uniform Commercial Code in effect in a State.

(20) OTHER TERMS.—Unless the context requires otherwise, the terms not defined in this section shall have the same meanings as in the Uniform Commercial Code.

SEC. 4. GENERAL PROVISIONS GOVERNING SUBSTITUTE CHECKS.

(a) NO AGREEMENT REQUIRED.—A person may deposit, present, or send for collection or return a substitute check without an agreement with the recipient, so long as a bank has made the warranties in section 5 with respect to such substitute check.

(b) LEGAL EQUIVALENCE.—A substitute check shall be the legal equivalent of the original check for all purposes, including any provision of any Federal or State law, and for all persons if the substitute check—

(1) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check as of the time the original check was truncated; and

(2) bears the legend: ''This is a legal copy of your check. You can use it the same way you would use the original check.''.

(c) ENDORSEMENTS.—A bank shall ensure that the substitute check for which the bank is the reconverting bank bears all endorsements applied by parties that previously handled the check (whether in electronic form or in the form of the original paper check or a substitute check) for forward collection or return.

(d) IDENTIFICATION OF RECONVERTING BANK.—A bank shall identify itself as a reconverting bank on any substitute check for which the bank is a reconverting bank so as to preserve any previous reconverting bank identifications in conformance with generally applicable industry standards.

(e) APPLICABLE LAW.—A substitute check that is the legal equivalent of the original check under subsection (b) shall be subject to any provision, including any provision relating to the protection of customers, of part 229 of title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the Uniform Commercial Code, and any other applicable Federal or State law as if such substitute check were the original check, to the extent such provision of law is not inconsistent with this Act.

SEC. 5. SUBSTITUTE CHECK WARRANTIES.

A bank that transfers, presents, or returns a substitute check and receives consideration for the check warrants, as a matter of law, to the transferee, any subsequent collecting or returning bank, the depositary bank, the drawee, the drawer, the payee, the depositor, and any endorser (regardless of whether the warrantee receives the substitute check or another paper or electronic form of the substitute check or original check) that—

(1) the substitute check meets all the requirements for legal equivalence under section 4(b); and

(2) no depositary bank, drawee, drawer, or endorser will receive presentment or return of the substitute check, the original check, or a copy or other paper or electronic version of the substitute check or original check such that the bank, drawee, drawer, or endorser will be asked to make a payment based on a check that the

bank, drawee, drawer, or endorser has already paid.

SEC. 6. INDEMNITY.

(a) INDEMNITY.—A reconverting bank and each bank that subsequently transfers, presents, or returns a substitute check in any electronic or paper form, and receives consideration for such transfer, presentment, or return shall indemnify the transferee, any subsequent collecting or returning bank, the depositary bank, the drawee, the drawer, the payee, the depositor, and any endorser, up to the amount described in subsections (b) and (c), as applicable, to the extent of any loss incurred by any recipient of a substitute check if that loss occurred due to the receipt of a substitute check instead of the original check.

(b) INDEMNITY AMOUNT.—

(1) AMOUNT IN EVENT OF BREACH OF WARRANTY.—The amount of the indemnity under subsection (a) shall be the amount of any loss (including costs and reasonable attorney's fees and other expenses of representation) proximately caused by a breach of a warranty provided under section 5.

(2) AMOUNT IN ABSENCE OF BREACH OF WARRANTY.—In the absence of a breach of a warranty provided under section 5, the amount of the indemnity under subsection (a) shall be the sum of—

(A) the amount of any loss, up to the amount of the substitute check; and

(B) interest and expenses (including costs and reasonable attorney's fees and other expenses of representation).

(c) COMPARATIVE NEGLIGENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a loss described in subsection (a) results in whole or in part from the negligence or failure to act in good faith on the part of an indemnified party, then that party's indemnification under this section shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of negligence or bad faith attributable to that party.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection reduces the rights of a consumer or any other person under the Uniform Commercial Code or other applicable provision of Federal or State law.

(d) EFFECT OF PRODUCING ORIGINAL CHECK OR COPY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the indemnifying bank produces the original check or a copy of the original check (including an image or a substitute check) that accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check (as of the time the original check was truncated) or is otherwise sufficient to determine whether or not a claim is valid, the indemnifying bank shall—

(A) be liable under this section only for losses covered by the indemnity that are incurred up to the time that the original check or copy is provided to the indemnified party; and

(B) have a right to the return of any funds it has paid under the indemnity in excess of those losses.

(2) COORDINATION OF INDEMNITY WITH IMPLIED WARRANTY.—The production of the original check, a substitute check, or a copy under paragraph (1) by an indemnifying bank shall not absolve the bank from any liability on a warranty established under this Act or any other provision of law.

(e) SUBROGATION OF RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each indemnifying bank shall be subrogated to the rights of any indemnified party to the extent of the indemnity.

(2) RECOVERY UNDER WARRANTY.—A bank that indemnifies a party under this section may attempt to recover from another party based on a warranty or other claim.

(3) DUTY OF INDEMNIFIED PARTY.—Each indemnified party shall have a duty to comply with all reasonable requests for assistance from an indemnifying bank in connection with any claim the indemnifying bank brings against a warrantor or other party related to a check that forms the basis for the indemnification.

SEC. 7. EXPEDITED RECREDIT FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) RECREDIT CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A consumer may make a claim for expedited recredit from the bank that holds the account of the consumer with respect to a substitute check, if the consumer asserts in good faith that—

(A) the bank charged the consumer's account for a substitute check that was provided to the consumer;

(B) either—

(i) the check was not properly charged to the consumer's account; or

(ii) the consumer has a warranty claim with respect to such substitute check;

(C) the consumer suffered a resulting loss; and

(D) the production of the original check or a better copy of the original check is necessary to determine the validity of any claim described in subparagraph (B).

(2) 40-DAY PERIOD.—Any claim under paragraph (1) with respect to a consumer account may be submitted by a consumer before the end of the 40-day period beginning on the later of—

(A) the date on which the financial institution mails or delivers, by a means agreed to by the consumer, the periodic statement of account for such account which contains information concerning the transaction giving rise to the claim; or

(B) the date on which the substitute check is made available to the consumer.

(3) EXTENSION UNDER EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.—If the ability of the consumer to submit the claim within the 40-day period under paragraph (2) is delayed due to extenuating circumstances, including extended travel or the illness of the consumer, the 40-day period shall be extended by a reasonable amount of time.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To make a claim for an expedited recredit under subsection (a) with respect to a substitute check, the consumer shall provide to the bank that holds the account of such consumer—

(A) a description of the claim, including an explanation of—

(i) why the substitute check was not properly charged to the consumer's account; or

(ii) the warranty claim with respect to such check;

(B) a statement that the consumer suffered a loss and an estimate of the amount of the loss;

(C) the reason why production of the original check or a better copy of the original check is necessary to determine the validity of the charge to the consumer's account or the warranty claim; and

(D) sufficient information to identify the substitute check and to investigate the claim.

(2) CLAIM IN WRITING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The bank holding the consumer account that is the subject of a claim by the consumer under subsection (a) may, in the discretion of the bank, require the consumer to submit the information required under paragraph (1) in writing.

(B) MEANS OF SUBMISSION.—A bank that requires a submission of information under subparagraph (A) may permit the consumer to make the submission electronically, if the consumer has agreed to communicate with the bank in that manner.

(c) RECREDIT TO CONSUMER.—

(1) CONDITIONS FOR RECREDIT.—The bank shall recredit a consumer account in accordance with paragraph (2) for the amount of a substitute check that was charged against the consumer account if—

(A) a consumer submits a claim to the bank with respect to that substitute check that meets the requirement of subsection (b); and

(B) the bank has not—

(i) provided to the consumer—

(I) the original check; or

(II) a copy of the original check (including an image or a substitute check) that accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check, as of the time at which the original check was truncated; and

(ii) demonstrated to the consumer that the substitute check was properly charged to the consumer account.

(2) TIMING OF RECREDIT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The bank shall recredit the consumer's account for the amount described in paragraph (1) no later than the end of the business day following the business day on which the bank determines the consumer's claim is valid.

(B) RECREDIT PENDING INVESTIGATION.—If the bank has not yet determined that the consumer's claim is valid before the end of the 10th business day after the business day on which the consumer submitted the claim, the bank shall recredit the consumer's account for—

(i) the lesser of the amount of the substitute check that was charged against the consumer account, or $2,500, together with interest if the account is an interest-bearing account, no later than the end of such 10th business day; and

(ii) the remaining amount of the substitute check that was charged against the consumer account, if any, together with interest if the account is an interest-bearing account, not later than the 45th calendar day following the business day on which the consumer submits the claim.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF RECREDIT.—

(1) NEXT BUSINESS DAY AVAILABILITY.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a bank that provides a recredit to a consumer account under subsection (c) shall make the recredited funds available for withdrawal by the consumer by the start of the next business day after the business day on which the bank recredits the consumer's account under subsection (c).

(2) SAFEGUARD EXCEPTIONS.—A bank may delay availability to a consumer of a recredit provided under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i) until the start of either the business day following the business day on which the bank determines that the consumer's claim is valid or the 45th calendar day following the business day on which the consumer submits a claim for such recredit in accordance with subsection (b), whichever is earlier, in any of the following circumstances:

(A) NEW ACCOUNTS.—The claim is made during the 30-day period beginning on the business day the consumer account was established.

(B) REPEATED OVERDRAFTS.—Without regard to the charge that is the subject of the claim for which the recredit was made—

(i) on 6 or more business days during the 6-month period ending on the date on which the consumer submits the claim, the balance in the consumer account was negative or would have become negative if checks or other charges to the account had been paid; or

(ii) on 2 or more business days during such 6-month period, the balance in the consumer account was negative or would have become negative in the amount of $5,000 or more if checks or other charges to the account had been paid.

(C) PREVENTION OF FRAUD LOSSES.—The bank has reasonable cause to believe that the claim is fraudulent, based on facts (other than the fact that the check in question or the consumer is of a particular class) that would cause a well-grounded belief in the mind of a reasonable person that the claim is fraudulent.

(3) OVERDRAFT FEES.—No bank that, in accordance with paragraph (2), delays the availability of a recredit under subsection (c) to any consumer account may impose any overdraft fees with respect to drafts drawn by the consumer on such recredited amount before the end of the 5-day period beginning on the date notice of the delay in the availability of such amount is sent by the bank to the consumer.

(e) REVERSAL OF RECREDIT.—A bank may reverse a recredit to a consumer account if the bank—

(1) determines that a substitute check for which the bank recredited a consumer account under subsection (c) was in fact properly charged to the consumer account; and

(2) notifies the consumer in accordance with subsection (f)(3).

(f) NOTICE TO CONSUMER.—

(1) NOTICE IF CONSUMER CLAIM NOT VALID.—If a bank determines that a substitute check subject to the consumer's claim was in fact properly charged to the consumer's account, the bank shall send to the consumer, no later than the business day following the business day on which the bank makes a determination—

(A) the original check or a copy of the original check (including an image or a substitute check) that—

(i) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check (as of the time the original check was truncated); or

(ii) is otherwise sufficient to determine whether or not the consumer's claim is valid; and

(B) an explanation of the basis for the determination by the bank that the substitute check was properly charged, including a statement that the consumer may request copies of any information or documents on which the bank relied in making the determination.

(2) NOTICE OF RECREDIT.—If a bank recredits a consumer account under subsection (c), the bank shall send to the consumer, no later than the business day following the business day on which the bank makes the recredit, a notice of—

(A) the amount of the recredit; and

(B) the date the recredited funds will be available for withdrawal.

(3) NOTICE OF REVERSAL OF RECREDIT.—In addition to the notice required under paragraph (1), if a bank reverses a recredited amount under subsection (e), the bank shall send to the consumer, no later than the business day following the business day on which the bank reverses the recredit, a notice of—

(A) the amount of the reversal; and

(B) the date the recredit was reversed.

(4) MODE OF DELIVERY.—A notice described in this subsection shall be delivered by United States mail or by any other means through which the consumer has agreed to receive account information.

(g) OTHER CLAIMS NOT AFFECTED.—Providing a recredit in accordance with this section shall not absolve the bank from liability for a claim made under any other law, such as a claim for wrongful dishonor under the Uniform Commercial Code, or from liability for additional damages under section 6 or 10.

(h) CLARIFICATION CONCERNING CONSUMER POSSESSION.—A consumer who was provided a substitute check may make a claim for an expedited recredit under this section with regard to a transaction involving the substitute check whether or not the consumer is in possession of the substitute check.

(i) SCOPE OF APPLICATION.—This section shall only apply to customers who are consumers.

SEC. 8. EXPEDITED RECREDIT PROCEDURES FOR BANKS.

(a) RECREDIT CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A bank may make a claim against an indemnifying bank for expedited recredit for which that bank is indemnified if—

(A) the claimant bank (or a bank that the claimant bank has indemnified) has received a claim for expedited recredit from a consumer under section 7 with respect to a substitute check or would have been subject to such a claim had the consumer's account been charged;

(B) the claimant bank has suffered a resulting loss or is obligated to recredit a consumer account under section 7 with respect to such substitute check; and

(C) production of the original check, another substitute check, or a better copy of the original check is necessary to determine the validity of the charge to the customer account or any warranty claim connected with such substitute check.

(2) 120-DAY PERIOD.—Any claim under paragraph (1) may be submitted by the claimant bank to an indemnifying bank before the end of the 120-day beginning on the date of the transaction that gave rise to the claim.

(b) PROCEDURES FOR CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To make a claim under subsection (a) for an expedited recredit relating to a substitute check, the claimant bank shall send to the indemnifying bank—

(A) a description of—

(i) the claim, including an explanation of why the substitute check cannot be properly charged to the consumer account; or

(ii) the warranty claim;

(B) a statement that the claimant bank has suffered a loss or is obligated to recredit the consumer's account under section 7, together with an estimate of the amount of the loss or recredit;

(C) the reason why production of the original check, another substitute check, or a better copy of the original check is necessary to determine the validity of the charge to the consumer account or the warranty claim; and

(D) information sufficient for the indemnifying bank to identify the substitute check and to investigate the claim.

(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COPIES OF SUBSTITUTE CHECKS.—If the information submitted by a claimant bank pursuant to paragraph (1) in connection with a claim for an expedited recredit includes a copy of any substitute check for which any such claim is made, the claimant bank shall take reasonable steps to ensure that any such copy cannot be—

(A) mistaken for the legal equivalent of the check under section 4(b); or

(B) sent or handled by any bank, including the indemnifying bank, as a forward collection or returned check.

(3) CLAIM IN WRITING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An indemnifying bank may, in the discretion of the bank, require the claimant bank to submit the information required by paragraph (1) in writing, including a copy of the written or electronically submitted claim, if any, that the consumer provided in accordance with section 7(b).

(B) MEANS OF SUBMISSION.—An indemnifying bank that requires a submission of information under subparagraph (A) may permit the claimant bank to make the submission electronically, if the claimant bank has agreed to communicate with the indemnifying bank in that manner.

(c) RECREDIT BY INDEMNIFYING BANK.—

(1) PROMPT ACTION REQUIRED.—No later than 10 business days after the business day on which an indemnifying bank receives a claim under subsection (a) from a claimant bank with respect to a substitute check, the indemnifying bank shall—

(A) provide, to the claimant bank, the original check (with respect to such substitute check) or a copy of the original check (including an image or a substitute check) that—

(i) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check (as of the time the original check was truncated); or

(ii) is otherwise sufficient to determine the bank's claim is not valid; and

(B) recredit the claimant bank for the amount of the claim up to the amount of the substitute check, plus interest if applicable; or

(C) provide information to the claimant bank as to why the indemnifying bank is not obligated to comply with subparagraph (A) or (B).

(2) RECREDIT DOES NOT ABROGATE OTHER LIABILITIES.—Providing a recredit under this subsection to a claimant bank with respect to a substitute check shall not absolve the indemnifying bank from liability for claims brought under any other law or from additional damages under section 6 or 10 with respect to such check.

(3) REFUND TO INDEMNIFYING BANK.—If a claimant bank reverses, in accordance with section 7(e), a recredit previously made to a consumer account under section 7(c), or otherwise receives a credit or recredit with regard to such substitute check, the claimant bank shall promptly refund to any indemnifying bank any amount previously advanced by the indemnifying bank in connection with such substitute check.

(d) PRODUCTION OF ORIGINAL CHECK OR A SUFFICIENT COPY GOVERNED BY SECTION 6(d).—If the indemnifying bank provides the claimant bank with the original check or a copy of the original check (including an image or a substitute check) under subsection (c)(1)(A), section 6(d) shall govern any right of the indemnifying bank to any repayment of any funds the indemnifying bank has recredited to the claimant bank pursuant to subsection (c).

SEC. 9. DELAYS IN AN EMERGENCY.

A delay by a bank beyond the time limits prescribed or permitted by this Act shall be excused if the delay is caused by interruption of communication or computer facilities, suspension of payments by another bank, war, emergency conditions, failure of equipment, or other circumstances beyond the control of a bank and if the bank uses such diligence as the circumstances require.

SEC. 10. MEASURE OF DAMAGES.

(a) LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 6, any person who, in connection with a substitute check, breaches any warranty under this Act or fails to comply with any requirement imposed by, or regulation prescribed pursuant to, this Act with respect to any other person shall be liable to such person in an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) the lesser of—

(i) the amount of the loss suffered by the other person as a result of the breach or failure; or

(ii) the amount of the substitute check; and

(B) interest and expenses (including costs and reasonable attorney's fees and other expenses of representation) related to the substitute check.

(2) OFFSET OF RECREDITS.—The amount of damages any person receives under paragraph (1), if any, shall be reduced by the amount, if any, that the claimant receives and retains as a recredit under section 7 or 8.

(b) COMPARATIVE NEGLIGENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a person incurs damages that resulted in whole or in part from the negligence or failure of that person to act in good faith, then the amount of any liability due to that person under subsection (a) shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of negligence or bad faith attributable to that person.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection reduces the rights of a consumer or any other person under the Uniform Commercial Code or other applicable provision of Federal or State law.

SEC. 11. STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND NOTICE OF CLAIM.

(a) ACTIONS UNDER THIS ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An action to enforce a claim under this Act may be brought in any United States district court, or in any other court of competent jurisdiction, before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date the cause of action accrues.

(2) ACCRUAL.—A cause of action accrues as of the date the injured party first learns, or by which such person reasonably should have learned, of the facts and circumstances giving rise to the cause of action.

(b) DISCHARGE OF CLAIMS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), unless a person gives notice of a claim to the indemnifying or warranting bank within 30 days after the person has reason to know of the claim and the identity of the indemnifying or warranting bank, the indemnifying or warranting bank is discharged from liability in an action to enforce a claim under this Act to the extent of any loss caused by the delay in giving notice of the claim.

(c) NOTICE OF CLAIM BY CONSUMER.—A timely claim by a consumer under section 7 for expedited recredit constitutes timely notice of a claim by the consumer for purposes of subsection (b).

SEC. 12. CONSUMER AWARENESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each bank shall provide, in accordance with subsection (b), a brief notice about substitute checks that describes—

(1) how a substitute check is the legal equivalent of an original check for all purposes, including any provision of any Federal or State law, and for all persons, if the substitute check—

(A) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check as of the time at which the original check was truncated; and

(B) bears the legend: 'This is a legal copy of your check. You can use it in the same way you would use the original check.'; and

(2) the consumer recredit rights established under section 7 when a consumer believes in good faith that a substitute check was not properly charged to the account of the consumer.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—

(1) EXISTING CUSTOMERS.—With respect to consumers who are customers of a bank on the effective date of this Act and who receive original checks or substitute checks, a bank shall provide the notice described in subsection (a) to each such consumer no later than the first regularly scheduled communication with the consumer after the effective date of this Act.

(2) NEW ACCOUNT HOLDERS.—A bank shall provide the notice described in subsection (a) to each consumer who will receive original checks or substitute checks, other than existing customers referred to in paragraph (1), at the time at which the customer relationship is initiated.

(3) MODE OF DELIVERY.—A bank may send the notices required by this subsection by United States mail or by any other means through which the consumer has agreed to receive account information.

(4) CONSUMERS WHO REQUEST COPIES OF CHECKS.—Notice shall be provided to each consumer of the bank that requests a copy of a check and receives a substitute check, at the time of the request.

(c) MODEL LANGUAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the end of the 9-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall publish model forms and clauses that a bank may use to describe each of the elements required by subsection (a).

(2) SAFE HARBOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A bank shall be treated as being in compliance with the requirements of subsection (a) if the bank's substitute check notice uses a model form or clause published by the Board and such model form or clause accurately describes the bank's policies and practices.

(B) DELETION OR REARRANGEMENT.—A bank may delete any information in the model form or clause that is not required by this Act or rearrange the format.

(3) USE OF MODEL LANGUAGE NOT REQUIRED.—This section shall not be construed as requiring any bank to use a model form or clause that the Board prepares under this subsection.

SEC. 13. EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.

This Act shall supersede any provision of Federal or State law, including the Uniform Commercial Code, that is inconsistent with this Act, but only to the extent of the inconsistency.

SEC. 14. VARIATION BY AGREEMENT.

(a) SECTION 8.—Any provision of section 8 may be varied by agreement of the banks involved.

(b) NO OTHER PROVISIONS MAY BE VARIED.—Except as provided in subsection (a), no provision of this Act may be varied by agreement of any person or persons.

SEC. 15. REGULATIONS.

The Board may prescribe such regulations as the Board determines to be necessary to implement, prevent circumvention or evasion of, or facilitate compliance with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 16. STUDY AND REPORT ON FUNDS AVAILABILITY.

(a) STUDY.—In order to evaluate the implementation and the impact of this Act, the Board shall conduct a study of—

(1) the percentage of total checks cleared in which the paper check is not returned to the paying bank;

(2) the extent to which banks make funds available to consumers for local and nonlocal checks prior to the expiration of maximum hold periods;

(3) the length of time within which depositary banks learn of the nonpayment of local and nonlocal checks;

(4) the increase or decrease in check-related losses over the study period; and

(5) the appropriateness of the time periods and amount limits applicable under sections 603 and 604 of the Expedited Funds Availability Act, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Before the end of the 30-month period beginning on the effective date of this Act, the Board shall submit a report to the Congress containing the results of the study conducted under this section, together with recommendations for legislative action.

SEC. 17. STATISTICAL REPORTING OF COSTS AND REVENUES FOR TRANSPORTING CHECKS BETWEEN RESERVE BANKS.

In the annual report prepared by the Board for the first full calendar year after the date of enactment of this Act and in each of the 9 subsequent annual reports by the Board, the Board shall include the amount of operating costs attributable to, and an estimate of the Federal Reserve banks' imputed revenues derived from, the transportation of commercial checks between Federal Reserve bank check processing centers.

SEC. 18. EVALUATION AND REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

(a) STUDY.—During the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall evaluate the implementation and administration of this Act, including—

(1) an estimate of the gains in economic efficiency made possible from check truncation;

(2) an evaluation of the benefits accruing to consumers and financial institutions from reduced transportation costs, longer hours for accepting deposits for credit within 1 business day, the impact of fraud losses, and an estimate of consumers' share of the total benefits derived from this Act; and

(3) an assessment of consumer acceptance of the check truncation process resulting from this Act, as well as any new costs incurred by consumers who had their original checks returned with their regular monthly statements prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Before the end of the 5-year period referred to in subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report to the Congress containing the findings and conclusions of the Comptroller General in connection with the evaluation conducted pursuant to subsection (a), together with such recommendations for legislative and administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

SEC. 19. DEPOSITARY SERVICES EFFICIENCY AND COST REDUCTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury has long compensated financial institutions for various critical depositary and financial agency services provided for or on behalf of the United States by—

(A) placing large balances, commonly referred to as ''compensating balances'', on deposit at such institutions; and

(B) using imputed interest on such funds to offset charges for the various depositary and financial agency services provided to or on behalf of the Government.

(2) As a result of sharp declines in interest rates over the last few years to record low levels, or the public debt outstanding reaching the statutory debt limit, the Department of the Treasury often has had to dramatically increase or decrease the size of the compensating balances on deposit at these financial institutions.

(3) The fluctuation of the compensating balances, and the necessary pledging of collateral by financial institutions to secure the value of compensating balances placed with those institutions, have created unintended financial uncertainty for the Secretary of the Treasury and for the management by financial institutions of their cash and securities.

(4) It is imperative that the process for providing financial services to the Government be transparent, and provide the information necessary for the Congress to effectively exercise its appropriation and oversight responsibilities.

(5) The use of direct payment for services rendered would strengthen cash and debt management responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury because the Secretary would no longer need to dramatically increase or decrease the level of such balances when interest rates fluctuate sharply or when the public debt outstanding reaches the statutory debt limit.

(6) An alternative to the use of compensating balances, such as direct payments to financial institutions, would ensure that payments to financial institutions for the services they provide would be made in a more predictable manner and could result in cost savings.

(7) Limiting the use of compensating balances could result in a more direct and cost-efficient method of obtaining those services currently provided under compensating balance arrangements.

(8) A transition from the use of compensating balances to another compensation method must be carefully managed to prevent higher-than-necessary transitional costs and enable participating financial institutions to modify their planned investment of cash and securities.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY DEPOSITARIES AND FINANCIAL AGENCIES OF THE UNITED STATES.—There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 2003 to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary for reimbursing financial institutions in their capacity as depositaries and financial agents of the United States for all services required or directed by the Secretary of the Treasury, or a designee of the Secretary, to be performed by such financial institutions on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury or another Federal agency, including services rendered before fiscal year 2004.

(c) ORDERLY TRANSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As appropriations authorized in subsection (b) become available, the Secretary of the Treasury shall promptly begin the process of phasing in the use of the appropriations to pay financial institutions serving as depositaries and financial agents of the United States, and transitioning from the use of compensating balances to fund these services.

(2) POST-TRANSITION USE LIMITED TO EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Following the transition to the use of the appropriations authorized in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury may use the compensating balances to pay financial institutions serving as depositaries and financial agents of the United States only in extraordinary situations where the Secretary determines that they are needed to ensure the fiscal operations of the Government continue to function in an efficient and effective manner.

(B) REPORT.—Any use of compensating balances pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall promptly be reported by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR ORDERLY TRANSITION.—In transitioning to the use of the appropriations authorized in subsection (b), the Secretary of the Treasury shall take such steps as may be appropriate to—

(A) prevent abrupt financial disruption to the functions of the Department of the Treasury or to the participating financial institutions; and

(B) maintain adequate accounting and management controls to ensure that payments to financial institutions for their banking services provided to the Government as depositaries and financial agents are accurate and that the arrangements last no longer than is necessary.

(4) REPORTS REQUIRED.—

(A) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report to the Congress on the use of compensating balances and on the use of appropriations authorized in subsection (b) during that fiscal year.

(ii) INCLUSION IN BUDGET.—The report required under clause (i) may be submitted as part of the budget submitted by the President under section 1105 of the title 31, United States Code, for the following fiscal year and if so, the report shall be submitted concurrently to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(B) FINAL REPORT FOLLOWING TRANSITION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Following completion of the transition from the use of compensating balances to the use of the appropriations authorized in subsection (b) to pay financial institutions for their services as depositaries and financial agents of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit a report on the transition to the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate.

(ii) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report submitted under clause (i) shall include a detailed analysis of—

(I) the cost of transition;

(II) the direct costs of the services being paid from the appropriations authorized in subsection (b); and

(III) the benefits realized from the use of direct payment for such services, rather than the use of compensating balance arrangements.

(d) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The 2d undesignated paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 412) is amended—

(1) in the 3d sentence, by inserting ''or any other asset of a Federal reserve bank'' before the period at the end; and

(2) in the last sentence, by inserting '', or are otherwise held by or on behalf of,'' after ''in the vaults of''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding section 20, this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act.

And the Senate agree to the same.

For consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
SPENCER BACHUS,
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE,
MELISSA A. HART,
PATRICK J. TIBERI,
BARNEY FRANK,
HAROLD E. FORD, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
WAYNE ALLARD,
PAUL S. SARBANES,
TIM JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1474), to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The Managers on the part of the House and the Senate met on October 1, 2003 (the House chairing), and reconciled the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment.

The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS; FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

House Bill

Section 1 of the House bill establishes the short title of the bill, the ''Check Clearing for the 21st Century Act,'' or the ''Check 21 Act'', and provides the findings and purposes of the legislation.

Senate Amendment

Section 1 of the Senate amendment provides the short title of the bill, the ''Check Truncation Act of 2003'', and a table of contents. Section 2 of the Senate amendment also provides the findings and purposes of the legislation.

Conference Agreement

The Senate recedes to the House.

DEFINITIONS

House Bill

Section 2 of the House bill defines certain terms, including ''substitute check,'' ''reconverting bank,'' ''collecting bank,'' ''depositary bank,'' ''claimant bank,'' and ''truncate.''

Senate Amendment

Section 3 of the Senate amendment defines certain terms, including ''indemnifying bank'', ''MICR line'', ''reconverting bank'', ''truncate'' and ''substitute check''.

Conference Agreement

The House recedes to the Senate with an amendment removing the definition of ''claimant bank''.

GENERAL PROVISIONS GOVERNING SUBSTITUTE CHECKS

House Bill

Section 3 of the House bill allows a person to deposit, present, or send for collection or return a substitute check without an agreement with the recipient. This section mandates that a substitute check have the legal equivalence of an original check if the substitute check: (i) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check at the time the original check was truncated; and (ii) contains the legend ''this is a copy of your check. You can use it the same way you would use the original check.''

The reconverting bank must ensure that the substitute check bears all the endorsements applied by all of the parties that previously handled the check and must identify itself as the reconverting bank.

Senate Amendment

Section 4 of the Senate amendment allows a person to deposit, present or send for collection or return a substitute check without an agreement with the recipient. This section mandates that a substitute check have the legal equivalence of an original check if the substitute check: (i) accurately represents all of the information on the front and back of the original check at the time the original check was truncated; and (ii) contains the legend ''this is a copy of your check. You can use it the same way you would use the original check.''

The reconverting bank must ensure that the substitute check bears all the endorsements applied by all of the parties that previously handled the check and shall identify itself as the reconverting bank.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

SUBSTITUTE CHECK WARRANTIES

House Bill

Section 4 of the House bill provides that a bank that transfers, presents or returns a substitute check and receives consideration for the check is deemed to have warranted that the substitute check meets all requirements for legal equivalence and that no entity will be asked to make a payment on a check already paid.

Senate Amendment

Section 5 of the Senate amendment states that a bank that transfers, presents or returns a substitute check and receives consideration for the check is deemed to have warranted that the substitute check meets all requirements for legal equivalence and that no entity will be asked to make a payment on a check already paid.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

INDEMNITY

House Bill

Section 5 of the House bill grants an indemnity to the transferee by a reconverting bank and each bank that subsequently transfers, presents or returns a substitute check and receives consideration for the transfer, presentment, or return up to either the amount of the loss proximately caused by the breach of the warranty provided in section 4 or, in the absence of such a breach, the amount of any loss up to the amount of the substitute check plus any interest or expenses.

This section also allows for comparative negligence if a loss results in whole or in part from the negligence or failure to act in good faith on the part of the indemnified party, reducing that party's indemnification by the amount of negligence or bad faith.

Senate Amendment

Section 6 of the Senate amendment bill grants an indemnity to the transferee by a reconverting bank and each bank that subsequently transfers, presents or returns a substitute check and receives consideration for such transfer, presentment or return up to either the amount of the loss proximately caused by the breach of the warranty provided in section 4 or, in the absence of such a breach, the amount of any loss up to the amount of the substitute check plus any interest or expenses.

This section also allows for comparative negligence if a loss results in whole or in part from the negligence or failure to act in good faith on the part of the indemnified party, reducing that party's indemnification by the amount of negligence or bad faith. Section 6(c)(2) of this section states that nothing in the comparative negligence provisions of section 6(c)(1) reduces consumer's rights under other laws.

Conference Agreement

The House recedes to the Senate.

EXPEDITED RECREDIT FOR CONSUMERS

House Bill

Section 6 of the House bill provides an expedited recredit to a consumer if the consumer asserts that the bank charged the customer's account improperly or the customer has a warranty claim with respect to the substitute check. The customer must show that they suffered a loss and that the production of the original or a better copy of the original is necessary to determine the validity of any claim. This claim must be made within 30 days after receiving their periodic statement and may have an additional 30 days to file a claim under extenuating circumstances. According to this section, if the bank has not determined if the claim is valid within 10 business days, the bank must recredit the lesser of the amount charged, or $2,500 with interest and any remaining amount must be recredited within 45 calendar days. Additionally, a consumer does not have to be in possession of the substitute check in order to make a claim.

Senate Amendment

Section 7 of the Senate amendment requires the consumer to make a claim for expedited recredit within 40 days after the bank transmits the periodic statement or receipt of the substitute check, whichever is later. Under extenuating circumstances, including extended travel or illness of the consumer, the bank shall extend the period for a reasonable amount of time.

Section 7(c)(1)(B) requires that banks do not have to provide copies of documentation relied upon in denying an expedited recredit claim. Instead, a bank must provide a statement of right of the consumer to request such documentation.

Conference Agreement

The Conference Agreement consists of the Senate provisions relating to (1) the time period for expedited recredit; (2) the extension of the time period for expedited recredit; and (3) allowing electronic submission of expedited recredit claims. Further, the Conference Agreement provides that, when resolving customer claims, the delivered copy of the original check must read that the check ''accurately represents all the information'' on the original check standard and that the bank does not have to provide copies of documentation relied upon in denying expedited recredit claim. Instead, a bank must provide a statement of the right of the consumer to request such documentation.

The Conference Agreement also adopts the House provision providing that a consumer who receives a substitute check does not need to currently have the substitute check to make a claim for expedited recredit.

EXPEDITED RECREDIT PROCEDURES FOR BANKS

House Bill

Section 7 of the House bill permits a bank to make a claim against an indemnifying bank for an expedited recredit if the claimant's customer has made a claim for recredit, the claimant bank has suffered a loss, and production of the original check, a substitute check or a better copy of the check is necessary to determine the validity of the charge. This claim must be made within 120 days of the transaction. This claim must be in writing and must describe the claim and demonstrate a loss.

Senate Amendment

Section 8 of the Senate amendment permits a bank to make a claim against an indemnifying bank for an expedited recredit if the claimant's customer has made a claim for recredit, the claimant bank has suffered a loss, and production of the original check, a substitute check or a better copy of the check is necessary to determine the validity of the charge. This claim must be made within 120 days of the transaction. This claim must be in writing and must describe the claim and demonstrate a loss.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

DELAYS IN AN EMERGENCY

House Bill

Section 8 of the House bill permits delays in compliance with the provisions of this legislation if they are caused by circumstances beyond the control of a bank, and if the bank used such diligence as the circumstances require.

Senate Amendment

Section 9 of the Senate amendment permits delays in compliance with the provisions of this legislation if they are caused by circumstances beyond the control of a bank, and if the bank used such diligence as the circumstances require.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

MEASURE OF DAMAGES

House Bill

Section 9 of the House bill makes persons who breach a warranty or fail to comply with the bill, or regulations under the bill, liable for the lesser of the amount of the loss or the amount of the substitute check plus interest and expenses. This section applies a comparative negligence standard for the determination of damages.

Senate Amendment

Section 10 of the Senate amendment makes persons who breach a warranty or fail to comply with the bill, or regulations under the bill, liable for the lesser of the amount of the loss or the amount of the substitute check plus interest and expenses. This section applies a comparative negligence standard for the determination of damages.

The amendment also provides that nothing in the comparative negligence provision of section 10(b)(1) reduces consumer's rights under other laws.

Conference Agreement

The House recedes to the Senate.

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS AND NOTICE OF CLAIM

House Bill

Section 10 of the House bill provides for a 1 year statute of limitations from the time that the customer learns of the claim.

Senate Amendment

Section 11 of the Senate amendment provides for a 1 year statute of limitations from the time that the customer learns of the claim.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

CONSUMER AWARENESS

House Bill

Section 11 of the House bill requires that each bank provide notice to its customers describing the process of check substitution and a description of the consumer recredit provision. This section applies to both new and existing customers.

Senate Amendment

Section 12 of the Senate amendment states that notice to consumers only has to be sent if consumers get their original checks or substitute checks back in their periodic statements.

Banks also must provide notice to customers that request a copy of a check and receive a substitute check from the bank.

Banks must provide customers that receive original checks or substitute checks with a brief informative notice for the first three years that the Act is in effect.

Conference Agreement

The Conference Agreement adopts the House position regarding the permanance of the consumer notice provisions.

The Conference Agreement also merges language from Senate section 12(b)(1)(C) and House section 11(b). The Conference Agreement adopts the Senate provision regarding the 9 month time frame within which the FRB must publish model language and requiring notice to include (i) description of substitute check process; and (ii) description of consumer recredit rights.

EFFECT ON OTHER LAW

House Bill

Section 12 of the House bill supersedes any inconsistent Federal or State laws to the extent of the inconsistency.

Senate Amendment

Section 13 of the Senate amendment supersedes any inconsistent Federal or State laws to the extent of the inconsistency.

Conference Agreement

This provision is not in disagreement.

VARIATION BY AGREEMENT

House Bill

Section 13 of the House bill permits provisions of section 7 to be varied by the banks involved.

Senate Amendment

Section 17 of the Senate amendment permits provisions of section 8 to be varied by the banks involved.

Conference Agreement

The Conference Agreement makes only technical changes related to cross-references and maintains the substance of both provisions.

REGULATIONS

House Bill

Section 14 of the House bill allows the Federal Reserve to write regulations related to the operation of this legislation. Additionally, the Federal Reserve is required to report on the increased speed of check processing and the prices it charges for transportation services.

Senate Amendment

Sections 14 and 15 of the Senate amendment allows the Federal Reserve to regulate the operation of this legislation. However, it differs in the study and monitoring of funds available. The Senate amendment mandates a study of implementation of the Act, including impact on funds availability.

Conference Agreement

The Conference Agreement adopts the Senate provisions regarding the authority of the Federal Reserve to issue regulations as it deems necessary to implement, prevent, circumvent or evasion of, or facilitate compliance with the legislation and the reporting requirements.

The Conferees also agree to a provision which requires the Federal Reserve Board to publish statistical data on costs and revenue related to transporting commercial checks (exclusive of the checks the reserve banks handle as fiscal agents) between Federal Reserve Bank offices by air or ground couriers. In the past, such statistics have been of interest to certain organizations. This provision does not mandate specific methodologies for imputing or estimating revenues. Further, this section does not change the Monetary Control Act's requirement that the Federal Reserve Banks, over the long run, recover the costs of their priced services

or affect the Federal Reserve Board's ability under its pricing principles to determine what constitutes a major service category.

The House recedes to the Senate on a funds availability study.

EVALUATION AND REPORT BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

House Bill

The House bill contains no similar provision.

Senate Amendment

Section 16 of the Senate amendment provides for the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the implementation and administration of this bill within 5 years.

Conference Agreement

The House recedes to the Senate.

DEPOSITARY SERVICES EFFICIENCY AND COST REDUCTION

House Bill

The House bill contains no similar provision.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains no similar provision.

Conference Agreement.

The Conference Agreement includes langue requested by the Department of Treasury which authorizes the Treasury Department to directly compensate financial institutions that provide depositary services to the Federal Government.

Additionally, the Conference Agreement includes language requested by Federal Reserve Board to effect technical changes to the Federal Reserve Act in the way currency is collateralized which will allow for greater liquidity in case of a national emergency.

EFFECTIVE DATE

House Bill

Section 15 establishes the effective date as 18 months after the date of enactment.

Senate Amendment

Section 18 establishes the effective date as 12 months after the date of enactment.

Conference Agreement

The House recedes to the Senate.

For consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

MICHAEL G. OXLEY,
SPENCER BACHUS,
STEVEN C. LATOURETTE,
MELISSA A. HART,
PATRICK J. TIBERI,
BARNEY FRANKS,
HAROLD E. FORD, JR.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD C. SHELBY,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
WAYNE ALLARD,
PAUL S. SARBANES,
TIM JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY. addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CALLING ON REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP TO BRING H.R. 303, A BILL TO END CONCURRENT RECEIPT, TO THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. WATERS. Madam Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about an issue of fundamental unfairness which burdens many of our veterans: concurrent receipt. I organized this Special Order to focus attention on the unfairness of the concurrent receipt law and to give Members the opportunity to demand that the Republican leadership bring to the floor H.R. 303, the bill that would end concurrent receipt.

Madam Speaker, today we will hear Democratic Members from districts throughout the Nation call for an end of concurrent receipt. Concurrent receipt is a Civil War-era law that prevents disabled veterans from receiving both military retirement and veterans disability benefits. Under the law, for every dollar that a veteran receives in disability pay, $1 is taken away from their retirement pay. The effect of the concurrent receipt law is to tax a veteran for being injured while serving in the military. This is an extremely unfair burden that we place on our wounded veterans.

Madam Speaker, America's veterans have made huge sacrifices in order to protect our freedoms. We should not repay their sacrifice by denying them the benefits they have earned and deserve. Congress must repeal the concurrent receipt law.

Over the past several years, there has been a strong bipartisan effort to repeal this law. In this Congress, the bill to repeal concurrent receipt, H.R. 303, has 370 cosponsors. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), a longtime Republican Member, is a sponsor of H.R. 303. Madam Speaker, 370 cosponsors is an extraordinary number of cosponsors for any bill. As all of us know, there are few bills introduced in this body that have 370 cosponsors. There are even fewer bills that do not come to the floor for action by Members of the House.

Yet despite this tremendous bipartisan support, the House Republican leadership, as well as the White House, has refused to support this bill. In fact, the Secretary of Defense has said that he would recommend that the President veto any legislation that includes language which would eliminate concurrent receipt. The House Republican leadership continues to ignore the will of the Members, and our constituents, and refuses even to allow H.R. 303 to come to the floor for action.

The opponents of this bill say that it will cost too much money. They cite a study from the Congressional Budget Office which estimates that it would cost the Federal Government $3 billion in fiscal year 2004 to cover the 400,000 eligible veterans. It is incredible that the opponents would offer such a poor excuse for why they refuse even to bring this bill to the floor.

□ 1745

Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker and Members, the Bush administration has spent almost $80 billion in Iraq and Afghanistan and is seeking a supplemental appropriation of $87 billion for the war in Iraq and Iraqi reconstruction. Yet, the administration will not seek the resources required to protect the retirement pay of veterans who had the misfortune of becoming disabled while serving their country. What a cruel, sick joke. These veterans earn their retirement pay, and they deserve both a full retirement benefit and their disability compensation.

We must not walk away from our obligations. How can we put a price on the service that these men and women gave to our country? How can we put a price on going through life without a limb or without the ability to see or hear? They did their job with bravery and dedication. Now, we must do ours. The Federal Government should provide full benefits to veterans who protected our people. Simple fairness and decency requires it.

Because of the opposition of the Republican leadership to this bill, Democrats have had to file a discharge petition in an attempt to bring H.R. 303 to the floor and force consideration of this bill. A successful discharge petition requires 218 signatures. To date, however, even though H.R. 303 has 370 cosponsors, there are only 203 signatures on the discharge petition.

Nearly every Democrat has signed the discharge petition, but only two Republicans have signed. Because of the opposition of the Republican leadership, not even Congressman BILIRAKIS, the sponsor of H.R. 303, has signed the discharge petition.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful that the Republican leadership has strong-armed their Members into not supporting the discharge petition on H.R. 303 and prevented the Congress from providing this essential relief to our veterans.

The Republican leadership's unfair and outrageous refusal to bring H.R. 303 to the floor for action is harming our veterans and keeping many veterans from obtaining a decent quality of life. Unfortunately, there are hundreds of thousands of veterans suffering under the concurrent receipt law. Because the United States military is committed to missions throughout the world that will result in additional veterans becoming disabled, the number of veterans who will be subjected to this tax will only grow.

Unfortunately, this is only one of the many policies that this administration and the Republican party have adopted which harms our veterans. For example, although it is not uncommon for a

veteran to wait 6 months or more to see a doctor, the Republicans' budget did not provide enough funding to shorten these waiting periods.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing to see the President constantly using our veterans for photo-ops, but when it comes to providing the necessary funding to give our veterans a good quality of life, the Republicans are nowhere to be found.

We, Democrats, have another way. We appreciate the sacrifice that all veterans have made and believe that the government must provide the necessary funding for veterans to receive the medical, educational, and other benefits they need and deserve. We particularly appreciate the men and women who were injured while serving their country and believe we should provide them with their full retirement benefits, as well as their full disability compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to pass H.R. 303 and help our disabled veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for calling this special order together because it is a very important subject.

Today in Iraq, our Nation is creating more than 130,000 veterans. These future veterans are fulfilling their duty to America in a time of war. We must commit to fulfill our own responsibilities to them in times of peace.

Three hundred and seventy Members of the House of Representatives are on record supporting a concurrent receipt bill to provide full health and retirement benefits for our Nation's veterans, but when the time came to actually bring this important legislation before the House of Representatives for a vote, 201 Democrats and only two Republicans signed their names to bring the bill to the floor of the House. It takes 218 names and signatures in order to force the majority party to bring this issue before us.

Concurrent receipt should not be a Democrat issue, and it should not be a Republican issue. Instead, this is an issue of fulfilling our commitment to those who have proven their commitment to us, to our Nation's veterans. The White House has estimated the health and retirement benefits for our veterans will cost $58 billion over the next 10 years. That is $6 billion a year to support the troops who have sacrificed for this country.

This is the same President that recently came to the Congress requesting $87 billion to pay for our war in Iraq that he announced many months ago had ended. The President's $87 billion supplemental request includes money for museums and memorials in Iraq, radios and phones for Iraqi businesses, and computer training and graduate school for Iraqi citizens. Certainly, we must invest in restoring the stability in a war-torn country, but these programs are not more important than health care for America's veterans.

What kind of message does this sent to our veterans and our troops currently in the field when the President tells them that paying for Iraqis to go to graduate school is more important than paying for veteran's health care? We are talking about men and women who fought for America, who were wounded for America, who have lost friends who have died for America. But when the time comes to pay their health bills, America's purse is shot. This is worse than irresponsible. It is downright dishonorable.

President Bush said last year that every country around the world, and I quote him, ''is either with us or against us,'' unquote. Our veterans deserve to ask the same question. ''Mr. President, are you with America's veterans or against them? Will you fight for them the way they are fighting for you?''

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask several questions. Why does the Republican leadership in this House want to put an additional tax on our veterans? Why does the Republican leadership in this House oppose eliminating the disabled veterans tax? Why is it okay to eliminate taxes for millionaires in this country, our most privileged, but not eliminate tax for our veterans? Why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why?

Mr. Speaker, as you know, under current law, disabled American veterans who are entitled to military retirement benefits have their retirement benefits reduced dollar for dollar by the amount they receive in disability payments. Now, they earn their military retirement, and they earn disability pay. However, these amounts are all set against each other.

Why does the Republican leadership and the administration support such a situation for our veterans in this country?

Military retirees and veterans with service-connected disabilities are the only Federal employees subject to this offset and are essentially funding their own disability benefits. They are funding their disability with their own money that they earned serving this country. As a result, the disabled veterans tax, that is supported by the administration and the Republican leadership, subjects our Nation's veterans to worse treatment than any other class of Federal retirees, bar none.

The Bush administration contends that allowing military veterans to draw their earned benefits is too costly, and it competes with funding that we need for other very important matters, such as tax cuts for millionaires.

A dollar is a dollar. While the Republican leadership has concluded that devoting $58 billion over 10 years to relieve an unconscionable burden for nearly 700,000 of our Nation's veterans is a budget buster, they see absolutely no problem of giving away approximately $90 billion over that same period to 184,000 people in this country that are making $1 million or more per year. The hypocrisy of that is shocking. It is galling, and it is shameful.

The other body is doing the right thing. In its version of the fiscal year 2004 Defense authorization legislation, the Senate has provided for full and immediate disability payments without any offset from the military retirement benefit to which they are entitled. That is doing the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, we can do the right thing in this House. We can stand up for the veterans against the Republican leadership, Mr. Speaker, and against the administration, and say we are going to do the right thing. We are fighting to pass bipartisan legislation on this side, H.R. 303, the Retired Pay Restoration Act, to help the more than 700,000 disabled veterans who are military retirees.

We believe on this side that it is important that our disabled military retirees receive both the disability pay and retirement pay that they have earned and that they deserve. It is critical for the administration to stop penalizing our disabled veterans at the very time we have our military in harm's way. We have to stop penalizing disabled veterans, if we are going to fulfill our commitment to those who served the country. Let us respect our veterans. Let us do the right thing and give our veterans what they have earned.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and my colleagues for organizing this very important special order, because I believe the information brought forward in this debate will be of great surprise to most of the people that might happen to listen to this discussion. Certainly, the people I represent in North Dakota, I believe, are largely unaware of the fact that we, essentially, have a disabled veterans tax.

This tax is imposed when you have someone that has earned a military retirement and on the other hand also had a disability payment from service in the military as a result of a service-connected injury resulting in permanent disability. The disabled veterans tax occurs when you have a 100 percent reduction of the retirement benefit by the disability payment receipt.

So let me make it simple. The injured veteran receiving a disability payment would, upon retiring from the military, have their military retirement reduced 100 percent by the amount of the disability payment. Now, if that is not a disabled veterans tax, I do not know what is. And it is completely unacceptable. There is not another classification of Federal employee treated in this fashion. There is

not a civil service employee upon getting their Federal retirement that would have their Federal retirement reduced by their military disability. Only those who have made a career of distinction and honor in serving our military have their retirement reduced 100 percent in the value of the disability benefit received.

We have to change this bill. This is a law that is on the books that is having a pernicious and unfair effect on our veterans. We need to act and we need to act now.

I commend the Republican sponsor of the legislation that wants to address this for bringing this before the Chamber. I am certainly pleased to participate. It ought to be bipartisan, if anything before us should be bipartisan.

□ 1800

Unfortunately, we have seen majority leadership refuse to bring this matter up for a vote. In fact, notwithstanding the very strong support reflected by the number of cosponsors, as reflected by the number of signatures on the discharge petition, we have seen them refuse to allow us for a vote.

Is it not ironic that as we seek to advance this very important relief for our veterans, we are not even allowed a vote on this matter? Our veterans are fighting, have fought, for democracy; our soldiers today are fighting for democracy, and yet when it comes to this important question, the majority leadership is not allowing democracy in this House because they are not allowing us to vote on this proposition.

In order to bust through this deadlock imposed by the majority leadership, we have brought forward a discharge petition which has now been signed by 203 Members of the House, including two Republican Members, all of the Democratic Members and two Republican Members.

I would ask the majority leadership if at least you will not allow us a vote, for goodness sake, discharge your members. Let them vote their conscience by signing a discharge petition and bringing it to the floor over your expressed wishes to the contrary. Let them serve their constituents on this one, not the majority leadership. Let them represent the veterans in their districts that are having their benefits unfairly taxed by the Federal Government.

Finally, if that is too much to ask, if it is too much to ask to bring this to a vote, if it is too much to ask to allow majority leadership to discharge their Members, to sign a discharge petition, then I would say to my friends in the majority, on this one you have to stand with your people irrespective of your leadership. Come up to the well. Sign the discharge petition. You have veterans who are having their retirement benefits reduced and reduced unfairly, reduced for suffering a service-connected disability. This must end.

If your leadership cannot see that, surely you can. And if you have questions about it, all you have to do is ask the veterans organizations so capably representing the veterans in your district. Ask your American Legion commander what he thinks of this matter. Ask the Veterans of Foreign Wars commander what they think of this matter. Ask the Disabled Veterans of America in your district what they think of this matter. That will quickly bring you to the conclusion that it is time for this tax to end. It is time for this House to have some democracy on this question. It is time for us to vote on getting the veterans the relief they need and they so richly deserve.

I thank the gentlewoman for letting me participate in this discussion.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this body to seriously consider our treatment of those who sacrificed nearly everything for our country. I am referring to America's disabled veterans and the archaic law that prevents them from receiving both their retirement pension and disability compensation, two payments that they earned.

Unfortunately, across our Nation, hundreds of thousands of veterans are denied their full retirement pay because we have yet to correct a senseless law passed 112 years ago. In California's 53rd Congressional District, a district that I am very proud to represent, 2,659 disabled veterans collectively lose out on $13 million in VA benefits each year.

Since coming to Congress, I have heard from my veterans and I can tell you many of them struggle to get by each month because our government withholds so much from their pensions. Please understand, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the brave men and women who sustained the most severe injuries to defend this Nation and to protect our liberties.

Take, for example, a 69-year-old Air Force lieutenant colonel from San Diego who has a 100 percent disability rating from exposure to Agent Orange during the Vietnam War. After 28 years of dedication, he retired only to learn that it was true. His hard-earned retirement pay would be offset dollar for dollar from his disability compensation. This proud veteran wrote me just recently and told me that he has finally given up on this government. He has communicated with his elected leaders about this inequity ever since he retired, and unfortunately, he has been told the same thing over and over again. Do not worry. Legislation is pending. We will pass concurrent receipt soon and take care of this for you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it has been 17 years since he retired and nothing has been done. It is time to show our disabled veterans that we value the incredible sacrifice they made and are making for us. It is time to repeal the disabled veterans tax and end this mistreatment once and for all.

Right now, this Congress is faced with the ability to finally deliver meaningful concurrent receipt legislation to the President. We need only a few more signatures on the discharge petition to bring the Retired Pay Restoration Act to the House floor. I urge my colleagues to sign this petition and take us a step closer to overturning this inequity.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this forward.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for taking the leadership on this, as she has done on so many issues in this Congress.

I want to add my voice to urge all of our colleagues to listen to the voice of our veterans. Find it in your hearts once and for all, this unjust disabled veterans tax.

A resident of my congressional district, the 51st in California, in San Diego, named Miguel Gonzalez, was wounded in service and declared eligible for VA disability compensation. After retiring from the military, he was also entitled to his retired pay, as every American is entitled to their retired pay. But unlike every other Federal employee, Mr. Speaker, for every dollar that he receives in his disability compensation, he gives back to the government a dollar from his retirement. What an unfair and demoralizing tax on the brief bravest and best in our Nation.

Today this tax is especially galling as we ask and expect our young men and women to fight the threats of terrorism. There has recently been an uproar, justifiably, about the charge that wounded servicemembers were billed for their hospital bills as they lay recovering from their wounds. They got a bill for the food while they were in the hospital.

I cannot see any difference between that case and the case we are talking about this evening, except that the disabled veterans tax costs our servicemembers much more than the hospital bill that we were so upset by. Why were we expecting the young men and women who spent the better part of their lives in service to their country to pay for their own retirement? It does not make sense, and it is an insult to these veterans.

Last year we passed this concurrent receipt in the House and in the Senate, and in a secret conference committee backed by the President of the United States it was removed. The will of the Congress, the will of the American people was frustrated by a secret meeting of a few people in concert with the White House.

Now we are trying a new process: 200 of our colleagues have signed the discharge petition, a process to get this to the floor in spite of the leadership's unwillingness to do so. We can get, with 218 signatures, we can move this bill

from the committee where it is stalled, to the full House of Representatives for a vote. We know it will pass, 370 members of this body have already signed on to it. A lot of them do not seem to have the courage to sign the discharge petition and that should not even be necessary.

It is shameful that we must resort to such a means to get a vote on this bill which would end this disabled veterans tax.

We are told that this bill will cost money. What does not? But it is a matter of priorities. We are willing to give our troops everything for their fighting in Iraq, now it is $87 billion for the next few months, but why are we not willing to give them all they need when they return home? What is our highest priority if not caring for our Nation's veterans? It seems to be tax cuts for the wealthiest of us all.

We must send a message to the men and women who right this moment are fighting in Iraq. They did not hesitate when called to duty. Many are serving much longer than anticipated. Some are returning home with disabilities that they will have to live with for the rest of their life.

What kind of nation are we? We must tell them that we value their service and that we value them. We must let them know that their Nation will honor them, not just in word, but in deed. Service-connected military retirees, I think we all know, have earned their retirement pay. They deserve their disability compensation. Let us not make them wait any longer for justice to prevail. We must end the disabled veterans tax.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for organizing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that is very important to the veterans that I represent. In my district, Las Vegas, Nevada, I hear from veterans every day regarding the disabled veterans tax.

Las Vegas has one of the fastest growing veterans populations in the country, and about 2,500 of these brave veterans lose military retirement benefits due to this unjust tax. Each of these individuals who was disabled due to service to our Nation loses thousands of dollars every year. That is thousands of dollars that can cover their health care costs, enable them to support their families, pay their rents, buy food and improve the quality of their lives.

Under this unfair tax, disabled veterans who retire from the military lose $1 from their military retirement pay for every dollar they receive for a service-connected disability. When a retired Marine Corps major from Nevada was diagnosed with Lou Gehrig's disease, he lost more than $2,000 in monthly retirement pay because of the disabled veterans tax. To make up for that loss of income, his wife, instead of being able to cut back on her hours so that she could care for him, instead she had to work overtime just to make ends meet at home.

But as unfair as this tax is to our disabled military retirees, what is more shocking, what is more unconscionable is the Republican leadership that will not let us vote on this legislation that would correct this long-standing inequity.

There are over 300 cosponsors of H.R. 303 which would eliminate the disabled veterans tax. And more than 200 members of Congress have signed the discharge petition to force H.R. 303 onto the floor for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership says they support veterans and they say they support ending the disabled veterans tax, yet they refuse to do what is right for veterans and bring H.R. 303 to the floor for a vote.

I invite my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to stand up and take care of the folks back home. The Republican leadership must put this bill on the floor for a vote. We should honor the commitments that we made to those who fought and are currently fighting around the world for our great Nation.

Support for our veterans is more than rousing rhetoric. It is more than a photo op. It is doing what is fair and moral to fulfill our duties and promises to them. We owe it to our veterans to keep our word, and Congress must take action to end this unfair tax on our veterans. We must take action now.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from California (Ms. WATERS) for yielding to me.

We are talking about ending the disabled veterans tax. Now, there may be people listening or watching who do not fully understand what we mean when we say disabled veterans tax. Well, let me just explain it briefly.

We know that disabled military retirees are the only Federal employees forced to pay for their own disability. Dollar for dollar they have got to give up their pension benefits in order to collect their disability benefits. We know that over 600,000, maybe some of them are watching today, 600,000 disabled veterans across this country, 10,000 disabled veterans in my State of Ohio, are paying millions of dollars every year because of this tax that we are trying to eliminate.

We know that the administration and the President himself, the President cannot escape this issue.

□ 1815

The Bush administration has told Congress that if we pass legislation to eliminate this unfair disabled veterans' tax, that the President will veto the legislation.

So what is Congress going to do? What are we going to do? Most of my Democratic colleagues have signed what we call a discharge petition. When the leadership of this House refuses to bring a bill to the floor, we have a mechanism called the discharge petition, and if we can get 218 Members of this House to sign that petition, that bill comes to the floor automatically.

How many have signed this discharge petition? Two hundred and three Members have signed this petition. We need 218 signatures to bring the bill to the floor. How many Republicans have signed this petition? Only two. Two hundred and one Democrats have signed the petition, only two Members of the Republican party. I am proud to say that every Democrat from the State of Ohio has signed this petition, and I am disappointed that not a single Republican from the State of Ohio has signed the discharge petition.

Why are they not signing the petition? I suspect it is because their leadership is telling them that they better had not, they better had not buck the leadership, there is a price to pay if they go against the leadership. Who are we here to represent, the leadership of the Republican party or the men and women, especially the disabled veterans, who have voted for us and sent us to represent them in this Chamber?

People listening may think, well, this is just a Democrat harangue against the Republicans, this is just a partisan issue, but I have, here in my hands, a news release that was sent out by the national veterans' groups. I will tell my colleagues who they are: The AMVETS, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Vietnam Veterans of America. They put a heading on their press release that is pretty strong. They say, Congress declares war against disabled veterans, and I would like to share with my colleagues just some of the things these national representatives of the veterans have said in their press release.

They begin by saying, The House majority leadership has shown callous contempt for the sacrifices of America's defenders by attempting to impose overly restrictive conditions that would limit benefits for disabilities from military service. That is what these organizations say.

They continue, An untold number of men and women will return from Iraq and the war on terror with disabilities. The military and veterans' organizations worry that many of them will not be able to directly identify or prove the origin of their ailments, but that certainly does not mean that they should be ignored. Any suggestion to the contrary is outrageous and shameful, they say.

Then they conclude their press release by saying, Our Nation is engaged in a war with a hostile enemy that would willingly kill innocent civilians. Yet it seems that some members of our government would shortchange those who protect us.

They continue, Disabled veterans should not have to fight their own government for the benefits they have earned. In a callous effort to limit government's obligations to our former, current and future defenders, authors of the provision in the Defense authorization bill took it upon themselves to rewrite the law regarding benefits for disabled veterans.

That is what the national veterans' organizations are saying. This is not just a Democratic attack upon the Republican leadership or upon the President. We can solve this problem quickly. If we just had a few more Republicans who would walk down here to the well of the House and put their signatures on this discharge petition, within a matter of hours that bill would be brought to this floor, and we could end the disabled veterans' tax.

Probably a lot of veterans are watching today or families of veterans or just simply Americans who care about veterans. I think it is fair for me to point out that President Bush is willing to spend millions in Iraq to develop a ZIP code system, but he is not willing to spend for America's veterans. He is willing to spend millions building roads in Iraq, but he is neglecting to provide for our veterans. He is willing to spend millions to build hospitals and clinics in Iraq, but he is unwilling to support eliminating this disabled veterans' tax.

We need to get our priorities right, and I hope the people in this country start letting the Members of this House who are unwilling to sign this discharge petition know how they feel about it. Every Member of this House who goes back to their Districts this weekend should be confronted with veterans saying, sir or ma'am, have you signed the discharge petition, and if you have not, why not?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this issue goes beyond politics. I sincerely respect and honor the active and retired members of our Armed Forces, as well as their families. I believe they deserve the respect of all Americans, and that respect should be demonstrated through words and actions.

The concurrent receipts issue was new to me when I first took Federal office. Learning about a policy that is tantamount to taxing veterans for being disabled infuriates me, and ending it simply makes sense. That is why I chose to cosponsor H.R. 303 and look forward to its passage in the House.

I am obviously not the only Member of this Chamber to feel this way. H.R. 303 has 366 cosponsors which is about as bipartisan as legislation can get these days. The idea of ending this disability tax appears to make sense to a supermajority, and we should have passed it months ago.

Here we are again, in yet another Congress, with concurrent receipts locked up in committee since January of this year, a full nine months ago. Our actions are not matching our words. Veterans' groups and individuals across the country and in my home district, the 2nd Congressional District of Maryland, have told me that passing H.R. 303 is one of their top priorities. They want it sooner rather than later, and frankly, they deserve it.

We seem to understand this on this side of the aisle, but we do not have the power to report it out of committee. We do not have the power to bring it to the floor, and we do not have the majority to pass it, but with 366 cosponsors, that should not matter.

So my Democratic colleague from Georgia filed a motion to discharge the bill to bring it to the floor. The entire Democratic Caucus has signed that petition, and as of today, two Republicans have signed on. Could someone please explain to me 366 cosponsors and only 203 signatures to discharge? What is going on?

I have heard that the majority leadership in the House and Senate are considering offering some version of concurrent receipts in the Department of Defense authorization. Some would prefer to wait for that option. I ask them, how much longer must we make our veterans wait when the language the veterans support, the bill they want, has already been introduced, has already been referred to committee and is ready for a vote and that is H.R. 303?

The veterans' disability tax or concurrent receipts, whatever one likes to call it, has been a partisan football in the political game for a while now. I cannot comment on that, I am a freshman, and this is my first try for the end zone on this bill. Whether Democrats or Republicans win or lose in this game, the veterans do need our help. Our citizens, who served and sacrificed for freedom we enjoy every day, deserve better. If the majority leadership is serious about that issue, then let us just bring H.R. 303 to the floor and vote on it. They control the agenda, and they can bring it to the floor today, right now.

Are words of respect enough? Should we not show the veterans how much we truly do respect them and their action and their sacrifices, including their families? Our side of the aisle has. We have done everything within our power. We have cosponsored the bill. We have signed the discharge petition. We have come to the floor today to speak on behalf of this bill, and we have vowed to vote for it when it reaches the floor. Our actions have matched our words.

We challenge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to do the same.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this for tonight.

I rise to ask why? Why are we not giving our veterans what they deserve? Time and time again we are reminded of the great sacrifices made by this Nation's veterans. These are people who sacrificed their lives for our lives, for our country, for our rights and freedoms.

I am honored to represent a large amount of veterans, and now they need our help, but unfortunately, the House Republican leadership is turning its back on our veterans.

Currently, there is an outmoded and unfair system dating back to the Civil War of compensation for disabled veterans who are retired from the military. Under current law, veterans who are entitled to both a retirement benefit for the military service and service-connected disability compensation are not able to receive both retirement and disability payments. This is an outrage. I do not understand. Here we are Representatives in this House, we are talking about spending $87 billion on a war and our young men and women are over in Iraq fighting for our freedoms, and yet we will not take care of the great veterans that have already preserved this for us.

H.R. 303, the concurrent receipt bill and/or ending disability veterans' tax, has over 370 Members. I know down here in Washington I have learned an awful lot. Usually, one would think if we had 370 people on a bill, it is going to fly through. That means 370 people, Representatives from across the country, agree bipartisanly this is something that we should be doing. Yet, we cannot bring it up on the House floor. The Republican leadership refuses to bring it onto the floor.

There is a discharge petition, which a lot of people that are listening to this might not understand. If we cannot get a bill through committee to be talked about and onto the floor, we have a right to try and get Members to sign a discharge petition so that we are forced to bring it onto the floor. We have 203 signatures; we need more. And our veterans out there, please write their Congressman, e-mail them, tell them this is what they need.

The Republican leadership does not want to bring the bill to the floor for a vote. The Republican-led Senate passed this provision in the Defense authorization bill. Yet, the House Republican leadership refuses to bring it to the floor of the House. Veterans' policy should be nonpartisan, but unfortunately, at the cost of the veterans, it has become a partisan issue.

Mr. Speaker, we should all be standing together for our veterans. I implore the House Republican leadership to bring it on to the floor. Let there be an up and down vote. Very easily, who is supporting our veterans and who is not, and let us give our veterans what they rightly deserve. After all, they have done so much for us. This is the least we can do for them.

The last couple of weekends I have been meeting with so many veterans'

groups, and this is the only thing they are talking about. Last Friday, I was at Northport Hospital and talking to so many prisoners of war that have survived from the Korean War, and they are saying why? Are you waiting for us all to die? Is that what you are doing, to save some money? I do not understand it. We have our young men and women that are going to be our future veterans. If we do not keep our promise, why should they care about defending this country? We have to make a difference.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

□ 1830

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, for organizing this Special Order, and really for her outstanding leadership not only on behalf of veterans, but in so many areas of deep concern and importance to our Nation.

I join her and many of my colleagues, well over 366 colleagues, to be specific, in calling for an end to the disabled veterans tax. The government decided many years ago, in 1891, to take disability benefits from retirees, to take it away from our veterans when they retired. It was wrong then, it is wrong now, and we need to change it.

Common sense tells us that there is a tremendous difference between what you receive for retirement and what you receive for a disability. If you are disabled, you have an injury. You may live in pain for the rest of your life, and you are entitled to that disability benefit. Veterans are likewise entitled to their retirement.

To show how outrageous this policy is, you could have a veteran who was injured and they decide to retire because of that injury. They then get disability benefits. But if another veteran who is injured decides to serve 20 years before he retires, when he or she retires, they only get their retirement. They do not get the disability benefit. In the private sector, if you have a disability, you get a disability benefit. If you retire, you get your retirement.

So this is a tremendously unfair policy, particularly when there are so many men and women risking their lives for our security. As we stand on this floor, they are in harm's way in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and we should change this unfair policy.

I must say that like many Americans I had a yellow ribbon in front of my apartment building for Ryan Dixon, my neighbor, who, in my opinion, is a great hero. He was part of the Special Forces. He served in Iraq. Thank God, he came back safe and he was not injured. But there are many other men and women who are injured, in Afghanistan and in Iraq, and they are entitled to their disability benefits.

Our Nation's veterans deserve nothing less than the benefits which they are entitled to, and we owe them an enormous debt of gratitude for their service to the Nation. It is time that we showed them our thanks by correcting this unjust and very unfair law. So I urge the majority, finally, to show its commitment to providing relief to the veterans across the country who rely on these critical benefits to live.

I really feel that it is a disincentive for people to stay in the military, to know that they will not receive their just retirement and disability benefits. So I call upon my colleagues, and particularly the leadership on the other side of the aisle, to bring this bill to the floor so that we can correct this injustice to our veterans.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time left on the hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). The gentlewoman from California has 8 minutes remaining.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), who has truly been a leader on this issue all over the country, and he is the Member who filed the discharge petition.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by thanking the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for organizing this, and I want to thank all of my Democrat colleagues who have spoken here today about a subject that is very important for our country, and actually is a national disgrace.

I visited a soldier who was wounded in Walter Reed not too long ago. He had come back from Iraq. He had an injury that is very similar to the injury that General Shinseki suffered earlier in his career. He had lost part of his foot. General Shinseki chose to stay in the military. He had a full career. He had a wonderful career and just retired as chief of staff of the Army.

This young man and I talked a little bit. I had been wounded in Vietnam, and I felt like maybe I could give him some solace by saying, look, they are going to be able to repair your foot; you are going to be able to stay in the military and have a career like General Shinseki had; somebody that everybody in the Army is very proud of. And he replied, sir, they tell me it is a better deal to get out.

Now, a lot of Americans do not know what I am talking about. For years, it has been referred to as concurrent receipt. It is a prohibition on receiving retirement benefits and disability benefits. Because that young man was injured in Iraq, lost part of his foot, he is going to be entitled to receive disability benefits. I was injured in Vietnam. I have shrapnel in my left leg. I get disability benefits. I have been getting disability benefits for 30-some-odd years. I get those benefits despite the fact that I only served my country 2 years. Had I stayed in the service and served my country for 20 years or more and been entitled to military retirement benefits, I would not get any disability benefits. Serve more, get less. It makes no sense.

And that is what that young man was referring to as he lay in his bed in Walter Reed. It is a better deal for me to get out of the Army because I will get my disability benefits. If I stay in the Army, serve my country more, I will not get my disability benefits; they will be taken away from me.

Well, we are calling this problem the disabled veterans tax, and many Members of Congress want to end the disabled veterans tax. Unfortunately, we have not been able to do that. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader, gave me an opportunity to file a discharge petition, which I did. The discharge petition is designed to force a vote on this issue. I know if we get a vote we will pass it and we will end this tax on disabled veterans. The question is whether or not we will get a vote.

Now, I have had the honor and the pleasure over the last month or two to speak to many veterans groups. I spoke to the National Convention of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, Vietnam Veterans of America, and many, many others. The key to whether or not we are going to be successful in ending what is a national disgrace is those of you who are watching this program today and others.

Veterans need to continue to put the pressure on. Those of you who do not know much about this issue and want to learn more about it can go to the Web site of any of the veterans organizations. You will find it either under the name of concurrent receipt or disabled veterans tax. You can go to my Web site, and you will get an awful lot of information about it. It is the congressional Web site for Jim Marshall.

We will not get this done by ourselves. Democrats can push as hard as they want to. They will not be successful. It is going to require the involvement of folks who are watching this show and all of the veterans who are interested in ending what is a national disgrace. We have 366 Members of Congress who have signed on to the legislation that would end the disabled veterans tax. We just cannot get a vote on it. We keep the pressure up, we can get the vote. At the very least, if we keep the pressure up, what we will do is get a giant step in the right direction proposed by the administration. I hope one or the other happens.

There needs to be some relief given to veterans. There is no excuse in this country for somebody like me, who served for a lesser period of time, to receive more than somebody who served more. With that, Mr. Speaker, I want to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for having led us today.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank not only the gentleman from Georgia but all of my colleagues who spoke this evening. We are spending so much time

on this issue because our veterans should be special and should be very important to all of the Members of Congress and to public policymakers in general.

Our veterans have been so loyal, not just to our country because of their service but they are always loyal to the Commander in Chief. They have allowed themselves to be misused, to be ignored, and to be marginalized too much, and particularly by this administration. We find ourselves fighting and the veterans are scratching and clawing trying to just get the kind of benefits that they deserve.

They are in these veterans hospitals across the Nation waiting in line for service, cannot get appointments. We do not have enough beds for them in nursing care homes. And now we hear about this particular issue on the floor tonight, and it seems to me that the President of the United States would put an end to this. This is a Commander in Chief that is now saying that he needs $87 billion more to continue the war in Iraq? We are going to have more veterans who will be disabled, who will come home, who will have to suffer this great injustice.

This is the President who has already spent $79 billion and who is coming back for more. And this is the President, along with others in the administration, who is talking about we all have to make sacrifices. Our soldiers are dying, our soldiers are being crippled and disabled. They are losing their limbs. How long do we have to beg? How long do we have to plead with this President?

I am here tonight, along with my colleagues, to ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to please sign that discharge petition. Please send a message to the veterans that during this time when we are at war, at a time when many of those who watch us on television who are fighting in Iraq, who may be the victim of some sniper's bullet any time, any day, let them know that should something happen, should they be crippled, should they lose a limb that they can depend on their government to see to it that they get both their retirement and the disability benefits that they deserve. I do not think that is too much to ask, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly feel a little bit ashamed this evening that we have to carry this debate this far. I served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs when I first came to the Congress of the United States. I interacted with all of the service organizations. I made a lot of friends, and I discovered at that time that there are many in the Congress who will wave the red, white, and blue flag and they will talk the talk; but they will not walk the walk. They will not stand up and ask for the dollars. They will not defend the services. They will not even take the time to help the veterans fight through the bureaucracy of veterans affairs to get the benefits that are coming to them.

My office makes this its number one priority. Not only do we work for the veterans, we have had to organize a whole chapter of the Vietnam-era veterans in my district because they were being ignored and they were not being serviced. We think that that is the least that a Member of Congress can do, to service the veterans, to fight for them, to make sure that they get justice. And on this issue, this should be the highest priority of our veterans agenda.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of eliminating the tax on disabled veterans, and thank my colleague MAXINE WATERS for organizing the time to discuss this important matter.

Those who spend their career serving our nation in the military deserve our respect and gratitude; yet, military retirees remain the only group of federal employees who must waive retirement pay in order to receive VA disability compensation. Our nation is stronger and more secure because of their service and dedication, and fulfilling our obligations to those who fought for our freedom must always be a national priority.

It is time to stop penalizing the more than 700,000 disabled veterans who are military retirees. Attempts to redefine who qualifies as a disabled veteran are unnecessary, and achieve nothing more than providing benefits to one group of veterans at the expense of others.

The solution is obvious, yet resolution has been difficult, I was disappointed last year when a threatened presidential veto caused the elimination of the veterans tax to be scaled back in the Defense Authorization bill and, again this year when the House Defense Authorization failed to include language to repeal the tax.

At a time when our Nation is asking more men and women to risk their lives and security on behalf of our country, we should make every effort to fulfill our promise to them upon their return. The strength of a nation is measured not only in the might of its military, but also the compassion shown by and to its members.

It is time to put a permanent end to the disabled veterans tax; their commitment to excellence in service to our country should not be answered with deficient services from that country.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. WATERS and the gentleman from Illinois, Ranking Member EVANS for their work on this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today outraged by the Majority Leadership's continual short-changing of American veterans. I appreciate Members' from both sides of the aisle, who work to support our retired soldiers. I find great irony in the support that this body gives in creating veterans in Afghanistan and Iraq, but the lack of assistance in sustaining these and previous veterans upon their return.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the Republicans and this Administration responding to an outraged constituent who asked me earlier this year if, "We are just going to reward our fighting men with medals and praise, then let them fend for themselves after they have suffered the insults and injuries of war?". How do I respond to this person and others, when I know that I voted against the VA–HUD appropriations bill which under-funded the Department of Veteran Affairs by an embarrassing $1.8 billion.

I know that I co-sponsored H.R. 2569, which would authorize concurrent receipt of military retirement pay and VA compensation benefits, make health care for veterans more accessible and affordable, allow veterans' surviving spouses to receive adequate benefits, and expand educational opportunities for reservists. H.R. 2569 further enhances benefits for the families of those killed while on active duty, and gives an essential "thank you" to our troops now returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I am a co-sponsor of H.R. 303. This legislation would permit retired members of the armed forces with service-connected disabilities to be paid both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation. H.R. 303 would rectify the injustice which has penalized those who sacrifice to serve our country for over 100 years. Additionally, I joined my colleagues to sign the discharge petition to bring this legislation to the floor.

As a veteran's daughter, I, along with 365 Members of this body, am frustrated by our constant attempts to support those who sacrificed for this nation. I find it morally reprehensible that this President continues his reckless policy of cutting taxes for the richest 1 percent of this country, yet refuses to guarantee our veterans basic benefits. And I ask: how much longer is this body willing to punish those who sacrifice and suffer for serving and defending this nation?

SECURING THE PEACE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to open an important discussion before the Congress on the topic of securing the peace in Iraq.

I am going to be brief in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, because we have some colleagues here who want to participate in this debate and who have other obligations. But let me simply start by saying that I believe it is absolutely essential for this Nation, now that we have deposed Saddam Hussein, to rebuild that country and to secure for them the peace. And what I mean by that is that it is simply not adequate in this world we live in today to get rid of a dictator like Saddam Hussein and then walk away. Tragically, America has done that all too often in its foreign policy, with disastrous consequences.

There will be discussion on the floor here tonight in the course of this debate of how we did that after World War I. We not only walked away, but we demanded reparations. The result was the rise of an atrocious dictatorship in Germany and another world war.

I want to point to another example just briefly here at the outset of this

debate. When we helped the people of Afghanistan fight off the Russian invaders, the Soviet invaders in their country, we did the right thing. But sadly, tragically, when that effort ended, and the Soviet Union retreated from Afghanistan and turned it back over to the people of Afghanistan, we simply walked away and we did not help them rebuild their nation. We did not help them set up an economy. The result was absolutely disastrous. It was the Taliban regime that we have now deposed.

I know firsthand the situation in Afghanistan today. I was there a year ago August. I know firsthand the situation in Iraq, because I spent 3 days inside Iraq just this last August, and I learned a great deal. I went to several different parts of the country. And it is absolutely critical that we not just depose Saddam Hussein but that we help the people of Iraq to structure a functioning government. That will pay dividends for years to come.

□ 1845

I want to not only talk in this hour about the importance of having deposed Saddam Hussein and now securing the peace by aiding the people of Iraq, but why it is a bad idea to demand that this be repaid out of oil proceeds or to demand that this be a loan from the American Government.

There may be times when we need to make loans. I think right now the aid that the President has asked for should be given as a grant, because I think it is critical for us to demonstrate not just to the people of Iraq, but to all of the people of the Middle East, indeed the Muslim world, that when the United States injects itself as we did in Iraq and deposes a terrible leader like Saddam Hussein, the United States then follows through with its commitment and keeps its word.

Mr. Speaker, with that as kind of an introduction, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK).

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, I recently joined 10 other Members of Congress to visit our troops and those working to restore peace to Iraq. What I saw there was absolutely amazing. There are many good and positive changes occurring in Iraq almost daily. The most remarkable and appreciated fact is the fact that Saddam Hussein is no longer in power. He clearly made the Iraqi people live in horrible fear.

Five miles from the historic city of Babylon we visited one of the 59 mass graves which has been discovered, which contained the remains of 3,000 Iraqis. To date, 2,100 have been identified and returned to their families for burial. There are still 900 unclaimed bodies in clear view of where we stood which await identification and a proper burial by their families.

There are a total of 300,000 missing Iraqis. With each new discovery of another mass grave, that number shrinks, bringing closure to many families.

The bright spot in this bleak description are the men and women in our military who not only liberated Iraq, but work every single day to bring peace and prosperity to this deserving country. Our men and women have repaired the power system so now light and air conditioning abound throughout Iraq. The sanitation and water systems that were in total disarray just 3 months ago are becoming more and more operational each and every day. Our men and women in uniform are reopening schools so all Iraqi children can attend school. Our troops have rebuilt and reopened the police academy in Baghdad so the Iraqis can be trained to provide for their own safety and their own security.

Everyone in America should be proud of what our troops are doing there. They are the best, and there are none better anywhere in the world. They do their jobs in intense heat under the most difficult circumstances, and they do it because it is the right thing to do; and they will tell you that as well. Every Iraqi we talked to thanked us and told us to thank President Bush when we saw him next. To a person, they all begged us not to leave their country too early. That is their greatest fear, the fear that we will cut and run.

This $87 billion supplemental is a tremendous investment in our future security. It will sustain our military forces in the war on terrorism and invest in the future of Iraq and, consequently, the future stability of the entire Middle East. The stakes are too high for us to fail.

Remember, only $20.3 billion of the supplemental spending request is for Iraq. It seems that the 10 Democratic Presidential nominees have either failed to look at the details of the President's proposal, or they are purposely misleading the American people into thinking all $87 billion is for the reconstruction in Iraq. Only $20.3 billion is for Iraq. The rest is to support our military in the war on terrorism.

The Vice President has said that in no way, shape or form will funds provided by the United States be used to pay foreign debts from the Saddam Hussein era in Iraq. The Iraqi Governing Council has asked the World Bank to assist in developing a proper accounting of their foreign debt. It is estimated to be about $120 billion. The Governing Council feels strongly that governments that knowingly lend money to a sadistic dictator such as Saddam Hussein to buy weapons and oppress his people do not deserve to have that money paid back.

There are key members of the Iraqi Governing Council who propose to repudiate all foreign debt from that era since that money was used to buy weapons and oppress the Iraqi people, and we should strongly support that policy.

We must continue to encourage the development of functioning local institutions in Iraq, not dependency on foreign administrators. This will take time and persistence. To transfer power before governmental institutions have properly developed would be reckless and dangerous. What matters most in developing states such as Iraq is leaders and law, not aid. The Iraqi Governing Council is committed to developing a constitution that creates a secular, democratic, strong federal government which embodies principles of equality for all Iraqis. They have already passed some of the most progressive laws in the Middle East in terms of encouraging foreign investment, allowing for dual citizenship, and establishing income and corporate tax structures, but it is too early to turn over control completely to the Iraqis.

In the short term, we must continue to increase the level of involvement of the Iraqi people in three key areas: security, control of money raised by oil revenues, and empowering them to represent themselves in world forums, such as OPEC and the United Nations. We will retain control of the funding that is provided in the supplemental. We have made unprecedented progress, and we must continue to be patient and stay the course.

There are many examples of our success to date. Approximately 5,000 small businesses have opened in Iraq since May 1, and an Iraqi central bank has been established. This took 3 years in postwar Germany. Almost all major hospitals and universities have been reopened, and hundreds of secondary schools will start school this fall.

An Iraqi Governing Council has been formed and appointed a cabinet of ministers. This took 14 months in postwar Germany. A 56,000 person security force has been armed and trained, and is contributing to Iraqi security. This took 14 months in postwar Germany.

There is still a tremendous security challenge, but more troops are not the answer. The Iraqis are eager to be responsible for their own security. Once the coalition trains Iraqis to be responsible for the governance and security of their own country, then we will be able to leave.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) on a fantastic op-ed piece that he wrote, which ran in today's Washington Post. The gentleman emphasized that the version of events that we see each day on the news is distorted and heavily skewed towards destruction and death and not the birth of a new nation that is taking place.

I want to quote from JIM's op-ed. ''We not only need Iraqi tips and intelligence, we need Iraqis fighting by our side and eventually assuming full responsibility for their internal security.'' He says, ''Many in Washington view the contest for the Presidency and control of Congress as a sum-zero game without external costs and benefits. Politicians and activists from both parties reflexively embellish news that is bad for the opposition, but to do that with regard to Iraq harms our troops and our efforts. Concerning Iraq, this normal political tripe can impose a heavy external cost.''

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia and commend him for his vision and candor. American journalists in Iraq have freely admitted that their editors are not interested in printing good news from Iraq, but only reporting on death and destruction. Those editors are doing a tremendous disservice not only to their readers, but to every American serving in Iraq, to the Iraqi people and to our country. We must tell the story of the successes as well as the setbacks.

There is still a long way to go in Iraq, but there are thousands of dedicated, intelligent and educated Iraqis eager to assume leadership roles and be responsible for the future of their country. They desperately need our help.

Our credibility, our security and the security of the Middle East are tightly linked to their success. We must stay the course and provide the support needed. The return on our investment is stability, democracy and partnership. The failure of our efforts is too frightening to contemplate.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's requests for additional funding for Iraq. It is absolutely essential.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful comments and I appreciate the gentleman participating in this discussion tonight. I know that the gentleman has family obligations, but his attendance here speaks to how important he thinks this topic is.

I also thank the gentleman for pointing out that only $20.3 billion, not the entire $87 billion, is dedicated to reconstructing Iraq. And I also think it is important that we listen to his comments about the Interim Governing Council and the fact that they are making progress, but this money is going to be spent by Americans right now, and I think to assert that although Americans are spending this money, the Iraqis ought to repay it seems unfair.

I also commend the gentleman about Iraqi involvement and responsibility. At the end of the day, this is an Iraqi responsibility and ultimately we have to get those people involved in recreating their nation, and I very much appreciate the gentleman's comments. I also appreciate him pointing out that this is a bipartisan discussion; and our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL) has written and spoken on this topic, and I think he will join us in this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Iraq this August and spent time there. Interesting in this debate, people who have been to Iraq and seen what is on the ground tend to support the President's position. Those who are critical tend to be those who have not been there.

Ambassador Bremer, I think, laid the groundwork by these remarks in a hearing just last month. He said the $20.3 billion in grants to Iraq the President is seeking as part of this $57 billion supplemental speed the grandeur of vision equal to the one which created the free world at the end of World War II. What he is referring to is the Marshall Plan, and I think for Americans to understand this discussion, they need to understand this aid, put in perspective.

As I mentioned earlier, at the end of World War I, we walked away. Indeed, we demanded reparations. We did not help Europe rebuild. That resulted in Hitler and another world war following that. But following World War II, we changed our policy rather dramatically, and we understood that rebuilding Europe was critically important. That was the Marshall Plan.

This second graph shows in current dollars that the Marshall Plan was dramatically more expensive than we are talking about in the President's request here. I think it is vitally important for the people of America to understand that if we are being asked to put up this money to rebuild Iraq, how does that compare to our prior experiences.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for doing this special order, and maybe we can have a dialogue.

The gentleman, myself, along with a couple of our other colleagues had the opportunity to spend 3 days in Iraq in August. I had an opportunity to go back in September to complement that trip and see some things we were not able to see in August; and in coming back, there are some things we agreed on.

Number one, we agreed on the quality of our troops. We have very, very talented young men and women who fought a war in Iraq and now are providing the security zone to allow this country to restructure itself.

Mr. SHADEGG. Not just their quality, their enthusiasm. They are committed to this task. They can see in the faces of the Iraqi people that they are trying to help every day what it is doing for that country and for their people.

Quite frankly, I think if every Member of Congress were to go to Iraq, and for that matter, I urge the administration to take business leaders, take average Americans over there, let them see when we help the Iraqis by fixing a well that is no longer working or by opening a school that is no longer functioning, and we will discuss education later in this Special Order, when we do that, the faces of those people light up. And these are people embracing the concept of freedom and democracy for the first time.

When we look into the eyes of our troops and soldiers, they know we are enabling these people to be free for the first time and to understand prosperity for the first time. I could not agree more with the gentleman's comments.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the media is portraying a very different story regarding what is going on in Iraq than what we saw. There is no doubt that Iraq is still a dangerous place. At least it was in August, it was in September, and it probably still is today. But as we flew over the city of Baghdad there were cars, buses and trucks on the streets. There was commerce. Much of the city of Baghdad was functioning.

We met with a couple of divisional military commanders who talked about the thousands of projects that they had going on, rebuilding schools, cleaning irrigation ditches, working on clinics, and they talked about the progress that they were making. We met with a number of talented people.

The second trip I had over there I met with Peter McPherson, who is the president of Michigan State. He is now back at Michigan State. He was kind of the shadow finance minister. I asked him, what about the plans? You guys did not have a plan for reconstruction.

He said, What do you mean we did not have a plan? Did you see our currency collapse? No.

He said there was a debate about whether Iraq should keep this currency that had Saddam Hussein's picture on it. He said, we made a conscious decision, we planned to keep that currency because we did not want the currency to collapse, we did not want a run on the banks. Commerce continued in Iraq after the war.

□ 1900

The plan is in place. They now have a tax code, 15 percent top rate. They have a tariff structure, and they also now have one of the most progressive foreign investment laws in the Middle East. They have thought through all those things. Now they are working with the Iraqi Governing Council to implement it.

Another individual from Michigan who was kind of their shadow health care minister, he said, ''What do you mean, no plan? Did you see a breakout of malaria? Did you see a breakout of cholera or diarrheal diseases after the war? That is very typical after you have had a military conflict.

''Those things did not happen. We had plans in place to try to prevent that, and we were successful in preventing those things from happening. We kept the clinics open. We kept the hospitals open. The doctors kept coming to work. We were able to treat the people. There were plans in place. We have got talented people who have run major universities, major businesses, major sectors of this country who are now helping put Iraq together.''

Does that mean everything has worked perfectly? Absolutely not. But these folks have a plan, they are implementing the plan and as they get new information they are adjusting it.

Mr. SHADEGG. I could not agree with the gentleman more. Certainly I think it is helpful to hear those kinds of comments. And understand when I said at the outset of this special order

that we want to discuss securing the peace, maybe that confuses people, but for the average American what I mean is, we are in a war, a war on terrorism; and the battleground of that war is a war to win the hearts and minds right now, first and foremost, of the Iraqi people.

We cannot win their hearts and minds if, for example, they do not have electricity to cool or air-condition their homes and it is 140 degrees out. We cannot win their hearts and minds and tell them we have a better system for them if, for example, they cannot get gasoline to run their cars.

There has been some complaining about the President wanting to send refined fuels into Iraq. Why do we need to do that? They do not have gasoline to run their automobiles to conduct their business lives. We saw that great progress has been made, but the aid the President is seeking now is so that more progress can be made. I commend the gentleman for his thoughts.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Let me add one thing. I do have another commitment. A lot of our colleagues are here tonight. That is great to see.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am thrilled to see so many of them here. I have got to get them all on.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. We talked about the horrors of Saddam. I will give you one of the ones that I have not seen published anywhere, but that I heard on my last trip.

I had the opportunity to go through the Ministry of Health. Then I had the opportunity to go through a hospital. We have heard about the mass graves, the slaughter of the Kurds and all of these types of folks. The one anecdote that somebody asked if I had heard about, they said, have you heard about our cornea transplant policy in Iraq? I said, no. He said, all the cornea transplants were done on Monday and Thursday. Executions were done Sunday night and Wednesday night.

Just one other example and these are stories that come from the Iraqis.

These folks are thankful that this man is gone. They are thankful that we are there, and they want us to stay because they trust us a whole lot more than they trust the U.N. We put together a good coalition in a very difficult situation, and as demonstrated by our colleagues here tonight, there are a whole lot of folks who have a lot more to add to this because we are going out and we are getting a complete picture by having this many Members participating in the debate, but also spending the time over in Iraq and everybody picking up their own little gems of information to give us a complete picture.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman. Without further ado, because we do have so many Members who want to participate, let me yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I appreciate so much the opportunity to be here tonight. I want to thank the gentleman for his efforts because he cares about the people of Iraq. He cares about the people of America, because that is what we are talking about, the security of the people of the United States.

We are in a war against terrorism. It began, not of our own making, on September 11, 2001. We are responding to a very vicious enemy, being the terrorists who have determined that the targets of their attack are the people of the United States. And so I thank you for doing this.

I additionally want to point out that the people who are here tonight, this is the largest outpouring I have ever seen of people who are genuinely concerned about our country, about the war on terrorism. I also want to point out that I particularly appreciate your pointing out the situation of how we assisted in the redevelopment of Germany after World War II. That is exactly what we are doing right now.

The reason that we redeveloped Germany was not to show any appreciation of the war that they brought upon the world during World War II, but it was to redevelop Germany so it would not be a breeding ground for Communists because that is where we were. We were getting ready, as we all knew, to go into the Cold War. And we were able to redevelop Germany, and then we were able to defeat the Communists.

The exact same principle is at hand here. We are trying to redevelop Iraq so that we can avoid Iraq continuing, it already has been, now we need to stop it, as a breeding ground, a country that supported or harbored terrorists, because we are in a war against terrorism. We defeated communism. We can defeat terrorism thanks to the efforts of the people who are here tonight.

It is really very heartwarming that the opportunity I had, I returned 2 weeks ago from the visit to Iraq. This was a trip put together, a congressional delegation, by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, and one of the very fine persons with us was the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL).

I want to congratulate him on his courage. He has been very outspoken in what he saw in Iraq. He saw the progress that the American forces and the coalition forces from all over the world, from 32 countries that are serving in Iraq.

In fact, in today's Washington Post, I would like to commend him, and he will be appearing apparently in a few minutes, on an op-ed which appeared in today's Washington Post. He had an excellent op-ed in the Atlanta Constitution. I just want to read one part. I do not mean to preempt his ability to speak this evening, but the gentleman from Georgia indicated, ''I went to Iraq a couple of weeks ago to resolve for myself the recent contrast between gloomy news coverage and optimistic Pentagon reports of our progress. My trip left no doubt that the Pentagon's version is far closer to reality.''

Mr. Speaker, the text of the op-ed is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 1, 2003]

DON'T PLAY POLITICS ON IRAQ

(By Jim Marshall)

My first trip to a combat zone occurred in 1969. I was a 21-year-old staff sergeant, naive as hell, a freshly trained Army Ranger who had left Princeton University to volunteer for ground combat in Vietnam. I vividly recall feeling way out of step with my Ivy League colleagues.

Well, that same out-of-step feeling is back. But this time it's about Iraq and involves some of my professional colleagues, political leaders and activists who carelessly using words, and phrases such as ''quagmire,'' ''our failure in Iraq,'' ''this is just another Vietnam,'' or the ''Bush administration has no plan.''

I went to Iraq a couple of weeks ago to resolve for myself the recent contrast between gloomy news coverage and optimistic Pentagon reports of our progress. My trip left no doubt that the Pentagon's version is far closer to reality. Our news coverage disproportionately dwells on the deaths, mistakes and setbacks suffered by coalition forces. Some will attribute this to a grand left-wing conspiracy, but a more plausible explanation is simply the tendency of our new media to focus on bad news. It sells. Few Americans think local news coverage fairly captures the essence of daily life and progress in their hometowns. Coverage from Iraq is no different.

Falsely bleak Iraq news circulating in the United States is a serious problem for coalition forces because it discourages Iraqi cooperation, the key to our ultimate success or failure, a daily determinant of life or death for American soldiers. As one example, coalition forces are now discovering nearly 50 percent of the improvised explosive devices through tips. Guess how they discover the rest.

We not only need Iraqi tips and intelligence, we need Iraqis fighting by our side and eventually assuming full responsibility for their internal security. But Iraqis have not forgotten the 1991 Gulf War. America encouraged the Shiites to rebel, then abandoned them to be slaughtered. I visited one of the mass graves, mute testimony to the wisdom of being cautious about relying on American politicians to live up to their commitments.

For Iraqis, news of America's resolve is critical to any decision to cooperate with coalition forces, a decision that can lead to death. Newspaper start-up ventures and sales of satellite dishes absolutely exploded following the collapse of Saddam Hussein's regime. With this on top of the Internet, Iraqis do get the picture from America—literally.

Many in Washington view the contest for the presidency and control of Congress as a zero-sum game without external costs or benefits. Politicians and activists in each party reflexively celebrate, spread and embellish news that is bad for the opposition. But to do that now with regard to Iraq harms our troops and our effort. Concerning Iraq, this normal political tripe can impose a heavy external cost.

It is too soon to determine whether Iraqis will step forward to secure their own freedom. For now, responsible Democrats should carefully avoid using the language of failure. It is false. It endangers our troops and our effort. It can be unforgivably self-fulfilling.

Democratic candidates for the presidency should repeatedly hammer home their support, if elected, for helping the Iraqi people

secure their own freedom. It is fine for each to contend that he or she is a better choice for securing victory in Iraq. But in making this argument, care should be taken not to dwell on perceived failures of the current team or plan. Americans, with help from commentators and others, will decide this for themselves.

Instead of being negative about Iraq, Democratic presidential candidates should emphasize the positive aspects of their own plans for Iraq. Save the negative attacks for the issues of jobs and the economy. Iraqis are far less likely to support the coalition effort if they think America might withdraw following the 2004 election.

Finally, no better signal of our commitment to this effort could currently be provided than for Congress to quickly approve, with little dissent or dithering, the president's request for an additional $87 billion for Iraq and Afghanistan. Of course no one wants to spend such a sum. But it is well worth it if it leads to a stable, secular representative government in Iraq, something that could immeasurably improve our future national security.

I minored in journalism at Washington & Lee University, and I served as a reporter for the Post and Courier in Charleston, South Carolina. What I have seen in Iraq is really sad, and that is that the level of news reporting has been of the police blotter, and that is that in lieu of covering what is going on in a community, a country, a State or a capital, what has occurred is that the reporters have gone to the police station, gotten the very negative reporting of incidents of violence, level of violence, and then reported that as the news. That is inappropriate. I would hope that they would cover the positive.

I brought some indications, I feel like show and tell tonight, but I brought several items that I want to show that I believe indicate the progress.

First of all, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) has been so good in bringing to our attention earlier today on the floor of Congress that the schools have reopened today, October 1, 2003, in Iraq. This is very significant. Many of the schools were closed, particularly in communities that did not support Saddam Hussein. Thanks to the work, the civil action projects of the American military, the schools have reopened.

By American standards, we would be appalled. These are one-room schoolhouses that have been repainted; we are not talking about elegant schoolhouses, but they reopened today. When they did reopen, the teachers and the students were given tablets so they could write on them what they learned and what they were having the ability to learn.

For the first time, they were in classrooms where they were not given propaganda. The propaganda in subliminal messages on the mathematics were how evil the Western world is, how evil the American people were. Now they know that there is an open society in the United States and in the Western democracies, and it is one that can be positive for the people of Iraq.

I am excited. Today is a big day for the people of Iraq. Over 1.5 million students have received the new textbooks and the new book bags to carry and go to school.

Another indication of progress is the money itself of Iraq. Those of us in South Carolina are very proud that George Wolfe, who is the general counsel of the U.S. Department of Treasury, is serving with the Coalition Provisional Authority in Iraq in one of Saddam's palaces. What they are doing is that on October 15, 2 weeks from today, they will be turning in the money which is currently in Iraq and they will be, first of all, deleting the dictator Saddam Hussein's picture, and the new money will be issued.

It will be dinars. It will be from what we have learned from prior experience, and that is, it will not be currency manipulation; the people will receive dinar per dinar. It will be of the new money. It is being done at 150 locations in a very large country, 26 million people throughout the country to turn in the money, and Saddam Hussein will be gone in terms of the money. That is very important.

A final point in my show and tell tonight, it was very exciting for me to be with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) to visit the reopening of the Kisik Oil Refinery. This is very significant. It is in the northern part of the country. The person who really coordinated this is General David Petraeus of the 101st Airborne Division.

They had the opportunity, again just 2 weeks ago, of reopening this refinery. It had closed 4 years ago; under the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, the refinery had closed. But it was reopened. Now we have production of gasoline and kerosene which will be used by the people of northern Iraq, it will be traded to the country of Syria. Syria was so confident of all things, and that had not been identified as one of the countries that has been favorable to us, but Syria actually provided, by way of barter, electricity several weeks ago, anticipating the opening of the refinery so that this electricity could be forwarded into northern Iraq, which is already democratically operating and operating fully, and it will be sent to Baghdad.

And so we saw firsthand tremendous progress. I want the American people to know the progress that has been made, how much we appreciate the sacrifices of the Armed Forces that are serving there, the competence of their leadership and themselves; and for the family members who have young people serving in Iraq, the equipment that is there, the technology to protect our troops. And I say that as a parent of three people in the military, as a retiree 2 months ago yesterday of 31 years in the Army National Guard.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership as we bring this. It should not be, but it seems to be new news to the people of the United States.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for his comments in support of this effort. I know that he believes deeply, as I do, that we have an obligation, having thrown out Saddam, as was needed to be done, a terrible dictator, to now help the Iraqi people. I think his illustrations of what we have done have helped.

Quite frankly, when I do these special orders, I like to have them be a discussion between several people, back and forth. Stunningly, we have so many people here tonight that it is almost not possible to follow that form.

One of our colleagues is the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). He is here, and I know he feels passionately that we need to rebuild Iraq, that the President is going in the right direction and that it is indeed a mandate in history, that this has lifelong consequences for our war against terror.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I will be brief because I know there are several people who have been to Iraq.

I believe my physician colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), may get up in a little while and talk about the medical situation over there, which was really abominable under Saddam Hussein.

I just want to state that I support the President's request to make this grant to Iraq. It is the right thing to do from a military strategy, it is the right thing to do from a political strategy and I am very, very pleased that this is going to be a bipartisan special order.

I just want to make one comment. I was so glad that you put this poster up here, because this $100 billion that we spent rebuilding Europe after World War II was somewhat in our own interests in that Europe was in such disarray that Communist forces were beginning to take over.

□ 1915

And those funds that were spent helped stabilize Europe, helped the democracies in Europe to emerge, and we essentially got a tremendous dividend from this investment in that there was a tremendous decade of peace and free trade, and ultimately in the end our economy benefitted from that.

And the situation here today is very similar. We have a unique opportunity to create a Western, U.S.-friendly, democratic beachhead in the middle of what has been a very problematic area in the Middle East that could have tremendous positive implications in decades and decades to come. And if we fail, the results could be absolutely horrible, not only in terms of dollars spent but as well in human lives. So I think the President's approach is right. All the military leaders say that this is desperately needed. All of the Members, and they are going to be speaking

more tonight like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), say it is very much needed. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, in the dialogue format, I just want to make one point. The gentleman points out the consequences in human lives, and I think he has spoken eloquently upon that topic. I just want to throw it back to him. I think he has made the point very clear that if we back away from Iraq right now, all those people in the country who are helping us right now, their lives will not be worth a penny, and I would like the gentleman to make a quick comment on that.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that at the House Republican conference last week, and it is a point that I do not think has been emphasized enough. If we fail, what is likely to happen? One of the scenarios is that another brutal, vicious, murderous dictatorship regime could come back. The worst case scenario, of course, is that Saddam himself could crawl out from under a rock and regain the reins of power. And we all know what he did in Basra after the first Gulf War. He executed 10,000 people. I think the bloodshed this time around would be much worse. So we really need to follow through on this, and we really need to make sure it is a success.

I think the President's proposal is very much the right thing to do, and I think all of us in the House and in the Senate should be backing him. This is money, I believe, that will be very well-spent in the long-term. This war on terror, I believe very strongly, it could end up resembling the Cold War. It may take decades or generations, and this is a very critical moment for us. If we succeed, it could have huge positive implications for the future. If we fail, it could be disastrous. And I yield back.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

One of the most eloquent spokesman who has gotten a lot of national coverage for his courage in speaking out, who makes this discussion tonight bipartisan and who makes this debate bipartisan, though there will be many, many Democrats who will vote with the President next week when we take up this legislation, is the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL). I yield to him on this topic.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I guess I would say that had I had a little bit more notice and appreciated the attempt to have a bipartisan effort here, I could have had plenty of Democrats on this side. There is no question about it. What we are going to find is that on the Democratic side, also on the Republican side, and I do not know how publicly on the gentleman's side, but certainly on the Democratic side, there will be questions concerning exactly how the money is planned to be spent. Is this appropriate? Is that appropriate? And there may be some who say this is inappropriate and that is inappropriate. But, in general, I think what we will find, and to a person this is what I have heard, Democrats are certainly in support of this effort to help the Iraqi people create a secular, representative government.

I do not want to take too much time because there are a number of people, and that might have caused a problem with my bringing a whole bunch of Democrats; so I do not want to steal the gentleman's thunder here. Let me say this. I appreciate the comments about my op-ed in the Post this morning.

Mr. SHADEGG. Two of our colleagues have already commented on it.

Mr. MARSHALL. And those who are viewing, if they wanted to get a more complete version of how I analyze our current situation, that would be a good place to go, and I would encourage people to do that.

I was a recon platoon sergeant in Vietnam. Vietnam is similar to the Iraqi situation and very dissimilar in other respects. In Vietnam, Russia and China were supporting the insurgency. So we had North Vietnam, Russia, and China. It made it very difficult for us to stamp the insurgency out, an insurgency that had been there for decades, was very well-organized. Iraq is very different from that. We do not have an external government with an awful lot of oomph, as China and Russia did at that time, and a great deal of commitment, as China and Russia had at that time, backing this insurgency. The insurgency is not something that is well-developed, but it could become so.

Here is the similarity: My job was to go out, find, engage the enemy. It was hard as heck to do. Iraqis, Iraqi troops, have a comparative advantage over any alien force, including Americans, that we simply cannot match. They speak the language. They read the street signs. They understand the culture. They can sort out friend from foe. Having their cooperation is critical to this endeavor. And, in part, I think one can understand why it is critical to the endeavor, because what we are trying to do is establish a representative government for the Iraqi people. One can force a dictatorship on folks, but one cannot force them to have a democracy. One cannot force people to be free. They have got to take it for themselves.

I think, as a country, we need to recognize that, that we have tremendous capabilities militarily, but there are some things that we just simply cannot do, and we cannot force freedom on people. They need to be coming forward and take it for themselves.

What does that involve? It involves Iraqis taking help from us. At least at this point they cannot do it on their own. They have got to step forward and be willing to cooperate with Americans. That involves taking risk. It is a tremendous benefit to us, and I think everybody here knows that. Right now, we are discovering about 50 percent of what they are calling IEDs now, improvised explosive devices. When I was in Nam, it was booby traps. We are discovering about 50 percent of those things, a little less than 50 percent, because people give us tips. They tell us where they are. Guess how we discover the rest of them? It is when our soldiers get hit by them, pretty much. More cooperation makes it safer for our soldiers. We find out where the ambushes are, where the booby traps are. We identify who the bad guys are. We are able to get them before they get us. But, very importantly, cooperation leads to people stepping forward, Iraqis stepping forward, taking up arms and going after the guerillas enthusiastically themselves. Simply having a police force, simply having an army, I do not care how many thousands of people, is not going to do it. They are going to have to be enthusiastic.

If I am an Iraqi, after 1991 when we encouraged the Shiites to rebel, then we withdrew and they were slaughtered, and some of my colleagues have been to the mass graves, as I have been, I am not going to step forward if I do not think the United States is committed.

So I encourage all of us to speak words of commitment, speak positively about the future of Iraq. We can differ on how we are going to get there, what is the best plan, when to bring in, how to bring in international folks, whether we can entice international folks, how we made mistakes in the past; but all of us should be talking about that. And, in addition, I think it is a good idea to go ahead and approve the President's request. It is a clear signal to Iraqis that we are committed. That is a big number, $20 billion for reconstruction.

The troops in Iraq told me repeatedly money is ammo, and what they meant by that was not that they did not have enough bullets or shells. What they meant by that is money enables them to do these reconstruction projects. These reconstruction projects build relationships and commitments with the Iraqis, lead to intelligence, lead to assistance, and ultimately lead to the commitment that we need from them if we are going to be successful here.

I have already spoken too long. The gentleman can tell I am passionate about this. I appreciate the gentleman's giving me an opportunity to speak, and I can tell my colleagues we would have tons of Democrats up here doing the same thing if we had just a little bit more notice.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman points out this is not partisan. This is largely a divide on who has been there and who has not been there, but I want to compliment the gentleman on one particular point, and that is I have been saying now for lo these many weeks that this has been on the discussion table, America, that the $20.3 billion for so-called reconstruction is as important to our military's success as the $60-some billion

for the military side, but the gentleman said it so eloquently. The real reason is, as the gentleman explained, and it certainly comes from his background having been in Vietnam. People, and that is if the Iraqi people are on our side, if they believe in us, if they want to help us, they are a resource that is absolutely invaluable. It is a resource that is worth ten times, in my opinion, $20 billion, if they come forward and say, ''There is an improvised explosive device right over here, and you need to go get it and get it out of there before it kills an American.''

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, in fact, what would be better is if they just take care of it themselves.

Mr. SHADEGG. Absolutely.

Mr. MARSHALL. They do not come to us and say, ''There it is. Would you take care of it?'' They go take care of it themselves. Ultimately, they have to be responsible for the security of their country. We do not need to be doing that. We will be able to tell in the next 6 months or a year or something like that, I cannot put a time frame on it, whether or not we are actually going to be able to entice them to come forward, and by gosh, we ought not to shrink from that effort right now, not after what we have spent, not given the opportunity that we have got as a country to make an immeasurable improvement in our future security.

Mr. SHADEGG. And this reconstruction aid is a way for us to illustrate that we are on their side, and for them to come to realize we are on their side, and for them to decide they need to be on our side and not on the side of the terrorists who want to destroy that country and bring Saddam back or some other regime that would be anti-American and be in line with the rest of the countries in that part of the world where terrorism is brewing against it.

So I think the gentleman's comments are eloquent, and I thank him for his participation and for all of his remarks on the topic.

I now yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE). I think he feels passionately about this issue as well.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona for arranging this special order and for all of those who have spoken. The most important part about this tonight, I think, is to hear from so many who have been there, and given what we hear in the news, I think that is particularly important because just watching the news channels, we simply do not get a good picture of what is going on there. We get a much better feel from those who have just returned. So I have appreciated this opportunity to hear that.

And I appreciated the concern that was raised before that not only do we make sure that we do not impose more debt on the Iraqi people, but that we ensure that the other debt that is held already is forgiven. It is extremely important. When we look, estimates vary anywhere from $60 billion to $150 billion and some more as far as outstanding debt. A lot of it is held by countries that are friendly with us and are on our side here, most of them, in fact. And I would hope that the administration, and I know they will, would exert all the pressure they can on these countries to make sure that we are not the only ones who are leaving Iraq debt-free and with an opportunity to grow and progress, that they have a responsibility to do so as well. I think if we want the support of Americans in this endeavor, we have to make sure that our partners around the world participate in this regard as well.

I would also encourage the administration to do what it can to exercise with us in Congress, and I think we need to remind our colleagues continually here to exercise fiscal restraint domestically. The primary function of the Federal Government, we all know, is national security. That is our first and primary function. This is important, what we are doing here. And we need, because of the situation we are in with a large deficit and a big debt, to make sure that we husband our resources properly and spend them where we need to and where the Federal Government has priority, and that is in our national defense. Again, I just want to thank my colleague from Arizona and all of the others who have appeared so far, and I just appreciate learning more myself and also to lend my support to this effort.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his input.

In the light of the fact that I want to get all of the remaining Members here who want to speak, a chance to speak, let me yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding but also for organizing this special order.

I think this is extremely important. Others have said it more eloquently than I will. I think the fundamental reality here is we have an opportunity as well as a responsibility to win the peace just as we won the war, and the President's proposal is about winning the peace. The $20.3 billion that will go towards rebuilding Iraq is about one winning the peace in Iraq. It is about helping the Iraqi people build a viable society that will not be a threat to its neighbors and to us anymore.

The President's determined that this money is needed soon after the decades during which Saddam Hussein's tyranny and the wars that he has brought on the Iraqi people has made this need urgent, and I hope we will all fully support this President's request.

I do, however, want to introduce an idea that I think is perfectly consistent with funding this request, and that is an idea that goes to the heart of what we ought to be doing here in Congress, and I think that is establishing our priorities, funding our priorities, and tightening our belts and living with some fiscal discipline throughout our budgeting process.

Today just happens to mark the first day of a new fiscal year for the Federal Government, and, unfortunately, it is a fiscal year in which we are going to undoubtedly run a several hundred billion dollar deficit. Given that situation, I think it is all the more important that we exercise the fiscal discipline and identify the priorities that we need to.

□ 1930

This is a priority. So I have proposed, together with our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), that we fund this, and we fund this fully but, at the same time, over the next several years, we find offsetting spending reductions in other foreign aid proposals, programs, areas that are not as high a priority, frankly, as rebuilding Iraq; and we reduce that spending by an amount that will, over time, add up to the amount we are spending in Iraq so that at the end of the day, the American taxpayer is not paying any additional net new sum of money to do this vital function. I think it is about priorities.

There are a number of areas that I would not suggest that we reduce funding in our foreign aid budget. For instance, our aid to Israel and Egypt is fundamental and very important. For other reasons, diplomatic and embassy security. There are a number of programs we should not touch. But frankly, if we were to trim by about 15 percent a year for the next 4 years, the next 5 years, I correct myself, for the next 5 years, we could fully offset this critical $20.3 billion expenditure that we need to make for our own security and for the security of our troops in Iraq and for the sake of the security of that region.

So I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. Again, I am very supportive of the President's request, but I would urge my colleagues to join me in an effort to find the appropriate offsets over the next several years so that this vital priority gets funded and some less important foreign aid programs wait until we have the resources to do it.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation, and I want to express my appreciation for his thoughtful analysis of this issue. We do have to prioritize, and the suggestion he makes is a good one. As was mentioned earlier, today was the first day of school in Iraq; and in my visit there, we learned that America has done a great deal to rebuild the schools, although Americans will say, well, why are we rebuilding their schools and not ours. As I explained earlier, what we are doing is going in and painting existing school buildings.

But helping the people of Iraq educate their children is a critically important role for America. Again, it helps us to win over their hearts and minds and to do what our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), said, and that is have the Iraqi

people side with us in this struggle. For example, for them to help our troops find an explosive device that is planted and intended to kill an American, they are the best ones who can do that. Education is a big part of that effort; and to discuss education in Iraq further, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Arizona. People have asked me what the trend is in Iraq, for better or for worse. I just returned from Iraq and the trend is for the better. The last time I was in Iraq, I was in uniform flying at 20,000 feet and the Iraqi Air Defense network was shooting at us. That force is now gone.

Now that the allies have won, I think we should follow several key principles. One, the war on terror must be fought overseas and not in America's cities. I come from Chicago, home to America's tallest building. The Sears Tower is still standing, and we want to keep it that way.

Second, we must finish the job in Iraq; otherwise, we condemn a future generation of young Americans to refight this war. If Desert Storm had a key lesson, it is that unfinished work ensures a new Middle East war. I think we should make sure that no future generation of Americans has to fight again, and that is why we need to finish what we are doing in Iraq.

Our goals must match the best ideals of Americans: an Iraq that does not invade another member of the U.N. each decade; an Iraq that governs by the consent of Iraqis; and an Iraq that cooperates with the United Nations, not confronts it. These are worthy missions and if we accept these missions, we must accept that we need to give our troops the tools they need to complete this job.

This is a difficult job. Let us look at Iraq under Saddam. Life expectancy in Iraq totaled just 58 years. Forty-seven percent of children did not attend school. Half of Baghdad's phones did not work. Iraq had the highest infant mortality rate in the Middle East. Seventy of 90 city water systems did not work. Saddam's health budget totaled 75 cents per person per year. There was only one newspaper, Uday Hussein's newspaper.

Under the allies now, the situation has changed. Ninety percent of Iraqi school kids started class today. Power generation is up 100 percent from 1,200 megawatts to 3,700. Five million school books were delivered, but these school books did not have the anti-U.S., anti-Semitic rhetoric. Now there are several dozen newspapers. I brought them back with me. These are newspapers that did not exist before May 1, like Azzaman, al-Balad, Al Mutamar, Ashraa, and even an English language newspaper, Iraq Today.

When I was in Iraq, I learned that 90 percent of Western reporters have left Iraq and for those young reporters who remain, their editors have told them that they are only interested in one story: injuries to Americans. We are not allowed to know about anything else happening in Iraq, but there are many developments in Iraq that we should know about.

I want to tell one last story. As my colleague from Arizona said, today is the first day of school in Iraq. And we, the United States Government, have prepared a school kit with the U.S. emblem on the front. This school kit is a book bag with pens, a calculator, school supplies, all intended for Iraqi children. The U.S. Government delivered 1.5 million of these school kits to the children of Iraq to ensure a good start with the school year. This was a start of the school year which did not include half of Iraqi children; it included 90 percent. They got a good start. Each day, Iraqi children, when they open their book bag, will see the U.S. emblem on the front. And that is a powerful message that they will remember: who helped them in their earliest years in class.

I think this represents some of the best ideals of America. It is showing that we are part of the future of this country. The situation is changing and changing for the better, and I thank my colleague for having this Special Order.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman illustrates how exactly we are going about winning the hearts and minds of the people of Iraq, and I thank him.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for putting on this Special Order, and I really feel privileged to be a part of this story tonight.

I too traveled to Iraq the last week in August. I came back to this country and turned on the national network news one night and the lead story was about Iraq. But honestly, I did not recognize the country that they were talking about, the country I had just left a few hours before. Perhaps General James Conway of the First Marine Expeditionary Force summed it up best when he said, ''Iraq is a vivid success story.'' Iraqis are concerned not that we will stay too long, but that we will leave too soon.

Let me talk for just a minute about health care in Iraq. Put this in the context that there was no health care infrastructure improvement in over 30 years. A member of the 385th Civil Affairs Brigade, Lieutenant Colonel Michael Keller, a good west Texas boy, had been to the medical library in Baghdad. He reported to me that within the medical library he could not find a medical text that had a copyright date later than 1984. Pharmaceutical agents that were manufactured in Iraq were useless; and, in fact, after the end of the combat phase, we relied heavily upon donations of medicine from the Kuwaitis. Saddam's per capita medical expenditures were 50 cent a person, compared now to $45 a person in the last 6 months.

Perhaps the most searing comparison was the opulence of the palaces compared with the dreadful poverty of the hospitals in Iraq, palaces that had marble veneers on every wall, two-story-high fireplaces, and hospitals that did not even have linoleum on the floors, hospitals that did not even have medical gases piped in.

Mr. Speaker, one of the points that was brought up earlier was the humanitarian disaster that did not occur in Iraq. Let me point out that if there had been 15,000 heat-related deaths in Iraq this summer, we would have been blistered in this country because of that. The 15,000 heat-related deaths occurred in France. We barely heard a word about it from our news media.

I know time is tight, so I yield back to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman who brings a great perspective. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding to me.

I rise in very strong support of the supplemental appropriation that the President has requested. In doing so, I do not take the position, and I am sure my colleagues do not, that this supplemental appropriation will be free of scrutiny. We will look it over; and, frankly, we will check it out, and I have no doubt in the legislative process we will improve it greatly.

But I think as to the big question, the President has it right, and I think he has it right for three reasons. First, as has been alluded to several times by a number of speakers tonight, our own history gives us the lessons that we should be drawing in this particular case. In the First World War, we won the war, we participated with our allies, but we did not do anything to rebuild a shattered Europe afterwards. Less than a generation later, young Americans were dying again in the same fields, in the same countries, for the same cause. In the Second World War, we took a different approach and it was extraordinarily successful. We not only won the war, we won the peace, we secured Europe; and, in doing so, we set up a powerful example in Europe that saved that continent from the awful tyranny of Communism.

There is even a more recent example and, frankly, a less happy one that I think as Americans we ought to reflect upon. We were engaged indirectly and, to some extent, directly in the struggle in Afghanistan to push out the old Soviet Union, and we were successful in that. We walked away from the problem. And in walking away, we left a country that was destroyed, that was devastated, that was divided; and in less than a generation, frankly, in a matter of a few years, terrorists set in, took over and planned and launched a deadly attack on the United States that we have lived with the consequences of. We should learn from our own history.

The second reason I support this supplemental is, quite frankly, the situation in Iraq. There is no question Iraq is a potentially rich country, but it is not rich today. The oil revenues, the revenues that the people of Iraq generate from their hard labor and work need to be reinvested in Iraq and will be reinvested in Iraq. The reality is there is simply not enough wealth to be created to get the job done and to get the job done in a timely, expeditious way, a way that is good for Iraq and, frankly, in a time frame that makes it possible for our own people to leave as quickly as possible, which is what we want and what they want.

Finally, and most powerfully, I think I favor this resolution simply because I support our American troops that are on the ground there. We have asked a generation of young Americans to perform a dangerous and difficult task.

I serve on the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. Speaker; and every single military person that has come to visit with us has told us this is an important part of winning the war, securing the peace, and that these dollars, particularly spent on civilian projects and rebuilding and reconstruction in Iraq, enhance the security of American forces that are deployed. I want American troops to be looked upon as what they are: liberators and benefactors. I do not want them to be regarded as conquerors, occupiers, and exploiters; and I think the latter will be the case.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a historic opportunity. All of us have a responsibility, I think, to do what previous generations of Americans have done: rise up, meet this challenge.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentleman for his leadership. He has not only spoken eloquently tonight, but I too heard the gentleman repeatedly in groups, caucuses, and organizations; and the gentleman is doing a fantastic job.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, rather than closing, my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA), is here. I know he feels passionately about this. I guess we have 15 seconds left. The gentleman led his own Special Order on this issue last night, and I yield to the gentleman to close.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, and I think the fact that we only have 15 seconds left, we have had so many Members here tonight to tell the real story.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I do not think I have ever seen a Special Order with this many speakers.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, the fact that we have so many Members who want to share the real story of Iraq I think speaks well, for the facts are that there is great hope, there is great optimism. Supporting the President's request is the right thing to do. We have one chance to get it right.

I thank the gentleman very much for hosting this evening's discussion.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. It is clear to me that we need to win over the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people. As our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MARSHALL), said from the other side of the aisle here tonight, we absolutely must have them on our side. This is the way to do it. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the President's full request.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 43RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF CYPRUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I actually did not come tonight to discuss Iraq or to respond to what my colleagues said on the Republican side, but I could not help but when one of my colleagues got up and showed that book bag and I think suggested that there were over a million Iraqi children that were going to receive that very nice book bag, I just could not help but think, well, what about all of the American children that went to school; I do not remember any of them getting a free book bag.

So part of the problem is that when the Republicans talk about all of these wonderful things that are going to be given to the Iraqis, they seem to forget that many of these things, whether it is education or health care needs, are not provided to our own citizens here in the United States.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to mark the 43rd anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. Since the end of 80 years of British rule in 1960, this remarkable island of Cyprus and its people have endured great hardships and great triumphs. Despite being divided for the past 29 years, Cypriots have not given up hope to one day see the end of the Turkish occupation and the reunification of the island. I recently traveled to Cyprus in August; and I firmly believe that all people, Greek, Turkish, Armenian and all of the inhabitants of the island, want to see the end of the intransigence of the Turkish leaders and greet each other as fellow citizens once again.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, on July 20 of 1974, Turkey unilaterally invaded the sovereign nation of Cyprus, resulting in the ethnic cleansing of the northern third of the island of Greek Cypriots.

□ 1945

This action was, and continues to be, widely condemned by the international community. And dozens of U.N. resolutions have been passed about this illegal occupation. And the European Union has made it clear that Turkey's entrance into the European Union eventually will be based in part by its ability and willingness to settle the situation in Cyprus.

Now, I have to say many of us know that this past year there seems to have been an opportunity to reunify the island and even the Turkish occupation of the northern part of Cyprus because Cyprus, it was finally agreed, would enter the European Union on its own. In fact, the accession to the European Union is scheduled to take place next May in 2004. In April of this year the decision was finally made by the European Union to accept Cyprus as a member.

The United Nations under Secretary General Annan put together a plan for the reunification of Cyprus. And back in the early part of this year, there were negotiations between the Turkish occupied government in the northern part of Cyprus and the government in Nicosia, the Greek government which represent the entire island as well as the Turkish government. And we were hopeful that there would be some agreement on a reunification plan before the decision was made in April that Cyprus would join the European Union. It certainly made sense to have Cyprus join the European Union as a unified island. But unfortunately because of the intransigence by the Turkish-Cypriot leader, Ralph Denktash, those talks led to nowhere. And everyone agreed, not only the Secretary General of the U.N. but also our government agreed and specifically stated that the reason why the talks broke down and no unification plan under the auspices of the U.N. was adopted was because the leader of the Turkish Cypriots, Mr. Denktash, refused to budge and refused to effectuate any real negotiation according to the U.N. plan.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share my outrage over a statement made by Mr. Denktash yesterday. Frustrated by the unity of the international community identifying him as the obstacle to reunification, he compared Secretary General Kofi Annan's plan for the reunification of Cyprus with the genocide committed by President Milosevic of Yugoslavia. Now, that is an outrage in itself. Here is the U.N. under the Secretary General trying to bring peace to a divided island, trying to reunify the island for all its people, and that is compared to the genocide by the President of Yugoslavia?

For Mr. Denktash, a man that has repeatedly flouted the will of the U.N. and his own citizenry, this ridiculous claim is, I think, the most egregious action that he has taken so far. It is not enough for him, it seems, to operate outside international norms; he must now accuse the U.N. of committing the worst of crimes against humanity.

Mr. Speaker, I sent a letter to Mr. Denktash today which I would insert into the RECORD.

OCTOBER 1, 2003.

Mr. RAUF DENKTASH,
Washington, DC.

Mr. DENKTASH: I was shocked to learn of your comments yesterday in an interview with the Anadolu Agency that compared United Nations Secretary General Kofi

Annan with indicted war criminal Slobadan Milosevic. This could not be further from the truth. Milosevic is accused of the worst of crimes against the ethnic Albanians, and Kofi Annan works tirelessly for the advancement of global truth and justice. In order to set the record straight, I ask that you issue an apology to the Secretary General and recommit yourself to the reunification process with Greek Cyprus.

Your statement clearly is not helpful to the reunification process of Cyprus. In sharp contrast, Greek Cypriot President Tassos Papadopoulos has proven to bend over backwards in order to move the talks forward. After the failure of the talks in March at The Hague, he did not waiver from his determination to arrive at a solution, stating that despite his ''understandable sense of disappointment, we will not abandon our efforts for a Cyprus solution, which would be functional and viable.''

It is also evident that you are not truly representing the will of your own citizenry. As you well know, tens of thousands of Turkish Cypriots protested in support of the U.N. plan for reunification with Greek Cyprus earlier this year. They demanded that they be given the same rights that are enjoyed by the Greek Cypriots, and reunite the country once again after 29 years of division. Your decision to open up the border to Cypriots on both sides for daily trips was a positive first step towards the cessation of tensions, but a first step is all it will remain if you do not return to the negotiating table.

A solution can still be reached in the Cyprus problem. You still have the chance to heed the advice of the international community and the demands of your own people. An apology regarding your recent comments about Kofi Annan, accompanied by a sincere commitment to the reunification talks, will go a long way for the people of Cyrpus to have their country back.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in that letter I demanded that he apologize for his statement and recommit himself to the U.N. peace process. His behavior further demonstrates what Mr. Annan stated about how it was solely Mr. Denktash who was the reason why these reunification talks broke down. I would ask him to start up the reunification talks again. This is what should be done, not making these outrageous statements about the U.N.

HURRICANE ISABEL RECOVERY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I will be joined here by a number of my colleagues from not only North Carolina but from States along the east coast that were hit by Hurricane Isabel with devastating force several weeks ago, and a number of lives were lost in my home State. More lives were lost, of course, as the storm made its way up the east coast through Virginia into the District of Columbia as it continued to move forward. And, of course, the amount of water that was dropped created flood conditions in some parts of the east coast that they have not seen for a long time.

This evening, though, let me speak specifically about North Carolina and then we will cover some of the other issues. And my colleagues are going to join me in a few minutes. But I want to express my appreciation this evening, Mr. Speaker, to some hard-working folks who came to North Carolina really before the storm hit, from FEMA and the emergency management people in North Carolina, Under Secretary Beatty and Governor Easley, who really were planning in getting ready.

We had a lot of advance planning and time to get ready for the storm when it was a category 5. Unfortunately, no matter how well you plan, you cannot stop the wind damage, nor can you stop the tidal surge. And that is what created tremendous damage. We have roughly 400 FEMA workers in North Carolina as I speak this evening helping door to door.

I appreciate this opportunity to bring to my colleagues' attention in this House the issues as they relates to recovery costs from this devastating hurricane. I have to my right here a photograph of a road. You know, most of us think it hit the coast and that is where it ended. This was well inland. This really is a road here, and you see how it was washed out.

I want to turn, though, to the next photograph. And I am going to leave this up and refer to it from time to time. This is a small rural village, the county seat, of Hyde County. It is not in my district, but I have a lot of friends who live there. When I was State superintendent of schools, I spent time with my friends there. And this small town is under water, or was under water.

What is so sad and devastating about this situation is when Hurricane Floyd hit in 1999, they saw flooding, substantial flooding. They borrowed money through SBA and other sources and with the FEMA money razed their homes, did the things they needed to do. And now the whole town is flooded, not just part of it, the whole town.

And I could cite stories all over the East, and my colleagues are going to talk about more of those this evening, so I will let them join me in just a minute. But as it roared ashore on Thursday, September 18, I could not help but think that Hurricane Fran that hit in 1996 came on a Thursday, Hurricane Floyd which was the 500-year flood, came on a Thursday, it seems like Thursdays in September are not the kind of days in North Carolina when you have got a storm coming you want to look forward to.

But as this storm roared through North Carolina and into Virginia and Maryland, its effects were felt all the way up into West Virginia and Pennsylvania and finally ultimately in Canada. Although it lost its strength as it came inland, it was a huge storm. And the fury of this storm touched millions of people along the east coast. A lot of folks were without power for a week. I was told today that finally, after now roughly almost 2 weeks, all the power is back on in North Carolina.

It destroyed homes, as I said. It destroyed whole towns, it flooded them, and it literally devastated crops. And I will talk about that more as the evening goes on with my colleagues.

And I am sorry to say that in North Carolina we lost five of our citizens as a result of this storm. And as is the case many times with a hurricane or storm that moves inland, we lose more lives from freshwater flooding than we do along the coast.

We asked our friends in North Carolina to send a photograph to us tonight to use to share with our colleagues, because many have seen the photographs or the things on TV as it relates to the Outer Banks and Hatteras and Ocracoke and others. This little small town is in a rural county; and, I dare say, no one has seen this photograph in Hyde County of Swan Quarter, a fishing village with some great people.

So far, 26 counties in North Carolina have been declared Federal disaster areas. And we just got word that the declaration may be extended to several more counties, and it should be. And I trust the people at FEMA will do it quickly. Because there is a lot of debris.

I talked this evening with a person who works for the State of North Carolina who works with our fishermen on the coast. And because of all the debris that has been washed on shore and clogged up the channels, many of our fishermen who would like to go out and earn a living, that even though the storm has passed, there is so much debris they cannot set the nets, their crab pots have been washed away. It is just devastating to their economic livelihood.

Preliminary damage estimates indicate, and these are only preliminary, the numbers will change, that North Carolina local governments have incurred more than $55 million in damages, an assessment for individual losses thus far and is continuing to rise as those numbers come in.

This is a State, as I said earlier, that was hit with Hurricane Fran in 1996 that created untold hundreds of millions of dollars, actually in the billions of dollars, of damage, a devastating flood in 1999, ice storms et cetera. I will talk about that more later. 1.8 million acres of three of our State's most important crops were heavily damaged: peanuts, cotton, and soybeans. And the shame of it is it comes to one of the areas of my State where there is very little manufacturing. Agriculture is the lifeblood of many of these communities. And it comes less than 1 year after our farmers suffered one of the worst droughts that we have faced in a long, long time.

Sometimes those of us in North Carolina feel that our State has become a sort of disaster central. We get an awful lot of disasters. Some have said

that when you dial 911, it rings in North Carolina. They are really talking about when hurricanes head in. And they normally hit North Carolina because it sort of sticks out in the ocean, if you look at the maps.

In the past several years, as I have said, we have had two major hurricanes, a major ice storm, and a drought. That is why the economy of our State is in such tough shape right now. Along with the manufacturing jobs we have lost, it has had a heavy impact. We have lost the second largest number of manufacturing jobs in the country, second only to Michigan.

Fortunately, because of the advanced technology that we enjoy today, Isabel was one of the best forecast storms that we have had in a long, long time. We needed direction and they told us about where it was going to hit and it hit there, the approximate wind speed, and they were right. But as I said earlier, we could not control the waves; we could not control the wind. And a lot of damage was done.

However, as these two photographs show, there is water in every house in this small town. The whole town is flooded. One thing that we can improve upon that we do not now have the ability to do is that we ought to be able to determine the hydrology of how much water is going to fall so we will know what the flood levels are.

Most of our Nation's hurricane preparedness efforts have been focused on tracking storms, telling close communities to leave, and they did in this one. It saved a lot of lives, and we are grateful for that. But we cannot deal with the surge. With early warnings, communities can take necessary preparedness and protect our citizens and, in many cases, protect property as was done along the North Carolina coast to the extent we could.

However, as was demonstrated by Hurricane Floyd in 1999, Tropical Storm Alison in 2002, and now Hurricane Isabel this year, we need to improve our ability to raise the awareness of our inland residents of the destructive nature of flooding.

□ 2000

And we can do something about it. A study done by Ed Rappaport of the Tropical Prediction Center shows that since 1970 fresh water flooding has caused 59 percent of storm deaths in the United States in all storms, whereas only 1 percent of the losses of life have come from coastal storm surges, and that is true in this storm.

That is why in the 107th Congress my colleagues joined me as I introduced and we got passed the Tropical Cyclone Inland Forecasting Improvement and Warning System Development Act. That is a long title to say we need a little bit of money to find out where the flash floods are going to be, how high they will be, so when we tell a person there will be a flash flood, they will know whether it will be 6 inches or 6 feet. There is a big difference in that to save lives.

This law authorizes a small sum, only $1.15 million a year for 5 years to provide the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, or NOAA, with additional resources to enhance the science of flood prediction and, most importantly, develop an important, effective flood warning index that will really save lives. We can do it. We have the technology to do it. It takes just a few dollars to help make our citizens here in the United States of America, who are paying the taxes, safer and to save lives.

We need to better understand the damage these storms can cause and better inform our citizens of the danger these storms pose.

I am working hard with my colleagues and this delegation and others to provide the funding this year to bring the process of developing an inland flood forecasting and warning system that our communities will have so that when the next hurricanes come, hopefully we will have a way to deal with it and we will be better informed to share with our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield to my colleague really from the Northeast, whose district encompasses a lot of the area that received substantial damage, a hard-working member who has really spent a lot of time working with his colleagues, working to make sure we get the money, to make a difference, to help his people back home, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE). I thank the gentleman for his hard work.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), my colleague, for organizing this special order tonight. And we thank our other colleagues who are going to join us, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and others.

I represent the First Congressional District of North Carolina, all or part of 23 counties. Most of these 23 counties were sort of in the eye of the storm, but there were about seven or eight who were actually hard hit and power was knocked out for more than a week.

We are here tonight because we want to talk about this storm and its impact on the communities, the cleanup and recovery process that has gone on and is going on. Tragedies such as these kinds of storms bring out the best in our people, and we want to talk a little bit about that and congratulate all of the volunteers and those who worked so hard. People find that in these kinds of tragedies they can lean on one another and they can lean on their faith and they can have hope for a brighter future, even while they are sitting in the dark, maybe with a candle flickering as the only light in their household.

As my colleague has pointed out, Hurricane Isabel made land 2 weeks ago, hitting North Carolina's coast and coming right across Greenville and Roanoke Rapids and Hoskey and on into Virginia and on up the coast and right across the District of Columbia. The resulting impact left entire communities in the dark for the better part of an entire week. As we learned today, the last out customer in Hartford County was to have their lights by dark tonight, and one customer in Washington County hopefully by midnight tonight.

There may still be a few isolated power outages where the storm has damaged the home itself or the meter box, and the power companies are not able to turn the power on until those areas are fixed. But people were left without lights, without water, without the necessities. And I know that there are some people who depend on their telephone as a lifeline. At some point, after a day or two, in most of these areas, telephones were out, roads were out and impassable.

I wanted to say a hearty thank-you to the thousands and thousands of volunteers, first responders who comprised about 95 percent of the relief operations early on in all of these communities. They, the firemen, were out there almost in the middle of the storm, the police officers, the sheriffs' departments. And then just individuals who knew that there were problems with trees across the highways and they went out with their chain saws, and they removed those trees so that people could get home; or if there was an emergency, they could get to the emergency relief.

And as the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) has pointed out, we are pleased that almost all of the power in these communities is now back on.

I want to talk about a few of the communities that I visited. My staff and I tried to go to every one of these 23 counties. It was a little difficult for me to get to all of them, but I got to maybe about eight or nine. But over in Northampton County, which was hard hit and out of power, we went to Jackson and to the emergency relief operation. They had just completed their building with help from the USDA rural development grant and loan and that building, they told me, was right on time. They had a generator there and they had power there, and they had some space for people to sleep. After about 24 hours, they needed about an hour's sleep and they could go in and get a little relief.

Over in Martin County I was pleased to go by and ride with a county commissioner, Mr. Lilly, and he took me into areas of that county where trees had blown across the highways. And he told me how the fire departments, even in the dark of night and early into the next morning, were out there with their chain saws. I said, well, how did they decide whose jurisdiction they were in? He said, Well, they did not worry about that. They just decided they would get together and work and solve the problem.

We went down to Bertie County, and the one thing that they were concerned

about, the county manager and the emergency personnel and the elected officials were all there at the center, and they said, We need generators because we are worried, they have a county-wide water system, we are worried about the water system. We have got some water, but we need generators to pump water into the holding tanks so we will not lose our water system, and they get contaminated.

In Hartford County we had similar situations and one of the churches just opened its doors. The National Guard brought a generator down to Mount Nebo, and they fed for 5 days; and the church just picked up the tab itself until they got some other people who gave food and allowed them to feed people who had no way of preparing their own food and many of whom had run out of money.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman is talking about the number of meals, I was looking through my notes here, and I think it is a good point to share with my colleagues.

As these things happen, it is amazing what happens with our neighbors and friends and our first responders. In many of these areas, especially in the gentleman's area and down east, almost all of them are volunteers. They are very few paid fire, rescue and other folks. They were out working 24 hours a day really in some cases. As a matter of fact, in Franklin County we lost a volunteer firemen who was killed as a result of being out that night, hit by a tree.

My notes indicate, as of today, a note I just received from Secretary Beatty, the governor's person who is in charge of Emergency Management, Crime Patrol and Public Safety, that in North Carolina the volunteer groups and Red Cross and Salvation Army, the North Carolina Baptist Men, and I am sure a lot of these that you talked about in churches, probably are not in this number that had prepared meals. They had prepared 623,168 meals to people in eastern North Carolina.

That gives you some idea what the devastation was. For many of these folks, not only are they living in shelters; FEMA has had to move in portable trailers because their homes are uninhabitable as they try to work through it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, this spirit of volunteerism, that was what impressed me most as I toured around these counties. And people who had trees to fall literally on top of their houses, well, I am thankful that it was not any worse than it was.

That kind of buoyed my spirits because when you go in and see the people and look at the devastation, it just touches you, and you have a feeling of, what can I do to help?

I am here because I want to let you know that those of us who represent you in Washington and those who represent you in the State of North Carolina and the Federal and the State and the local governments are all coming together to try to fix this problem.

We went to Gates County, and over in Gates it is amazing. It was one of the hardest hit counties. They lost all of on their electric power. They lost their telephone power, and they even lost their radio power. The only way they could communicate for a while was by cell phone, and then they lost their cell phone power. It was amazing. The way they figured out to do it was they got some signs, and as people would ride by, they would have on the signs where they could go to get ice and water and food and help.

I talked to the sheriff over there and he was telling me that he was so proud of not only his employees but every last person that came out and volunteered their time and said, What can I do to help?

He did tell me, and I hope I am not stepping over the line to say this, at one point he saw some power trucks coming through his community to head down to the coast. He started to pick up the next phone to say that the next one that comes through, I am going to hijack them and make them help. But he did not do that. He said he knew they were directed where to go and they had an obligation.

But for several days the community was cut off from the rest of the world, and they were left to their own devices of how they were to communicate. They were able to do it and they were successful. And after first striking out with DOT, they were able to get some of those battery-powered signs that they could put up and to help them with their communication.

Over in Washington County, another county that was hard hit and the power knocked out, the story is told of residents who could not travel down the main highways, but they had to use, instead, dirt roads on the farmers' farms, and the farmers were on standby with their tractors just in case someone got stuck and could not get through. That is the kind of spirit that this hurricane brought out.

But it was so devastating and there are still people who, even though they have their power, they have damage in their yards, to their homes, and it is going to be a long time before they can recover and get back to a normal life.

But yet I want to say that the emergency management, FEMA people, everybody that I saw as I traveled through was working just as hard as they could. And the private insurance companies, I am told, I did not see them, but I am told they came in and tried to set up stations and do what they could.

We have already talked about the agricultural loss, $168 million loss of prospects. We grow a lot of peanuts, a lot of cotton and corn. We do not know yet all of that damage that has taken place, but yet we are hopeful that we are going to come through. And we had eight counties in this district that were initially not declared, Greene, Lenoir, Vance, Warren, Nash, Granville and Wilson; and I understand they have been and are being added to the list and they can get some relief. That will take some of the pressure off of the local government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come back later and talk about one little community in Bertie County, Colerain, and the fishery that was destroyed down there, but I will yield to the gentleman at this time.

□ 2015

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just have gotten a copy of a document from Department of Homeland Security and FEMA where those counties have now been declared part of this disaster area.

I now want to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the 4th Congressional District (Mr. PRICE). When he was talking about being without power, he and I remember very vividly, as busy as we were with Floyd, Fran hit us real hard, and I will never forget being out of power for a week. One of the things I always said, you really knew who your friend was then. It was the people who shared ice with you in September when it was really hot, but that being said, we need not forget tonight that a lot of these people in eastern North Carolina, even though we have got FEMA there working, all of our friends working, there is some insurance available, there is going to be a lot of hurt and need, and we are going to need to work together to make sure resources are available because, if not, some of these communities, as total communities, will have real problems continuing to exist, and a lot of our agricultural friends will not be able to make it. There is not enough insurance. The State's going to have to come up with about a 25 percent match. I think these are the kind of times when our States face some tough times, but the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) has been there every step of the way helping in this, and I want to thank him, and I yield to him now for his comments.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for taking out this special order tonight. It is a real service, I believe, not only to the people of North Carolina but to our fellow citizens across this country to point out the dimensions of this disaster and to point out the human needs and to line out what we in the Congress, and in government at all levels, are going to need to do to meet this challenge.

I also thank the gentleman from the 1st District (Mr. BALLANCE) for his words. He is a fine Representative for that part of North Carolina and has shown that once again in these recent days by being out there with his people, assessing the needs, offering words of support and comfort and coming back here to fight for the support that is needed.

So we are facing, once again, a challenge. As the gentleman indicated, it is one that we have had some personal experience with. North Carolina has had more than our share, it seems, in recent years of these kinds of disasters, I believe, being days without power in the aftermath of Hurricane Fran, days without power in very cold weather last December with the ice storms. This time in our area it was only a little over a day without power; although I think most of us did spend most of our weekends, the last couple of weekends, cleaning up debris and getting our property back in order.

The fact is that to the east of the 4th District and of the 2nd District, the devastation is far worse, and we understand that, and we understand the need for all the members of our congressional delegation to pull together and to look out after our friends and neighbors in eastern North Carolina, particularly the northeastern part of our State, an area which the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE) represents so well.

We are mindful also of the needs of our friends in Virginia, in Maryland, in all the States and counties along the path of this devastating storm, Isabel.

Once again, we are facing the daunting challenge of recovering from a major hurricane. It has devastated our coast in North Carolina. It has caused major damage to homes and public facilities. It has displaced thousands of families. Preliminary damage assessments indicate that at least $55 million in damage costs have been incurred by local governments. The losses to individuals are still being determined, but that is going to be a very high number. Agricultural damages are over $160 million, and that number also is very, very likely to climb.

Twenty-six of North Carolina's counties have been designated as disaster areas. We are almost certain that 10 more will be added and perhaps more after that.

As with Hurricane Floyd and Hurricane Fran, the North Carolina congressional delegation is already working together to support the State's recovery efforts in every way that we can, and as my colleagues have expressed tonight, we are very, very grateful for the partnership that we have experienced with Federal agencies being on the scene, State agencies, local governments, volunteer groups, congregations, civic-minded individuals, people who have demonstrated once again the importance of reaching out to those in need, the importance of that value of community, that notion that we are all in this together and that when adversity strikes a portion of our community, we have all got to do our part to make the community whole.

The Federal relief agencies, of course, we in the Congress pay special attention to, and I am happy to say that they have been on the job. This storm did give some ample warning. We had actually very accurate predictions this time of when this storm would arrive, and where it would go, and FEMA and other Federal agencies were on the ground as the storm approached. That is also true of our State agencies. They came in before the storm. They have remained in the State, and they have worked together cooperatively. I think we can be proud of the Federal-State-local cooperative effort, the public-private cooperative effort that this storm has brought forth. Once again, adversity sometimes brings out some of the best aspects of our communities, and we have experienced that.

Most of the Federal assistance, Mr. Speaker, is going to come through FEMA's regular disaster assistance programs. They will pay 75 percent of the costs borne by the State and local governments associated with the disaster. In the worst hit counties, FEMA will make special assistance available to individuals. They will help make repairs to their homes and for other immediate needs.

Congress replenished recently FEMA's disaster account by some $1.4 billion through two supplemental appropriations bills. This funding was provided in response to an administration request based on disasters in other parts of the country earlier in the year. Unfortunately, the money that Congress has thus far provided does fall short still of the administration's request, and the administration's request itself was not intended to cover Isabel or future disasters.

So, once again, we have a disaster coming in the period between two fiscal years, and we have some important questions we must address about the funding that is available from existing resources and also the funding that is available in the fiscal 2004 Homeland Security bill. That bill, by the way, was signed by the President today in a very impressive ceremony over at the Department of Homeland Security. That bill contains funding for FEMA, money that we are going to have to draw on.

I am not sure the money in that bill will be sufficient to carry us through the next fiscal year. In fact, I am fairly certain that it will not be because there are surely more disasters to come, and we are still in the midst of assessing the costs for this disaster.

I spoke last week on the House floor, Mr. Speaker, about the shortfalls that could occur in the disaster relief accounts and the impact of such shortfalls on disaster victims. Our colleagues know that when the balance of these accounts begins to shrink, FEMA is obligated to stop the flow of relief to ensure that they have enough funding to help victims of disasters that might be just around the corner.

So I am determined, Mr. Speaker, that we are not in this case going to put either FEMA or the victims of Isabel in that kind of position. I am a member of the Appropriations subcommittee that funds FEMA, and I am already conferring with that agency about the status of their disaster account and whether or not it has sufficient resources to also cover the needs resulting from Hurricane Isabel, and we are going to assess that in very short order. We will be working with the administration and with the Congress to act quickly on any supplemental spending requests, if they are needed, so that the disaster relief account has adequate resources, and FEMA assistance is able to flow quickly and efficiently to North Carolina and to other affected areas.

There are other disaster-related programs, Mr. Speaker, at the Department of Transportation, at the Natural Resources Conservation Service, at the Small Business Administration, and they are also going to need to be tapped. So we will need to keep an eye out for those programs as well.

As we get more details about the agricultural losses, and I know that our colleague from the 2nd District is in a particularly good position to assess that, because of the nature of these districts and also his service on the Committee on Agriculture, we will need to work with the administration and our colleagues in Congress to provide relief to farmers, as we normally do following major disasters.

So we have a lot of work to do. There is a lot to be heartened by, the kind of human sympathy and compassion that has been displayed in the face of this awful disaster, the kind of cooperation we have seen among governmental agencies and private organizations, but there is a lot of work yet to do.

We are going to need to cooperate with Members from all over the country, but particularly with Members from Virginia and Maryland and other affected States, and we are going to need to work across party lines, with the administration and with each other, to ensure that the Federal Government is a full partner in this effort, that it does all that it can do and all that it should do to aid in this recovery effort.

So I am appreciative, Mr. Speaker, of the chance here tonight to join with these colleagues and to highlight some of the needs and to serve notice that we are going to be working as hard as we know how and as cooperatively as we can possibly manage, to address these needs in the weeks ahead, and I thank my colleague for giving us the chance to make our case and to look toward the challenges facing us in the future.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for not only joining us this evening but, more importantly, for his leadership and his hard work on the Committee on Appropriations, as we work through other issues dealing with a host of other issues. I remember the challenge we had with Hurricane Floyd, which was one of the most devastating things we dealt with in FEMA, and you were there carrying a full load and a half, and we appreciate that and all your efforts, and I

thank the gentleman for his leadership in this area, and I know the people of North Carolina appreciate it as well and others across the country because I think you appropriately pointed out, and I thank you for that, it is really when one part of the country is affected, all of us as Americans are affected and as tax-paying citizens.

I want to express again my appreciation to our friends in North Carolina at the Emergency Management. I was there on Wednesday evening late, and again Thursday morning for the briefings, and I would encourage my colleagues in the Congress, if you have not been to visit the folks, you ought to go by and visit them. It is kind of hard to say you ought to go when they are having an emergency, but when you have got an impending disaster, to see all these groups come together, FEMA, the power companies, the different areas, the National Guard, the Red Cross, all these different volunteer groups who are in the same meeting and they get all the briefings on the weather, et cetera, and each one has to report what they are doing, where they are throughout the day, as they get ready, as the storm is approaching.

I did that on Thursday morning and then went down to Fort Bragg which was the staging area for FEMA where they brought in something like 19 or 20 trailers loaded with fuel. That just happened to be one of many staging areas in North Carolina. They were ready for the storm to hit, and as soon as it hit and they could get in, they started disbursing things. It shows that I guess in North Carolina, we have been through it a lot, and they sort of know how to get ready, but so does a lot of other parts of the country. It is a great tribute I think to how we work together to get things done, Federal, State and local, and we can work together when we need to, and I appreciate that.

I know on Friday morning after the storm had hit and such devastation was out there, I joined with the interim Agricultural Commission to fly around the State to take a look at not only the home loss and road damage, but also agricultural damage. And we flew over to Lewisburg and Rocky Mount, Roanoke Rapids over by Hoskey, landed in Elizabeth City where they had no power. Everything was being run by a generator. Part of the buildings were gone, as you can appreciate in a major hurricane, and back over Edenton, a beautiful city right there on the Sound and back into the Raleigh, and it almost breaks your heart to see these, as we know, the really colonial towns that took such a hammering in the storm.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the town of Edenton, North Carolina, is a beautiful town. At one time, it was capital of North Carolina. It took a devastating hit in this storm, and the previous high-water mark, I think, was probably Hurricane Hazel in the 1950s, to say nothing of Fran and Floyd later, and this storm in that part of North Carolina topped all of those. The damage was far greater, and so it is important to stress that while the Outer Banks are hurt very badly, and there has been a great deal of attention focused on that area, and that carries with it, of course, a lot of agricultural damage, those inland areas in northeastern North Carolina are hit fully as hard and have a huge challenge in this road back.

□ 2030

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), for all his hard work and for those remarks. He is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I would now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE).

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me, and I too want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE). He mentioned the SBA. We know that 75 to 80 percent of all of our businesses in this country are small businesses.

One of the problems that we are going to have in this devastated area is that a lot of these small businesses are wiped out and they are going to have difficulty cranking back up. Some of them did not have insurance. I want to just mention one. This is not necessarily a small business, Perry-Wynns Fish Company, out on the Chowan River, in a little town called Colerain, not far from Edenton. They had seven buildings there on the river, and every last one of them was blown down.

Mike Perry was searching through the debris looking for his whistle he blew at the end of every workday, and he could not find it. Hopefully, by now, he has found that whistle. He said he had $2 million worth of property that was not insured, but he said he is going to rebuild. He is going to back up a little bit from the river and rebuild and start again.

I think that is the spirit that we are going to see in a lot of our small businesses, whether they had insurance or whether they did not have it. The attitude that I saw is that we are not going to let this defeat us. We are going to get right back in the game. We are going to start our business back. We are going to serve this community as we have done in the past.

One of the other items I want to mention is, as the gentleman has said, we were able to predict this storm with great accuracy. One of the things I think we are going to have to do in the future is to stockpile, at least in certain strategic areas, generators. Somebody mentioned to me that maybe firemen ought to have as part of their issuance in rural North Carolina a chainsaw, so that they can put it on their fire truck and have it as part of their standard equipment, because we have a lot of trees, a lot of pine trees and other trees in this area, and they need to remove those.

But I want to close on the point of again saying how much I admire and still admire all of our citizens and all of our people in the community and all of our first responders and all of our FEMA people for the spirit that was displayed in the face of all of this devastation. Everybody was upbeat and ready to go and ready to help.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, and then I will yield back to him, because I think that is important to remember.

The gentleman mentioned our firemen and others who used chainsaws. So many times when we think in terms of our first responders, emergency folks, the EMS people who save lives and go out, we fail to realize they do more than that. They are doing other things in the community, especially our firemen, and especially in rural parts of this country.

I remember as a small child growing up in rural eastern North Carolina seeing a tobacco barn burn, because that is where I grew up, and I will never forget watching it burn. There was nothing my parents could do. And I am sure they did not have insurance on it. And the gentleman knows exactly what I am talking about, as he grew up there. What a frightening thing that was as a child. And I had no concept, as small as I was, that that was part of the year's income for the family and that was going to be devastating for the family in terms of the economic loss. But to see that fire as it moved, and there was nothing you could do, absolutely nothing.

Then we started to form volunteer fire departments, and they had just trucks. And today we call on them to do more than that. In this flood they did not have to put out a fire; they were saving people from flooded buildings. They were going in with their heavy equipment where they could and getting people out of buildings, as were our emergency personnel. We call on them to do more and more. And we in this Congress, I think, beyond FEMA and the things we need to do, should not forget that we have a partnership with these local volunteers, Federal, State and local, to help them and their families. Because they are giving an awful lot of time in emergencies. They are at the table. They are called to be at the table.

Our National Guard folks in North Carolina, we called them up, what few we had left. About half of them had been called up for Iraq, but we called up something like 800 to 1,000. And we still have tonight, I understand, somewhere in the neighborhood of 220, 230 still on duty in different places of the State, especially in eastern North Carolina where they are still trying to continue to move things before they are deactivated.

And, Mr. Speaker, I yield back to my colleague.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in those sentiments. Many times we do not even say thank you collectively to this group of people. They do not ask any questions. They are sort of like soldiers. When they see a problem, they just grab their equipment and go; and the community depends on them. We depend on them, and they save the government a lot of money. We hope that in some way we can figure out how to make available to them at least some types of equipment.

I heard, as I mentioned earlier, I heard the word ''generator'' mentioned over and over again. Hopefully, we can figure out a way to make some funding available to these small towns, rural areas, to have generators available to them when these crises come into the community. They can at least keep the water system and the sewer system going until we can get the power back on.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Along that line, Mr. Speaker, as we were talking about our volunteers, we have a bill in, as the gentleman well knows because he is a cosponsor of it and which I introduced, to provide a benefit. This fireman that lost his life in Franklin County may have very well have been eligible as a volunteer for the death benefit for those who are saving people's lives or helping save lives and ultimately give their life in that regards. That is something this Congress can do. I think currently we have about 276 Members who have signed that piece of legislation. Last time I checked, it takes about 218 to pass it. I hope we will move it.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman again for organizing this Special Order tonight and thank him for that bill. I am very proud to be a part of it and am hopeful that it will come to fruition.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my friend from the first district, for joining me this evening in this Special Order and to share with our colleagues here what North Carolina has gone through. And it is not just North Carolina when a hurricane hits. This one hit in North Carolina, but bad storms do not really know where county lines or State lines are; they just keep rolling. In this case, it rolled right through Virginia, where there was tremendous devastation in Virginia and in Richmond; and it rolled up into Maryland and the District of Columbia, where we saw power lines down, and we have seen here recently where people lost power and there was a fear that we would have flooding on a scale here in this city unlike what we had seen since the 1930s.

So it was a devastating storm that caused immense damage and a lot of heartache and loss of life. And the loss of lives were substantially more in Virginia and Maryland as it moved up the coast. Lives were lost, and the storm caused hundreds of millions of dollars in damage to homes, roads, crops, and livestock. In North Carolina, I have to add beyond livestock, poultry too. We sort of think of that as being a little different.

The truth is many of these people that lost, even though FEMA is there helping and they have some insurance, they will not be made whole. They are coming up short. And the shame of it is that for many of them they had the flood in 1999, some of them did, the drought hit them last year, and now they have gotten a real bad body blow this year with another storm. I have talked to a number of the farmers and the interim commissioner of agriculture, and he is afraid some of these people just will not make it. And it is not because they are not good folks, they are not good farmers, they are not good people. It is just the fact that nature has hit them hard.

I hope that FEMA and the Department of Homeland Security, the administration, and certainly this Congress, recognize the need to support these storm-damaged areas through recovery and rebuilding, not only just on the outer banks of North Carolina, as we suffered in our State, but in Virginia, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and other places in Pennsylvania and up West Virginia, matter of fact, traveling all the way into Canada. I do not really think we are going to reach to Canada, but certainly we want to help our people here at home.

The United States has an outstanding and a very commendable record of responding to disasters around the globe. We are usually the first ones there. But I think now we need to respond with the same kind of effort and the same level of enthusiasm when disaster hits here at home. These are our neighbors. They are our friends. They are taxpaying citizens of the United States of America. And as my friends and colleagues have pointed out, they are not looking for a handout. They do not want that. They want an opportunity to get back in business, to get their lives back in order, and to once again be contributing taxpaying citizens of America.

They will do it. But they would do it a whole lot quicker if we could help them. North Carolina is suffering through one of the toughest economic times we have seen in a long time, and I commit to my colleagues that we are going to join hands and ask all our other colleagues from North Carolina and across the aisle, because these people in North Carolina need our help, and in Virginia and Maryland. It is our obligation, in my opinion, to make sure the job gets done.

Let me thank my colleagues one again, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE), from the first district, whose district really was hit hard. Very hard. I think I only have about three counties, well four, Vance, Franklin, Nash, and possibly Sampson may be put in that group that have been declared disaster counties. Others may be added. At least one more. But it is tough.

I remember going through Floyd, when almost all of them were in it, and it is tough to see people lose everything they have. I remember when I went in the Rocky Mountains, and the lady was sitting beside the road trying to go through a family Bible. It was wet, and that was all she had been able to save because that had her family photographs in it. These are the kinds of things that happen. These are the things you cannot replace. But we sure can help them get their lives back in order.

I thank my colleagues for their help in this Special Order this evening. We will keep our colleagues up to date on what is happening in North Carolina and with our friends in Virginia and Maryland.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say that there is finally light at the end of the tunnel in what has been a long battle. Tomorrow, the House is poised to pass the conference report on S. 3, the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. This conference report represents several years of hard work on the part of the Congress to produce a bill that passes constitutional muster.

Since 1995, State legislators in both Houses of Congress have passed laws with broad bipartisan support banning this barbaric procedure. Although successful in 31 States, twice bills passed by Congress to ban partial-birth abortion were vetoed by President Clinton. However, I am happy to say that President Bush has indicated that he will sign this bill into law and ban what he calls this abhorrent procedure that offends human dignity.

We have several Members here joining me to speak on why this needs to happen, and I want to first yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me; and more importantly, I thank the gentleman for hosting this critical Special Order on the eve of some extraordinarily good news for the right to life in America.

As the gentleman from Minnesota just suggested, it is astonishing to think how long it has taken this Congress to address this issue, literally first coming to the floor of the 104th Congress on November 1, 1995. That was the day that Congress first considered the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. And here we stand in October of 2003, 8 years almost to the day since; and we

are on the eve of this legislation actually becoming law, passing a conference report that will go to a President who, unlike the past administration, will not veto this ban of this barbaric procedure, but will sign it with the humility and the gratitude of the American people in his heart.

□ 2045

Mr. Speaker, partial-birth abortion is truly an antiseptic word to describe a barbaric procedure, and I believe it is important as we begin this conversation today to reflect however briefly on the barbarism of this procedure, aided as we are by some less-than-graphic images, but nonetheless effective.

What is described in these images, hopefully tastefully, for families that may be watching across the country, happens several thousand times a year. Healthy mothers carrying healthy babies in the fifth or sixth month of pregnancy undergo a procedure which has come to be known as partial-birth abortion. As is depicted in these images, a doctor inserting the forceps forcibly causes the unborn child into a breech position in the birth canal, feet first for lay people like me.

After that with the assistance of the forceps, the child is then forcibly pulled out, delivered breech through the birth canal out of the mother by his or her leg, and once the child is removed from the birth canal, at least until the base of the head is available, the procedure is quite horrible in and of itself, but it becomes fitting to refer to it as barbaric from there, for here, as I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, children who in most cases would be able to live outside the womb, literally inches from birth, are then held in the birth canal, stabbed at the base of the back of their skull and the contents of their brains forcefully removed by a suction vacuum device. Once the head is collapsed, the remains of the unborn child are removed.

It is no small wonder that that liberal lion, the late great Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, referred to this procedure as ''near infanticide.'' Tonight, I know we will hear from many of our colleagues, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) who chairs this Special Order, we will hear arguments about constitutionality and about why this law which will come to this Chamber tomorrow and go to the President's desk within days is superior to laws which have been challenged successfully at the State level at our own Supreme Court.

But I would like to begin our Special Order tonight with none of those arguments, none of the discussion about constitutionality or endorsements, or even that the American Medical Association said that ''this procedure is never the only appropriate procedure, never medically necessary.'' I would rather begin tonight by suggesting that what is not arguable to the overwhelming majority of the American public is that this practice is inherently, morally wrong.

What is not arguable is the practice of delivering an unborn child feet first and holding it in the birth canal while the back of its head is stabbed with a suction device is evil. That is not arguable. What we will render unlawful tomorrow and then with the President's signature is what virtually every American knows in their heart is evil and morally wrong, and so the polls attest to that moral conscience of the American people.

As I yield back to the gentleman, I am mindful of that Bible verse that whatsoever you do for the least of these, you do for me, the Lord tells us. And I submit what we will do in this Congress tomorrow, banning this barbaric procedure known as partial-birth abortion, is the least we can do for the least of these.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this critical issue on the eve of such an important legislative accomplishment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) for clearly and crisply outlining why we find this procedure so abhorrent and why we find it important to pass this tomorrow.

Since I had a young nephew that was born less than 2 pounds, a pound and then some, sadly, three to 5,000 young children, most of them, many of them bigger than my nephew was born, have lost their lives through partial-birth abortion; and it is time that we end this. It is deplorable that a country like ours which was founded on the respect for life has continued to allow this terrible practice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, no matter where we stand on the abortion issue, most Americans agree the brutal and horrific practice of partial-birth abortion needs to end. In previous Congresses, legislation to ban partial-birth abortion has been thwarted by Presidential veto. This year President Bush will sign this bill into law, making it the first abortion-limiting law on the books since Roe v. Wade was enacted.

This is truly a historic moment and a milestone for the rights of the unborn. This is also a historic time for this Congress. We have listened to the will of our constituents, and we hear them loud and clear. They demand a ban on partial-birth abortion. According to a recently Gallup Poll conducted earlier this year, 70 percent of Americans favor a law which would make this procedure illegal except in cases necessary to save the life of the mother.

The outrage over this grotesque practice is nothing new. The American Medical Association has said, ''The partial delivery of a living fetus for the purpose of killing it outside the womb is ethically offensive to most Americans and physicians. It degrades the medical practice and cheapens the value of life.''

As a husband and father of four beautiful children, I have a deep respect for the sanctity of life and the miracle of childbirth. I have been at every one of my children's births, and what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) described as having to stop the head of a child because if it comes out, you cannot kill it, you have to stop the head, and to stick a device in the back of the head and suck the brains out should not happen in the United States of America or anywhere else in the world. There is no place in a civilized society for this horrific act.

This evening we can take solace in the fact that the nightmare of partial-birth abortion will soon end. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. SULLIVAN), and he and I are not alone in the position that this should end. A Gallup Poll conducted in January found that 70 percent of those surveyed favored banning this horrible procedure. Even doctors agree on this point. The overwhelming share of doctors believe this procedure is not necessary. The partial-birth abortion procedure has been labeled as not good medicine by the AMA. Respected medical professionals like former Surgeon General Everett Koop testified in 1996 that partial-birth abortion is never medically necessary to protect the mother's health and future fertility.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in great anticipation of a historic action we will be taking tomorrow in this House. Tomorrow we will vote on a conference report that will ban the cruel practice of partial-birth abortion. With the passage of this conference report, we will finally eradicate a brutal practice that is inflicted upon the most innocent of our society, the unborn.

I am not going to outline the gory details of this practice, because others have done that; but I will say that medical experts have repeatedly testified that fetuses are fully able to feel pain after 20 weeks of development, the time at which most partial-birth abortions take place. Thus, these babies are fully able to feel the terrible pain that is being inflicted upon them.

Opponents of this bill argue that it is unconstitutional because it does not provide an exemption for when the health of the mother is at risk. I would point out that health experts have testified time and time again that a partial-birth abortion is never needed to save the life of a mother. In fact, the American Medical Association has stated that this procedure often poses a serious health risk to the mother.

Mr. Speaker, life is the most precious gift and opportunity we are given as human beings. Robbing children of that opportunity is wrong, wrong, wrong. Three times the House of Representatives has passed a ban on partial-birth abortions. President Clinton vetoed it twice, and last year the leadership in

the other body refused to take up the bill. We finally are presented with an opportunity to take a giant step forward in banning this gruesome practice. President Bush has said he would sign a ban on partial-birth abortion, and I encourage all Members to vote for the conference report tomorrow, and finally we will put an end to a violent attack on our most innocent citizens.

Almost 3 years ago when I started to run for office, I told the people of the 9th Congressional District of Pennsylvania that it would be a great day in America when we passed a bill banning partial-birth abortion. Tomorrow it will be a great day in America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for putting this Special Order together, and God bless America.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, even the strongest abortion rights supporters have a hard time defending this procedure. In four of the last five Congresses, Congress has passed a partial-birth abortion ban by a two-thirds majority. Instead, abortion rights supporters insist this procedure is rare and used only in the most extreme positions to avoid serious physical injury to the mother. Nothing could be further from the truth. Hundreds of obstetricians have stated they regularly treat women for medical conditions used to rationalize partial-birth abortions, and these babies are regularly delivered with no threat to the mother's health or future fertility. These medical reasons include depression and other treatable conditions like emotional trauma, psychological problems, and age. While these may be serious, I do not think that they warrant the life of an otherwise healthy unborn child.

Even Dr. Martin Haskell who has performed more than a thousand of these abortions has stated that 80 percent of those were purely elective, meaning the health had nothing to do with it. What is most disturbing is that multiple doctors have testified that this procedure is typically done on healthy women with healthy unborn children after 20 weeks when a baby can often survive without assistance for hours outside the womb.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER).

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to show my support for the partial-birth abortion ban. On June 5, I stood in these very Chambers and took the oath of office to be sworn in to the 108th Congress. I said at that time while I was on the floor that the only regret I had was that I was not here the day on June 4 when this body passed the partial-birth abortion bill and sent it to the Senate. I said that day I was looking forward to tonight and tomorrow when we are going to have an opportunity, I will have an opportunity to cast that very vote, that very important vote.

Mr. Speaker, we have been at war in this country for many years. Americans are working hard today to stop the killing fields in Iraq, and tomorrow we are going to stop the killing fields in America.

□ 2100

These cultural wars have divided our country. Yet our desire for respecting life will win out tomorrow.

The issue of abortion is a very personal and emotional one that requires considerable reflection. I believe the sanctity of human life must be honored and the rights of the unborn need to be protected.

I believe that some women are not ready for the enormous responsibility of motherhood, and that is the reason that we need to make sure that we make other options available to them. And the parents should play a very active role in helping, sometimes, children make these very important decisions.

I know that during the Clinton administration, the President vetoed this bill twice, and I am happy to be working with a President who once and for all will sign this bill into law. I know my constituents would certainly like to see this practice banned, and I intend to watch this happen on this floor tomorrow.

No compassionate person wants to see a woman suffer the personal tragedy of abortion. Women deserve better than partial-birth abortion. The argument that partial-birth abortion provides some benefit, even in tragic cases, is false, and women should not have to bear the psychological burden that is the result of such flawed reasoning.

Women who experience abortions also experience the psychological pain of being present at the destruction and disposal of their babies, suffering that is virtually incomprehensible to anyone who has not experienced it. What is more, many women look for a way out at the last moments before an abortion, by whatever method, but their appeals are sometimes disregarded. This is especially true when many of those are sedated during this procedure.

We stand on the precipice of a great victory for the pro-life movement tomorrow. By committing to our children, we are investing in the future of America and the future greatness of our proud country. I appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I thank my friend from Texas.

I would just remind us to keep in mind that under Federal and most State laws, a live birth is when a baby is entirely delivered from a mother and shows any sign of life, regardless of whether or not it has yet reached the stage where it can survive independently of the mother. Under the doctrine set by the Supreme Court, such a baby, no matter how premature, is a person and is protected under the law. Even worse, scientists have shown that babies at such a stage certainly experience great pain during partial-birth abortion. On this fact alone, we should ban this procedure.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I stood here in June to tell the story of little Samuel Alexander Armas, the little boy who was operated on at 21 weeks for his spina bifida condition. Baby Samuel's famous grasp of the doctor's finger as he reached out of the mother's womb gave us all a new and profound gratitude for the miracle of life. And now, Mr. Speaker, just this month, doctors in England have recorded the smiles of unborn children at just 24 weeks through advanced ultrasound. I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, without this legislation, how many smiles will we miss having the privilege of sharing?

But, Mr. Speaker, an historic day is nearly upon the United States Congress, for tomorrow we will extend the hand of hope to the unborn. We will vote to protect unborn children from this unspeakable and horrifying procedure called partial-birth abortion.

Seven years ago, such a bill was first passed by Congress, but then, tragically, it was vetoed by President Bill Clinton. Since then, unborn children numbering in the thousands have been unmercifully killed by this barbaric, nightmarish procedure. There is no greater mark of shame or disgrace upon the Clinton administration.

But now, thankfully, Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a new President, and President George Bush will sign this bill into law and a new day will have dawned in America. Because even though this bill will not protect the other 4,000 unborn children that die each day in America from abortion on demand, it marks a turning point in the soul of this Nation, because it points to a day when that warm sunlight of life will finally break through the clouds and shine once again on the faces of unborn children in this country.

When that day comes, and it will, Mr. Speaker, history and coming generations will remember that it was George Bush and Members of this Congress who found the courage to reach out and take the tiny hand of an unnamed baby and refuse to let go until the storm was gone.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I thank the Member from Arizona.

Partial-birth abortion, it is often said is there, to try to help the women's health. But so often it is detrimental to the very things that people say it is trying to help. So often women suffer from depression and psychological stress after having performed this procedure. So this again is something that we need, as a Congress, to act on tomorrow.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to do something just a little different

now and step back just a small amount from our debate. Sometimes it is good to step back and see the forest.

And so what I would like to do would be to ask a question of those of you who are paying attention to this rather grave moment in the history of our Nation; and that is a very simple question. What is it that has made America, America? What was it that caused people from every nation and every tribe and all over the globe to come to this great land and live in a land where there is prosperity and freedom? I understand there are the detractors, but all of the paths across our borders that are being beaten by immigrants tell the story that there is something special about America.

What is that special thing? If somebody put a camera in front of you and said, what is it that makes America a special place? How would you summarize in one sentence the essence, the formula that is America?

If it were me, I would look back to the document of our birthday, to that great second paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, a long sentence. It says, ''We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.''

The sentence goes on from there and says that the purpose of government is to protect those God-given rights: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That means that there is a very simple formula that is the heart of America: There is a God, He grants us unalienable rights, and the job of government is to protect those rights.

If the government does not protect those basic rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, gentlemen, we have failed in the basic function of why we were here in the first place. We might as well jump on our airplanes and go home and stick our heads in the sand, because that is the purpose of why we are here.

There are some people today who would say, I don't like the formula, I don't agree with that, I don't think there is a God that gives unalienable rights. There were people in those days, we called them Tories, who felt that way as well. But they did not win.

America was built on that basic set of ideas. As we have gone along in time, that set of ideas has proven the test of time and we have been blessed with freedom and prosperity.

But there have been those, those days which I think of as pages in our history that we are not as proud of. There are some gray days in our history. One was in some of our relations with our own brothers, the Indians. There was a Trail of Tears of the Cherokee people that was a gray page in our history.

In the mid-1800s, there was an even grayer page as our Nation grappled and dealt with the terrible scourge of slavery in this land. At that time, the first President of my political party, the Republicans, took charge and under his administration saw fit to try to get rid of those dark pages in America's history.

And then we moved forward to the time when I was born, and unfortunately during the time that I have been alive, the blackest page yet in American history was opened in the process of abortion, where we denied the most basic tenet of what makes America, the right for people to be alive, because if you are not alive, it does not do any good to have freedom of speech or freedom to own property or any other right if you are dead. And of these practices of abortion, the worst, the most obviously evil, is this practice of partial-birth abortion.

As an ironic history, as a matter of fact, some pro-lifers brought it to the attention of the media and the media said, Oh, that couldn't possibly happen. They checked with the pro-abortion people. Oh, that doesn't happen. Then the media found out that they had been lied to.

That is the only thing that seems to make the media really mad is when they get lied to. So they started to let people know what this practice of partial-birth abortion is. I did not like biology very well, and the pictures that I see of it I can hardly stand.

Consider that there is a child that has lived 9 months, he is instants away from taking his first breath of fresh air, of freedom and we are going to poke a hole in the back of his skull and suck out his brains. It makes me sick. It made a lot of other Americans sick as well.

And so it is now that we come to this momentous time, tomorrow, when there is a possibility that we can close again a dark page of America's past. We can close the page on the nightmare of partial-birth abortion. And we can once again reaffirm those truths that we stand by, that there are basic rights given to all mankind everywhere by our God and that the most basic right of any government is to protect the life, that precious life made in the image of our Creator, the life of our little children.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I thank the Member from Missouri. I thank him for calling us all back to our roots, to what this country has always stood for, what this country was built upon, the respect for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I would also like to call on the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) for his remarks.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank my friend from Minnesota for showing the leadership of gathering this special order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak out tonight to express my strong support for the passage of the conference report on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. As a physician who has dedicated over two decades of my life to the practice of obstetrics, I believe this unnecessary procedure should be banned.

I have delivered over 3,000 babies. I am personally opposed to abortion; but in particular, the only reason to select the partial-birth abortion procedure is to ensure one thing, and that is that you have a dead baby at the end of the procedure.

As a physician, I recognize that serious complications can occur during the last trimester of pregnancy. However, if the mother's health dictates that the pregnancy must be concluded and a normal birth is not possible, deliver the baby by C-section. Whether the infant lives or dies is then determined by the severity of the medical complications and the degree of prematurity. But the outcome is dictated by the disease process itself. The fate of the infant during the partial-birth abortion procedure is predetermined by the nature of the procedure and is uniformly fatal to the baby.

During my two decades of obstetrics, with my share of high-risk pregnancies, I never, never encountered a situation where the partial-birth abortion procedure was required. I believe it is an inhumane act that is not ever medically necessary.

The procedure itself, always fatal to the baby, carries risks for the mother as well. Partial-birth abortions are done in the third trimester, and at that point, the child has all the characteristics of what we normally associate with a healthy newborn. Through the use of technology, prospective moms and dads have the opportunity to see how life develops before birth. Parents can now watch the beating of their unborn child's heart as early as 21 days after conception and can see the movement of the child's arms and legs at 3 months.

□ 2115

In 1995, a panel of 12 doctors representing the American Medical Association voted unanimously to recommend banning the partial-birth abortion procedure, calling it ''basically repulsive.'' I agree with the AMA that it is repulsive, and, moreover, it is unnecessary. I strongly support the passage of the conference report to the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. Just like my good friend from Missouri, I believe that the United States Constitution is very clear when it guarantees a right to life. Partial-birth abortion has no place in a civilized society. Thankfully, after tomorrow it will no longer be around.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and with great authority with his medical experience he speaks out the truth that this is a procedure that America must ban.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), someone who has equal authority from the medical field.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and giving me an opportunity tonight as a physician Member, and particularly as an

OBGYN physician Member, just like my colleague from Texas.

During my campaign and these 9 months that I have served in Congress since the election, back in the district probably the most frequent question that I am asked is ''Phil, do you miss it? Do you miss your practice? You gave up a great profession, and you delivered all those babies, over 5,000 during a 27-year career.'' And the answer to them is, of course, I miss it. I miss it tremendously. What a wonderful opportunity and a calling it was to be a physician, and, in particular, to bring life into the world. And I am very proud, of course, to say that in all those 27 years, I have never once performed an abortion. But maybe God, and I guess, Mr. Speaker, it is okay for me to say ''God'' in this Chamber, maybe God had a higher calling for me, wanted me to have an opportunity to do something even greater, Mr. Speaker, than bringing a precious life into the world.

One of my supporters during the campaign, when I asked him for help in helping me get elected, he said, ''Phil, I am going to support you if you promise to do one thing. I want you to promise me that you will just do good when you get to the Congress.''

I know now tomorrow, I have an opportunity to do something very good, an opportunity to vote to ban an abominable procedure known as partial-birth abortion, and I do not know how many years of life I have got left, but when I cast that vote tomorrow, and I have that privilege, that honor, that distinction of being one of 535 Members of this Congress out of some 275, 280 million people to make that vote, and when we pass this bill, yet once again for the third time, we have a President in George W. Bush who is committed to finally end this abomination. And I just cannot help but think about all the lives that now I have an opportunity to save forever, and maybe it will be far more than the 5,200 that I have already delivered.

We have heard from other Members on this issue and seen the graphic description of this procedure, and I will not go into that again, but I can tell my colleagues as a physician, there is no reason, there is never a reason for the health of the mother to perform an abortion in the third trimester of pregnancy. We are talking about, for those who do not understand trimester, we divide a pregnancy into thirds, but when one gets into that third trimester, we are talking about children, fetuses if they want to call them that, but literally who are 4½ to 5 pounds, fully capable of life outside the womb. And what people are doing in this procedure is, literally, killing these children, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) indicated, so that they are born dead, and, therefore, are characterized as an abortion, but what they are doing is no different than taking, literally, a child that is lying there in the bassinet at 4½ pounds and sticking a knife through his chest. It is the exact same effect. One is legal and one is not legal. One is called an abortion. The other is called murder, but there is no difference and make no mistake about it. What the mother is put through in this process of partial-birth abortion in the interest of preserving her health is one of the most dangerous medical procedures one could possibly do.

It is something that is so clear in my mind as a physician, as a compassionate human being, that I cannot really understand how anybody could not vote to ban this procedure. And I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, men and women, this is not about Roe v. Wade. This is not even so much pro-life and pro-choice, although the Members of this body that are speaking tonight are passionately pro-life. But this procedure needs to be banned because it is nothing more than murder in a so-called legalized fashion, and it does nothing to protect the health of the mother.

So I am very proud to tell my colleagues tonight that my vote will be very strong to ban this abomination known as partial-birth abortion, and I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota for giving us this time tonight to talk about this procedure and, specifically, giving me time to address it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, I think one can see the passion that we who are gathered here today have for ending this cruel procedure. We have heard from the AMA. We have heard from two doctors in a row who confirm the AMA's belief that this procedure is not only not necessary, as the AMA would say, but as the last two physicians so eloquently said, is a cruel procedure that's time has long since passed, should have never started, should never have been allowed to start in the first place, but now we are calling upon it to end.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the dean of the pro-life caucus, a man who has dedicated decades of his life here in Congress to try to lead the effort on repealing partial-birth abortion and so many other pro-life issues, and will be a big factor in our success when President Bush finally signs this.

So again, it is an honor for me to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my very good friend and colleague not only for his leadership tonight, but for many years on behalf of the rights of the unborn and their mothers. He has been a stalwart. He has been compassionate, and I thank him for his leadership. And I would like to thank my colleagues who have spoken, the two docs, and the other Members who have spoken tonight so eloquently and passionately in favor of protecting the most innocent and the most at-risk minority in America today and that is the unborn children and the other victims of abortion, who every time that victim is the mother, many of whom who have been cast aside. They have been hurt and hurt very severely as a result of abortion.

Just a couple of months ago we hosted, a number of us, a group of four women including Jennifer O'Neil, the actress who was in ''Summer of '42.'' She was a former Cover Girl. Melba Moore, an accomplished singer, four women who have had abortions, who have become part of a group called Silent No More. They have spoken out, and I encourage women who might be listening to this or men or who know someone who has had an abortion and is living with that agony to know that there is hope, there is reconciliation. The pro-life movement has always been about speaking truth to power, to Government and to those who would take the life of an unborn child, but also speaking truth and reconciliation to those women who have been victimized by abortion, including partial-birth abortion. Silentnomoreawareness.org can be accessed through the Web or through contacting our various offices. It is an outstanding means of reaching out to these women who are hurting.

During the course of their conversations, one woman who had two abortions talked about how she had so many sleepless nights. She thought that she could never hold a child again in her hand. Jennifer O'Neil had talked about the pressure that had been put upon her time and again by her family members who thought they were doing something benign and good for her, while actually hurting her severely, unwittingly but nevertheless hurting her severely. And she carried that pain for years, and now speaks out passionately to the women of America to come forward and know that there is reconciliation and to warn other women not to march into that abortion clinic and get a partial-birth abortion or any of the other methods that dismember or chemically poison unborn children.

I just would point out to my colleagues that some 62 years ago, from a podium right up there by the Speaker, Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave his famous speech after the attack on Pearl Harbor and called December 7 ''a day that would live in infamy.'' I would point out to my colleagues that as a result of that, as we all know, some 55 million people around the world lost their lives to that global conflict.

Another day of infamy less visible but no less lethal, the imposition of abortion on demand by the U.S. Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade on January 22, 1973, has unleashed an assault on innocent human life that is absolutely staggering, about 44.4 million dead babies, children, and counting. The loss of so many innocent children by chemical poisoning, by literal dismemberment and suction machines 20 to 30 times more powerful than an average vacuum machine that all of us

have in our homes, ripping apart that child; and now we see this cruel and unthinkable method where a baby, very late-term, as the doc pointed out a moment ago, third trimester, some in their second trimester but late second trimester, very mature babies where a doctor literally punctures their brains, usually with Metzenbaum scissors, to make a hole so that the baby's brains could be sucked out.

That is pathetic child abuse, and thankfully tomorrow the House, with the leadership of so many Members, especially with our President, will be putting into effect when the Senate finally adopts it as well, which they will, signs this ban into law.

Let me just give an idea of the numbers again, because I think sometimes we, in our entertainment-oriented age and the fact that we can go from one distraction to another, forget how many people have been lost. I mentioned 44.4 million. I am a big Yankee fan.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. We have a disagreement on that issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. My team lost to his last night. Yankee Stadium was filled to capacity, 56,292 people. The number of lives that have been lost since Roe v. Wade, 44.4 million, and picture this, it would be like filling Yankee Stadium every single day for 788 days full of children who are then slaughtered. The horrific loss of life, that is a staggering loss of life, is beyond almost any of our comprehensions to grasp, and yet that is what has happened in the 30 years since Roe v. Wade.

It has been done in what seems to be the pristine environment of an abortion clinic. We know that is not often case. Many of these so-called doctors are anything but. They are at the lower level of the medical chain, if you will, food chain, and I have known some abortion doctors, some of whom have actually become pro-life, and they talk about the squalor, the killing that goes on every day and the mental impact it even has on them.

So I just want to say to my colleagues that tomorrow we take, I think, a major step forward in trying to stop some of this killing, and I think the logical among us, the logical people out there in America, will begin connecting the dots and saying if it is so horrific to kill a baby with partial-birth abortion, why is suction okay? Why is D & E and all the other methods that are no less gruesome but a little bit more invisible because they do not happen as late in the stage of the pregnancy and they are not as visible as a partial-birth abortion, why are they any less of an act of child abuse? And this is all about child abuse. Again, there are two victims in every abortion, and my hope is that tomorrow we take a step forward in protecting these children from this cruelty.

I thank my good friend.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue, on protecting the lives of those babies that have been lost in this horrific procedure, to keep this from happening in the future.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) to also continue the reasons why it is we need to, as a Congress, pass this bill tomorrow and send it to the President's desk.

□ 2130

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for his leadership in organizing this tonight and letting me participate in this.

I have been involved in the pro-life movement for many years. Not as long as Grandpa SMITH who literally, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), have been the crusaders in the United States Congress and have kept this issue alive and have never let anyone in this Congress, House or Senate, or the administration, forget the importance of this. This is just a huge day for him in particular. Because I have been in many meetings with leadership over the years and different things and they say, man, that CHRIS SMITH, sometimes he just gets obsessed on this issue. And he has, literally, while he has done many other things here in Congress, has focused on this issue and helped keep Congress focused on this.

I want to share a little bit of a different thought, not about the procedure itself, but some of the history behind it, because I am a little older than some of the other guys here. When the pro-life movement really started in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as we became concerned that California and New York had opened up abortion procedures and were letting people from States like Indiana where people had chosen not to have abortion moved to those States, we were stunned.

I was in graduate school at the University of Notre Dame. We had organized a conservative club there, and we had started to look at the abortion movement when, on January 22, 1973, the Supreme Court took in its hands, overruled all of the States in America, and said, these poor little children are unprotected. We were stunned. In those first 48 hours, Dr. Charles Rice, who was our advisor to our group, wrote the Human Life Amendment for then-Congressman Larry Hogan, and it was introduced shortly after that decision. Dr. John Wilke, who was one of the original founders of the National Right to Life's daughter was at Notre Dame and she and I, along with Chuck Donavan and Rich Maji and Leo Bukinani and others, formed a group called the Student Committee for the Human Life Amendment within 48 hours of that decision. We organized across the country.

In fact, one of the first meetings I was at was with the bishop in South Bend with a lot of the leaders, different priests and other activists; and after we talked about abortion a little bit, they talked about baptizing the fetuses. I held up my hand and I said, I think that actually is a religious issue. And the bishop leaned back and said, ah, a Protestant among us. The truth is that in the early days of the pro-life movement, the Protestant Church was asleep. Most of America was asleep. The Catholic Church understood more what was happening.

Over the years, the pro-life movement got organized, and we thought that we could roll back that decision politically. The Human Life Amendment, surely, the American people, when they saw the truth, we could change this. As they understood the slaughter that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) just described of millions of babies, surely they would overrule.

In 1980, when Ronald Reagan won and the Republicans took the Senate, where pro-lifers and conservatives for the first time started to look at the political system and said, we need to get involved, we thought it would change. We got tax cuts, we fought back communism, but we did not make progress on abortion; and it was incredibly frustrating over the years, as people came out for 30 years to march here in Washington.

One of the things we hear back home repeatedly is, does it do any good? I have been working in this movement for 30 years. Does it do any good? Is there any hope? What has happened in America? Is anybody sensitive? I remember one time when I was an undergraduate in our student government office, there was a debate about whether unwanted children should be born, and one of my friends turned to one of the abortion advocates and said, you know, my mom told me that at the time I was born, she really did not want me, and if abortion had been legal, she would have killed me. And he turned to this person and said, you would have killed me. I would be dead.

Do my colleagues know what? One of my big fears about talking tonight is that somehow, something is going to go wrong. It seems like after 30 years, we cannot possibly get something into law. But after all of those years of marches, we have not made a lot of progress, but this is an important step. Because if we pass this and then the Senate passes this, and then we have this President, we are actually going to save some babies' lives. We are actually going to pass legislation so people like my friend can say, I am alive because of how people voted, how people marched, how people spoke out. When people say there is no difference, that I cannot make a difference in this system, that my involvement does not do any good, I say to them, when this bill passes, those of us who have worked in the trenches, those of us who have been speaking out for years, those of us who have gotten involved in campaigns, in fact, your vote makes a difference,

your actions make a difference; and there are going to be babies growing up to be young adults and adults who will create families who would have been dead if you had not been involved.

So I thank my colleagues for their work. I thank the Members here, because this is a great day for America and a great day for those children.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I thank him for the passion that he has had for this issue since his time at Notre Dame. I am very pleased to have a son there at Notre Dame. I am very pleased that my oldest daughter was the first president of the Fire for Life chapter at her high school. And as the father of four, it is hard to imagine not having those children. It is hard to imagine children not having the opportunity to have the same experience that each of us as parents have had the opportunity to grow up with and watch and watch them develop.

As someone who is very familiar with children and has a passion for life, I would also like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues have all heard the statement that says that years from now we will not remember what kind of houses we lived in or what kind of cars we drove, what material possessions we possessed; but we will remember if we made a difference in the life of a child.

Some years ago, actually before I decided to run for the State senate, I remember working in a newborn intensive care unit at Mercy Hospital in Pittsburgh. There and at McGee Hospital, part of my job was to see the infants who had been born prematurely. I worked with the families and infants and made sure that we took care of dealing with any risks that they may have had for developmental disabilities, and dealing with the families and dealing with a child who was born at perhaps 27, 26, 25, 24 weeks.

It amazed me the miracles that I saw of these babies no bigger than my hand, no bigger than my hand, frail, transparent skin, eyes, in some cases they were so young, barely opened, of how we saw them struggle, but how we saw them breathe. And their hearts beating, you could see beneath their skin. And how, as time went on, we worked with the families and the nurses to help these young babies learn to deal with their world, not stress them too much so that they would grow up. It is amazing to me now, years after I started that career, to be seeing these children graduating from high school and graduating from college; children at that age that otherwise people would see as throwaway babies, throwaway babies; but they are very real.

As the history of our Nation is written, each generation that perhaps has been in this Chamber or the former Chamber has had its core issues it has dealt with. Initially there was the forming of our Nation. What did the Constitution mean? There were also issues of the expansion west. There were issues of slavery. There were issues of civil rights, the women's suffrage, the different generations of folks who worked in these Chambers dealt with. I think one of the issues that will define our generation as legislators will be what we did to be meaningful in the life of a child.

I look upon this as perhaps there is no more humbling, but prouder, thing to do than to save a child's life. Many of us have also, I am sure, heard the phrase that says, if we get here, if we can make one small difference in the world, one small improvement, the votes we will take on this bill will do that, not just for one child, but for thousands and thousands, perhaps millions of children, who otherwise would have seen life untimely ripped from them, as it was.

But for me it is particularly important because I have seen these children live. I have seen children much younger than those we are talking about preventing their deaths thrive. I have talked to them. I have played baseball with them. We have laughed together; we have cried together. And it is important that we understand that it is part of that, that this is not just tissue. It is not just some amorphous cells there floating about; but these are real beings, real beings.

I am also struck as being a father. I know a lot of us speaking here tonight are men, and so many times those who are involved in this issue, they talk about, well, perhaps this is a women's rights issue. Let me speak about fatherhood. I do not think there is any more important thing we do as men on this Earth, outside of having a good relationship with our wives, than being fathers. That is the next generation we deal with. I think part of our role as fathers is to make sure we are there to nurture our children, to feed them, to clothe them, to provide for them, to play with them, to help teach them in the ways of life. But that is important, and it is not diminished because we are males. Our love and our compassion and our caring for children, it is very real. But it always has distressed me when sometimes these arguments come out about pro-life or pro-choice or abortion, that somehow, because a person is only a man, he does not get to have input on that.

If we were able in this Nation to bring men back in the fold, to work more with children, what a great Nation this would be. No longer having the troubles that so many children have, who have been abandoned by a parent, struggling along, a mom or a dad struggling with single parenthood, trying to make ends meet, but really working with them. How much better children's lives would be, if all men took that responsibility as a father seriously and not just there; but you have to continue to not just create life, but nurture children along the way.

It is because of that feeling as fathers that I think we also have an important role in making sure we preserve and work to protect the lives of these children as well. We love them as much, we cry when they are hurt, we shed a tear when they get married or when something sad happens to them. We love them as much, and we have every right to protect those lives. It is part of our responsibility as men and as fathers. And when people say it is not, that is part of something that weakens the American fabric of the family.

If you want to measure the strength of society, you can measure that strength by the integrity of the families within that society. If you want to see the weakness of the family, watch how culture after culture has tried to dismantle families, move parents away, split them up, raise them one way or another. It loses the core, loses the core of its being. We have that in America with families as long as we care for them and love them. That is why it is our duty, that is why it is our responsibility to make sure that we are there to protect the lives of these young children. So that years from now when we look back, we can say it did not matter what kind of house we lived in, what kind of car we drove, what we accumulated. We will be able to say with peace in our hearts, we were important in the life of a child.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for speaking out with such passion and with such authority.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by sharing a story that is in my heart, a story and some thoughts on a community in my district that has recently shown us all the way that we should respect each other, that we should respect life itself.

When I heard for the first time that a shooting had occurred at Rocori High School in Cold Spring, Minnesota, last week, my first thought was disbelief. That is the last place in the world that I would have ever expected something like that to happen. Cold Spring is a community with well-maintained homes, clean-cut students, and active parents.

When I heard that the coach at that school bravely averted further bloodshed, I was not surprised. Many teachers from my time in high school came to mind that may have done the same thing. The Rocori school staff and the Cold Spring community reacted to the incident in a commendable fashion.

I have met many of the people from the community there and the St. Paul Parish community, including Father Clydis, at a pro-life dinner hosted in the parish school last year. The parish school gym was packed and the local community members served dinner. I remember the idyllic community scene, complete with a church and an American flag, painted on a wall in the gym. I remember the community choir who entertained us that evening and

the song, they sang a German song; and the whole room joining in except for me singing that German song. I know of no town in this great land where it takes their heritage, their families, their community, their faith, their life, people's lives more seriously.

Therefore, I had high expectations when I attended a service for Aaron Rollins, a 17-year-old senior who had been shot by a 15-year-old freshman. But I was taken aback when I walked into this beautiful, modern church that seated over 1,000. For a town of less than 3,000 to have such a commitment to a building in and of itself shows their commitment to each other and their faith. But over 1,500 people came out for that service, students, parents, townspeople. The service lasted over 2 hours, 2 hours; but it flew by. Nearly the entire senior class lined up on either side of the aisle as honorary pall bearers. We saw looks of devastation comforted by a quiet faith on the faces of children who had never before experienced such a loss.

□ 2145

A large number of them were dressed in khaki slacks and skirts, black shirts and camouflage ties to honor Aaron's love of hunting.

But what allowed the gathering not to be overcome with grief was their deeply held belief that even though Aaron barely missed last weekend's duck hunting opener in Minnesota, he now had a new home where the ducks were probably even more plentiful.

But watching this family and how they coped with it and the grief that they felt was just overwhelming. They prayed for Seth Bartell who was also shot and remained in critical condition. But the part of the service that really blew me away, really elevated me further for my respect for the people of Cold Spring and really showed us the true spirit of love and life was when twice during the service the young man who shot Aaron and Seth was lifted up in prayer.

They prayed that that family who struggled to cope with tragedy, that the community show them the compassion and understanding that we want to see in this world.

I think Cold Spring indeed calls us to a higher level. If they can reach out for such compassion towards someone who has inflicted so much pain, how can we not reach out with an equal amount of compassion to those who have done no harm to anyone, the unborn?

That is why we gather here.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this ban of partial-birth abortion.

This city whose granite has built beautiful memorials on the Mall here in our Nation's Capital, they have shown us that their values are as solid as that granite. Let us follow their example.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EVANS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ESHOO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family illness.

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today after 2:00 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a surgical procedure.

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

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. DAVIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. BORDALLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

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

S. 1261. An act to reauthorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1680. An act to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on September 30, 2003 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3146. To extend the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program, and certain tax and trade programs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 2, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the second quarter of 2003, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, RAVI SAWHNEY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 11 AND APR. 20, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ravi Sawhney [3]	4/11	4/20	India				2,418.00		1,154.00		3,573.00
Committee total							2,418.00		1,154.00		3,573.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Office of Representative Sheila Jackson-Lee.

RAVI SAWHNEY, July 10, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL F. SCANDLING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 23 AND MAY 28, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Daniel F. Scandling		5/23	USA				7,051.31				7,051.31
	5/24	5/25	Kuwait		778.00						778.00
	5/25	5/26	Iraq								
	5/26	5/27	Kuwait								
	5/28		USA								
Committee total					778.00		7,051.31				7,829.31

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL F. SCANDLING, June 24, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. FRANK R. WOLF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 23 AND MAY 28, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Frank R. Wolf		5/23	USA				7,051.31				7,051.31
	5/24	5/25	Kuwait		778.00						778.00
	5/25	5/26	Iraq								
	5/26	5/27	Kuwait								
	5/28		USA								
Committee total					778.00		7,051.31				7,829.31

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FRANK R. WOLF, July 7, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 27 AND JULY 2, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Donald A. Manzullo	6/27	7/2	Italy		2,532.00		(3)				2,532.00
Committee total					2,532.00						2,532.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Chairman, July 17, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TED VAN DER MEID, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 27 AND JULY 2, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ted Van Der Meid	6/27	7/2	Italy		2,532.00		(3)				2,532.00
Committee total					2,532.00						2,532.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

TED VAN DER MEID, Aug. 5, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CHRIS CONNELLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 27 AND JULY 2, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Chris Connelly	6/27	7/2	Italy	2,212.00	2,532.00					2,212.00	2,532.00
Committee total				2,212.00	2,532.00					2,212.00	2,532.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS CONNELLY, July 14, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, DENMARK, THE NETHERLANDS, AND SPAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 25 AND AUG. 4, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Dennis J. Hastert	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Nussle	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, DENMARK, THE NETHERLANDS, AND SPAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 25 AND AUG. 4, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doc Hastings	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Sue Wilkins Myrick	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis R. Rehberg	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Dr. Eisold	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Ted Van der Meid	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
John Feehery	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Darren Willcox	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Kevin Fromer	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Vanessa Griddine	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
David Roth	7/26	7/28	United Kingdom	540	861.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis J. Hastert	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Nussle	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Doc Hastings	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Sue Wilkins Myrick	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis R. Rehberg	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Dr. Eisold	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Ted Vander Meid	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
John Feehery	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Darren Willcox	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Kevin Fromer	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Vanessa Griddine	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
David Roth	7/28	7/30	Denmark	3,757.50	582.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis J. Hastert	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Nussle	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Doc Hastings	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Sue Wilkins Myrick	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis R. Rehberg	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Dr. Eisold	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Ted Vander Meid	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
John Feehery	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Darren Willcox	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Kevin Fromer	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Vanessa Griddine	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
David Roth	7/30	7/31	Netherlands	143.39	165.00		(3)				
Hon. Dennis J. Hastert	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Alcee L. Hastings	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Jim Nussle	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Doc. Hastings	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Sue Wilkins Myrick	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Charlie Norwood	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella [4]	7/31	8/3	Spain	1,010	883.00	1,819.77	2,094.68				
Hon. Dennis R. Rehberg	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Dr. Eisold	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Ted Van der Meid	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
John Feeheny	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Darren Willcos	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Kevin Fromer	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Vanessa Griddine	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
David Roth	7/31	8/4	Spain	1,010	1,148.00		(3)				
Committee total				109,117.80	54,855.00	1,819.77	2,094.68				

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Left trip early—returned one day per diem to State Department.

Dennis J. Hastert, Speaker of the House.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, AND NORWAY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 26 AND AUGUST 6, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doug Bereuter	7/26	8/2	Italy		2,356.52						2,356.52
	8/2	8/6	Norway		1,208.00		5,739.84				6,947.84
Committee total					3,564.52		5,739.84				9,304.36

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUG BEREUTER, Sept. 3, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO TAIWAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 2 AND AUG. 9, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Amanda Parsons	8/2	8/9	Taiwan		1,500.00		2,750.00		70.00		4,320.00
Committee total					1,500.00		2,750.00		70.00		4,320.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AMANDA PARSONS, Sept. 8, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John Boehner [4]	11/23	11/29	Italy		2,080.00		(3)				2,080.00
	11/29	12/1	Greece		236.00		(3)				236.00
	12/1	12/2	Spain		196.00		(3)				196.00
Hon. George Miller	12/14	12/15	Taipei		282.00		5,291.76				5,573.76
Roundtrip commercial airfare	12/15	12/18	Hanoi		615.00						615.00
Roundtrip commercial airfare	12/18	12/19	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
John Lawrence [5]	12/14	12/15	Taipei		282.00		6,163.76				6,445.76
Roundtrip commercial airfare	12/15	12/18	Hanoi		615.00						615.00
Roundtrip commercial airfare	12/18	12/19	Hong Kong		411.00						411.00
Committee total					5,128.00		11,455.52				16,583.52

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] To participate in CODEL of Hon. David L. Hobson.
[5] To participate in CODEL of Hon. George Miller.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, July 18, 2003.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert [3]	1/18	1/20	Australia		$4,386.47		2,254.96		3,379.58		10,021.91
Committee total					4,386.47		2,254.96		3,379.58		10,021.91

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. curency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Other CODEL participants—additional per diem received for accomodations.
[4] Local transportation.

SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, Chairman, July 9, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, July 9, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	4/14	4/18	Italy		1,152.00						1,152.00
	4/18	4/21	Belgium		1,002.00						1,002.00
									735.80		735.80
							(3)				
Hon. Chet Edwards	4/14	4/18	Italy		1,152.00						1,152.00
	4/18	4/19	Belgium		434.00						434.00
									735.80		735.80
							(3)				
Part commercial airfare									559.30		559.30
Valerie Baldwin	4/14	4/18	Italy		1,152.00						1,152.00
	4/18	4/21	Belgium		1,002.00						1,002.00
									735.80		735.80
							(3)				
Thomas Forhan	4/14	4/18	Italy		1,152.00						1,152.00
	4/18	4/21	Belgium		1,002.00						1,002.00
									735.80		735.80
							(3)				
Kevin V. Cook	4/13	4/18	Japan		1,695.00						1,695.00
Commercial airfare							7,832.91				7,832.91
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	4/23	4/24	Qatar		284.50						284.50
	4/24	4/25	Uzbekistan		296.30						296.30

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/25	4/26	Italy		309.47						309.47
									3,023.52		3,023.52
							(3)				
Hon. Rodney Frelinghuysen	4/23	4/24	Qatar		284.50						284.50
	4/24	4/25	Uzbekistan		296.30						296.30
	4/25	4/26	Italy		309.47						309.47
									3,023.52		3,023.52
							(3)				
Douglas Gregory	4/23	4/24	Qatar		284.50						284.50
	4/24	4/25	Uzbekistan		296.30						296.30
	4/25	4/26	Italy		309.47						309.47
									3,023.52		3,023.52
							(3)				
Susan E. Quantius	4/24	4/25	Canada		307.00						307.00
									52.00		52.00
Commercial airfare							402.60				402.60
Scott Lilly	4/14	4/16	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	4/16	4/18	Germany		596.00						596.00
	4/18	4/23	Italy		2,035.00						2,035.00
	4/23	4/24	Spain		280.00						280.00
									96.92		96.92
Commercial airfare							8,117.31				8,117.31
Hon. Jim Kolbe	4/16	4/17	Kuwait		389.00						389.00
	4/17	4/19	Jordan		476.00						476.00
Commercial airfare							5,684.78				5,684.78
Scott B. Gudes	4/16	4/17	Kuwait		389.00						389.00
	4/17	4/20	Jordan		714.00						714.00
	4/20	4/24	Serbia & Montenegro		900.18						900.18
									588.91		588.91
Commercial airfare							7,627.40				7,627.40
Hon. James P. Moran	4/13	4/16	Colombia		581.00						581.00
Hon. Frank Wolf	5/24	5/24	Kuwait		389.00						389.00
	5/25	5/26	Iraq								
	5/26	5/27	Kuwait		389.00						389.00
Commercial airfare							7,051.31				7,051.31
Hon. Jim Kolbe	5/24	5/26	Brazil		436.00						436.00
	5/26	5/31	Argentina		1,560.00						1,560.00
Commercial airfare							6,618.40				6,618.40
Scott B. Gudes	5/24	5/26	Brazil		436.00						436.00
	5/26	5/31	Argentina		1,560.00						1,560.00
Commercial airfare							6,618.40				6,618.40
Hon. Dave Weldon	5/25	5/29	Uganda		110.00						110.00
	5/29	5/30	England		160.00						160.00
									80.00		80.00
Commercial airfare							8,265.00				8,265.00
Committee total					24,972.99		58,777.41		12,831.59		96,581.99

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Chairman, July 17, 2003

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Travel to South Korea, April 13–19, 2003:											
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	4/13	4/17	South Korea		1,244.00						1,244.00
Commercial airfare							4,866.42				4,866.42
Visit to Vietnam, April 21–26, 2003:											
Hon. Rob Simmons	4/21	4/26	Vietnam		547.00						547.00
Commercial airfare							9,189.35				9,189.35
Travel to France, April 22–26, 2003:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	4/24	4/26	France		686.00						686.00
Commercial airfare							4,543.25				4,543.25
Travel to North Korea and South Korea, May 30–June 2, 2003:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Hon. Jeff Miller	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Hon. Joe Wilson	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Mr. Douglas C. Roach	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Mr. Robert W. Lautrup	5/30	6/1	North Korea		870.00						870.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		1,184.00						1,184.00
Travel to Cuba, June 6, 2003:											
Hon. Roscoe G. Bartlett	6/6	6/6	Cuba		13.16						13.16
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	6/6	6/6	Cuba		13.16						13.16
Hon. Phil Gingrey	6/6	6/6	Cuba		13.16						13.16
Mr. James M. Lariviere	6/6	6/6	Cuba		13.16						13.16
Ms. Erin C. Conaton	6/6	6/6	Cuba		13.16						13.16
Committee total					16,920.80		18,599.02				35,519.82

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, July 31, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, July 29, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Chairman, July 29, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Darrell Issa	5/25	5/27	Egypt		343.00		6,988.77				7,422.77
	5/27	5/29	Israel		724.00						724.00
	5/29	5/31	Lebanon		244.00						244.00
	5/30	6/1	Syria		268.00						268.00
	6/1	6/1	Qatar (transit)								
	6/1	6/1	England (transit)								
Committee total					1,607.00		6,988.77		388.48		8,595.77

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILLY TAUZIN, Chairman, July 23, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, July 29, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Tom Davis	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Randy Kaplan	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Susie Schulte	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
David Marin	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Chris Donesa	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Peter Sirh	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Mason Alinger	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Ron Martinson	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Tony Haywood	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Hon. Jim Cooper	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00				32.37		
Grace Washbourne	6/9	6/15	Switzerland		2,215.58		6,429.50				
	6/15	6/16	Germany		114.00						
Lawrence Halloran	6/10	6/15	Switzerland		1,323.95		6,368.00				
	6/15	6/16	Germany		114.00						
John Hunter	6/9	6/15	Switzerland		2,215.58		6,429.50				
	6/15	6/16	Germany		114.00						
Corinne Zaccagnini	6/7	6/15	Switzerland		2,215.58		6,259.10				
	6/15	6/16	Germany		114.00						
Hon. Ron Lewis	4/14	4/18	Italy		288.00						
	4/18	4/21	Belgium		334.00						
Rep. Christopher Shays	4/15	4/16	Kuwait		878.00		347.98		1,149.33		
	4/16	4/17	Jordan		238.00				1,149.33		
	4/17	4/23	Israel		1,810.00				1,149.33		
Nicholas Palarino	4/12	4/15	Qatar		936.00		7,090.98		1,149.33		
	4/15	4/16	Kuwait		878.00				1,149.33		
	4/16	4/17	Jordan		238.00				1,149.33		
	4/17	4/23	Israel		1,810.00				1,149.33		
Nick Coleman	5/24	5/25	Denmark		270.00		5,064.15				
	5/25	5/27	Sweden		550.00						
	5/27	5/29	Czech Republic		233.00						

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Chris Donesa	5/24	5/25	Denmark		270.00		5,064.15				
	5/25	5/27	Sweden		550.00						
	5/27	5/29	Czech Republic		233.00						
Hon. Mark Souder	5/24	5/25	Denmark		270.00		5,064.15				
	5/25	5/27	Sweden		550.00						
	5/27	5/29	Czech Republic		233.00						
Hon. Henry Waxman	6/27	7/2	Italy		2,532.00						
Hon. Candice Miller	6/27	7/2	Italy		2,532.00						
Committee total					31,269.69		48,117.51		8,369.01		87,756.21

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, July 23, 2003.

CORRECTED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Douglas Anderson	4/22	4/29	South Korea		1,818.00		3,958.33				5,776.33
Hon. Cass Ballenger	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		30.00						30.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		241.00						241.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
	5/4	5/5	Venezuela		60.00		(3)				60.00
Ted Brennan	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		115.00						115.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		222.00						222.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		336.00		(3)				336.00
	5/4	5/5	Venezuela		198.00		(3)				198.00
Hon. Dan Burton	4/26	4/29	Costa Rica		384.00		1,298.00				1,682.00
Jean Carroll	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Malik Chaka	5/26	5/31	Ivory Coast		845.00		6,135.93				6,980.93
Hon. William Delahunt	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00		(3)				721.00
	5/4	5/5	Venezuela		298.00		(3)				298.00
Hon. Eliot Engel	5/30	6/2	North Korea		669.00		(3)				669.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Paul Gallis	5/24	5/29	Czech Republic		2,085.00		6,258.72				8,343.72
Matthew Gobush	4/25	4/27	Syria		536.00						536.00
	4/27	4/28	Israel		362.00						362.00
Round trip airfare	4/25	4/28					6,899.93				6,899.93
	5/27	5/30	Czech Republic		932.00		5,240.78				6,172.78
Dennis Halpin	4/22	4/29	South Korea		1,820.00		3,958.33				5,778.33
Hon. Katherine Harris	4/13	4/16	Colombia		721.00		(3)				721.00
Noelle Lusane	5/25	5/29	Ivory Coast		676.00		6,135.93				6,811.93
Joathan Katz	4/26	4/29	Turkey		814.00		4,299.84				5,113.84
David Killion	4/13	4/16	France		1,029.00				[4] 236.09		1,265.09
	4/16	4/19	Switzerland		1,623.30						1,623.30
Round trip airfare	4/13	4/19					6,442.59				6,442.59
Kay King	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		262.00		(3)				262.00
Robert King	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		110.00						110.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		263.00						263.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
	5/26	5/28	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	5/28	5/31	Laos		321.00						321.00
Round trip airfare	5/26	5/31					9,719.97				9,719.97
Hon. Tom Lantos	4/25	4/27	Syria		536.00						536.00
	4/27	4/28	Israel		362.00				[4] 1,996.00		2,358.00
Round trip airfare	4/25	4/28					5,825.36				5,825.36
Bob Jones	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Tanya Mazin	5/27	5/31	Czech Republic		932.00		5,240.78				6,172.78
Caleb McCarry	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		161.00						161.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		346.00						346.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		409.00		(3)				409.00
	5/4	5/5	Venezuela		201.00		(3)				201.00
Alan Makovsky	4/25	4/27	Syria		452.00						452.00
	4/27	4/28	Israel		321.00						321.00
Round trip airfare	4/25	4/28					6,899.93				6,899.93
	5/28	6/1	Turkey		797.00		5.096.34				5,893.34
John Mackey	4/13	4/16	Columbia		721.00		(3)				721.00
	5/29	6/2	Austria		868.00		5,586.63				6,454.63
Hon. Gregory Meeks	5/4	5/5	Venezuela		218.00		(3)				218.00
Vince Morelli	5/26	5/28	Belguim		380.00		5,685.49				6,065.49
Paul Oosturg Sanz	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		120.00						120.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		213.00						213.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		415.00		(3)				415.00
Frank Record	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		176.00						176.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		366.00						366.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		426.00		(3)				426.00
	5/25	5/28	Belgium		805.00						805.00
	5/28	5/31	Italy		1,119.00						1,119.00
Round trip airfare	5/25	5/31					6,470.00				6,470.00
Walker Roberts	5/24	5/31	Japan		2,350.00		8,063.29				10,413.29
Hon. Edward Royce	4/13	4/17	South Korea		1,244.00		3,927.42				5,171.42
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	5/24	5/25	Netherlands		339.00						339.00
	5/26	5/30	Israel		1,660.00						1,660.00
	5/30	6/2	Austria		267.00						267.00
Roundtrip airfare	5/24	6/2					9,290.76				9,290.76
Doug Seay	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Hon. Nick Smith	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00

CORRECTED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Samuel Stratman	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		201.00						201.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		391.00						391.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		401.00		(3)				401.00
Roundtrip airfair	5/25	5/31					6,470.00				6,470.00
	5/27	5/31	Czech Republic		932.00		5,240.78				6,172.78
Hon. Adam Schiff	4/13	4/17	South Korea		1,244.00		4,426.42				5,670.42
Thomas Sheehy	4/12	4/17	South Korea		1,244.00		4,094.92				5,338.92
Hon. Thomas Tancredo	4/16	4/18	Hungary		508.00						508.00
	4/18	4/22	Italy		1,911.09				[4] 1,679.81		3,590.90
Roundtrip airfare	4/16	4/22					1,734.32				1,734.32
Hillel Weinberg	5/25	5/28	Belgium		795.00						795.00
	5/28	5/31	Italy		1,119.00						1,119.00
Roundtrip airfare	5/25	5/31					6,040.00				6,040.00
Hon. Jerry Weller	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dominican Republic		476.00		(3)				476.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	4/26	4/29	Turkey		814.00		4,299.84				5,113.84
	5/31	6/1	Syria		268.00						268.00
	6/1	6/3	Israel		628.00						628.00
Roundtrip airfair	5/31	6/3					6,365.82				6,365.82
Peter Yeo	5/26	5/28	Thailand		364.00						364.00
	5/28	5/31	Laos		321.00						321.00
Roundtrip airfair	5/26	5/31					9,719.97				9,719.97
Committee totals					53,502.39		170,826.42		3,911.90		228,440.71

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Indicates delegation costs.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, July 24, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Todd Willens	4/21	4/26	Switzerland		1,945.00		6,031.56		430.00		8,406.56
Matt Miller	4/21	4/26	Switzerland		1,945.00		6,031.56				7,976.56
Amie Brown	5/25	6/1	Switzerland		2,730.00		4,680.31				7,410.31
Steve Ding	6/17	6/20	Germany		1,086.00		7,619.77				8,705.77
Todd Willens	6/15	6/20	Germany		1,810.00		6,775.46				8,585.46
Dave Whaley	6/15	6/22	Germany		2,534.00		6,487.77				9,021.77
Catherine Ware	6/15	6/21	Germany		2,172.00		6,487.77				8,659.77
Committee total					14,222.00		44,114.20		430.00		58,766.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD W. POMBO, Chairman, July 29, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David Dreier	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dom. Republic		714.00						714.00
							687.22				687.22
Brad Smith	4/21	4/22	Nicaragua		226.00						226.00
	4/22	4/24	Brazil		416.00						416.00
	4/24	4/26	Dom. Republic		714.00						714.00
							687.22				687.22
Committee total					2,712.00		1,374.44				4086.74

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, July 25, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS AND OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, July 9, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, July 31, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Angela Ellard	4/13	4/17	Switzerland		1,017.00		6,077.00				7,094.00
David Kavanaugh	4/13	4/17	Switzerland		1,017.00		6,077.00				7,094.00
Viji Rangaswami	4/13	4/17	Switzerland		1,017.00		6,077.00				7,094.00
Hon. Zavier Bacerra	4/13	4/17	South Korea		1,244.00		3,938.92				5,182.92
Hon. Philip S. English	6/27	7/2	Rome		2,532.00		(3)				2,532.00
Committee totals					6,827.00		22,169.92				28,996.92

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, July 31, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Patrick Murray	4/11	4/18	Europe		2,434.00		287.45				2,721.45
Commercial Aircraft											5,519.17
Merrell Moorehead	4/11	4/18	Europe		2,434.00						2,434.00
Commercial Aircraft							5,519.17				5,519.17
Brant Bassett	4/11	4/18	Europe		2,434.00						2,434.00
Commercial Aircraft							5,519.17				5,519.17
Hon. Alcee Hastings	4/14	4/21	Europe		3,199.00				674.80		3,873.80
Commercial Aircraft							5,743.58				5,743.58
Wyndee Parker	4/15	4/29	Europe		3,342.00						3,342.00
Commercial Aircraft							6,293.33				6,293.33
Elizabeth Larson	4/15	4/28	Europe		3,120.00						3,120.00
Commercial Aircraft							5,716.40				5,716.40
Michael Ennis	4/20	4/25	Europe		1,624.00						1,624.00
Commercial Aircraft							5,523.40				5,523.40
Marcel Lettre	4/20	4/25	Europe		1,624.00						1,624.00
Commercial Aircraft							5,523.40				5,523.40
John Keefe	4/20	4/29	Europe		2,944.00						2,944.00
Commercial Aircraft							6,206.71				6,206.71
Hon. Anna Eshoo	4/23	4/28	Europe		1,538.00						1,538.00
Commercial Aircraft							6,393.37				6,393.37
Hon. Rush Holt	4/23	4/29	Europe		1,460.00				65.11		1,525.11
Commercial Aircraft							6,688.42				6,688.42
Patrick Murray	5/27	5/31	Europe		1,552.00						1,552.00
Commercial Aircraft							6,490.00				6,490.00
Committee totals					27,705.00		71,423.57		739.91		99,868.48

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman, July 31, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]

HOUSE COMMITTEES
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☒

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, July 10, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Janice Helwig		4/21	USA				5,413.00				5,413.00
	4/22	8/1	Austria		15,363.00						15,363.00
Erika Schlager		4/5	USA				5,410.00				5,410.00
	4/6	4/8	Slovakia		462.00						462.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/9	4/12	Austria		625.00						625.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	4/21	4/26	Copenhagen		1,410.00		2,276.00				3,686.00
Chadwick Gore		4/23	USA				4,499.00				4,499.00
	4/24	4/26	Copenhagen		436.00						436.00
Maureen Walsh		5/11	USA				4,706.00				4,706.00
	5/12	5/16	Poland		1,043.00						1,043.00
	5/16	5/24	Czech Republic		2,032.00						2,032.00
Marlene Kaufmann		5/13	USA				6,119.00				6,119.00
	5/14	5/17	Switzerland		849.00						849.00
	5/17	5/20	Austria		651.00						651.00
	5/20	5/22	Czech Republic		732.00						732.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, FOR TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE SPEAKER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Michael Ochs		5/20	USA				6,650.00				6,650.00
	5/22	5/27	Armenia		921.00						921.00
	5/27	5/29	Georgia		518.00						518.00
	5/29	5/31	Azerbaijan		679.00						679.00
Ronald McNamara		6/15	USA				6,558.00				6,558.00
	6/16	6/17	Belgium		322.00						322.00
	6/17	6/21	Austria		1,523.00						1,523.00
Hon. Christopher Smith		6/18	USA				5,583.00				5,583.00
	6/19	6/21	Austria		749.00						749.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings		6/18	USA				5,659.00				5.569.00
	6/19	6/21	Austria		749.00						749.00
K. Hamilton Thames		6/17	USA				4,841.00				4,841.00
	6/18	6/22	Austria		903.00						903.00
	6/22	6/25	Hungary		568.00						568.00
Donald Kursch		6/15	USA				6,022.00				6,022.00
	6/16	6/18	Belgium		525.00						525.00
	6/18	6/21	Austria		889.00						889.00
	6/21	6/24	Hungary		790.00						790.00
	6/24	6/27	Austria		703.00						703.00
Robert Hand		6/23	USA				1,241.00				1,241.00
	6/24	6/27	Austria		492.00						492.00
Committee total					33,934.00		64,887.00				98,821.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, July 31, 2003.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4483. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trifloxysulfuron; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–2003–0286; FRL–7325–1] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4484. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the request and availability of funds for the Department of Homeland Security's Counterterrorism Fund, pursuant to Public Law 106–554, and Pub.L. 108–7; (H. Doc. No. 108–134); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4485. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 108–133); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4486. A letter from the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Determining Eligibility for Free and Reduced Price Meals in Schools—Verification Reporting and Recordkeeping Requirements (RIN: 0584–AD20) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4487. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Technology Centers Program; Notice [CFDA No.: 84.341] received September 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4488. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Community Technology Centers Program; Notices [CFDA No.: 84.341] received September 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4489. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting Certification From the Secretary of Health and Human Services Pursuant to Section 604(c)(2) of the Balanced Budget Refinement Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4490. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [MO 195–1195a; FRL–7559–9] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4491. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina: Approval of Miscellaneous Revisions to Regulations Within the Forsyth County Local Implementation Plan[NC 105–200331a; FRL–7559–5] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4492. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans North Carolina; Miscellaneous Revisions to the North Carolina State Implementation Plan [NC 106–200336(a); FRL–7558–9] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4493. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Redesignation of Grant County to Attainment for Sulfur Dioxide [NM–43–1–7600a; FRL–7556–7] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4494. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wisconsin [WI111–1a; FRL 7547–5] received September 30, 2003, pursuant

to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4495. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Operating Permits Program; State of Iowa [IA 183–1183a; FRL 7559–8] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4496. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming; Control of Emissions From Existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerators [No. R803CISWI; FRL–7560–2] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4497. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Approval of Revision to Operating Permits Program in North Dakota [No. R803NDT5REV; FRL–7560–5] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4498. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control Districts [CA–271–0412a; FRL–755108] received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4499. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4500. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting President Bush's certification that the Board of the International Fund is, as a whole, broadly representative of the interests of the communities in Ireland and Northern Ireland; and that disbursements from the International Fund will be distributed in accordance with principles of economic justice; and will address the needs of both communities in Northern Irelandand will create employment opportunities in regions and communities of Northern Ireland suffering from high rates of unemployment, pursuant to Public Law 99—415, section 5(c) (100 Stat. 948); to the Committee on International Relations.

4501. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period ending March 31, 2002, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4502. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period July 1, 2003 through September 30, 2003 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 108–132); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

4503. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30384; Amdt. No. 3072] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4504. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30383; Amdt. No. 3071] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4505. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30381; Amdt. No. 3069] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4506. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30382; Amdt. No. 3070] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4507. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30385; Amdt. No. 3073] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4508. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Federal Airways V–13 and C–407; Harlingen, TX [Docket No. FAA 2003–15061; Airspace Docket No. ASD 03–ASW–1] (RIN 2120–AA66) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4509. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Trent 768–60, Trent 772–60, and Trent 772B–60 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003–NE–29–AD; Amendment 39–13300; AD 2003–18–09] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4510. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Schempp-Hirth Flugzeugbau GbmH Model Duo-Discus Gliders [Docket No. 2003–CE–33–AD; Amendment 39–13282; AD 2003–16–51] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4511. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–135 and –145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002–NM–88–AD; Amendment 39–13189; AD2003–12–04] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4512. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Dynamics (Convair) Model P4Y–2 Airplanes, General Dynamics (Consolidated-Vultee) (Army) Model LB–30 Airplanes, and General Dynamics (Consolidated) (Army) Model C–87A Airplanes [Docket No. 2003–NM–164–AD; Amendment 39–13292; AD 2003–18–01] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4513. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model 369A, D, E, H, HE, HM, HS, F, and FF Helicopters; Correction [Docket No. 2003–SW–17–AD; Amendment 39–13215; AD 2003–08051] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4514. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D–200 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002–NE–41–AD; Amendment 39–13258; AD 2003–16–05] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4515. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce RB211 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No. 2000–NE–13–AD; Amendment 39–13200; AD 2003–12–15] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4516. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Short Brothers and Harland Ltd. Models SC–7 Series 2 and SC–7 Series 3 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–17–AD; Amendment 39–13279; AD 2003–17–05] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4517. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Piaggio Aero Industries S.p.A. Model p-180 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003–CE–30–AD; Amendment 39–13277; AD 2003–17–03] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4518. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SE3160, SA315B, SA316B, SA316C, and SA319B Helicopters [Docket No. 2003–SW–34–AD; Amendment 39–13276; AD 2003–15–51] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4519. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc. RB211–535 [Docket No. 202–NE16–AD; Amendment 39–13290; AD 2003–17–15](RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4520. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400 Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric Model CF6–80C2 Series Engines [Docket No. 2002–NM–128–AD; Amendment 39–13269; AD 2003–16–16] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4521. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc., Model 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 2003–SW–04–AD; Amendment 39–13264; AD 2003–16–11] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4522. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Propeller Systems, Inc. Hub Models B5JFR36C1101, C5JFR36C1102, B5JFR36C1103, and C5JFR36C1104 [Docket No. 2003–NE–32–AD; Amendment 39–13285; AD 2003–17–10] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4523. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd. & Co KG Dart 528, 529, 529D, 531, 532, 535, 542, and 552 Series Turboprop Engines. [Docket No. 2003–NE–10–AD; Amendment 39–13286; AD 2003–17–11] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4524. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003–NM–142–AD; Amendment 39–13272; AD 2003–16–19] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4525. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. 2003–NM–141–AD; Amendment 39–13262; AD 2003–16–09] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4526. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Wytwornia Sprzetu Komunikacyjnego (WSK) PZL–10W Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 2003–NE–30–AD; Amendment 39–13295; AD 2003–18–04] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4527. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace Corning, IA [Docket No. FAA–2003–15727; Airspace Docket No. 03–ACE–69] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4528. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model EC 155B, SA–365N and N1, AS–365N2, and AS 365 N3 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002–SW–53–AD; Amendment 39–13294; AD 2003–18–03] (RIN 2120–AA64) received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4529. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Clarion, IA [Docket No. FAA–2003–15726; Airspace Docket No. 03–ACE–68] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4530. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace, Chariton, IA [Docket No. FAA–2003–15725; Airspace Docket No. 03–ACE–67] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4531. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace, Wichita Mid-Continent Airport, KS [Docket No. FAA–2003–15454; Airspace Docket No. 03–ACE–52] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4532. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Window Rock, AZ [Docket No. FAA–2003–15299; Airspace Docket No. 03–AWP–9] received September 23, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4533. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002–NM–62–AD; Amendment 39–13246; AD 2003–15–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4534. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Trent 800 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003–NE–03–AD; Amendment 39–13249; AD 2003–15–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4535. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (formerly Allied Signal) Model RE220 (RJ) Auxiliary Power Units [Docket No. 2002–NE–42–AD; Amendment 39–13250; AD 2003–15–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4536. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (formerly AlliedSignal) Model RE220 (RJ) Auxiliary Power Units [Docket No. 2002–NE–42–AD; Amendment 39–13250; AD 2003–15–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4537. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–66–AD; Amendment 39–13248; AD 2003–15–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4538. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, –100B, –100B SUD, –200B, –200C, –200F, –300, –400, –400D, and –400F Series Airplanes; and Model 747SR Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–117–AD; Amendment 39–13261; AD 2003–16–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4539. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002–NM–16–AD; Amendment 39–13260; AD 2003–16–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4540. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes Equipped with General Electric CF6–45 or CF6–50 Series Engines [Docket No. 2001–NM–232–AD; Amendment 39–13259; AD 2003–16–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4541. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No. 2003–SW–33–AD; Amendment 39–13255; AD 2003–14–51] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4542. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D–200 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002–NE–41–AD; Amendment 39–13258; AD 2003–16–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4543. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Trent 768–60, Trent 772–60, and Trent 772B–60 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2003–NE–28–AD; Amendment 39–13252; AD 2003–15–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4544. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 2001–NE–34–AD; Amendment 39–13257; AD 2003–16–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4545. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca Arriel 1 Series Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 94–ANE–08–AD; Amendment 39–13256; AD 2003–16–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4546. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10–10, DC–10–10F, DC–10–15, DC–10–30, DC–10–30F (KC10A and KDC–10), DC–10–40,

DC–10–40F, MD–10–10F, and MD–10–30F Airplanes [Docket No. 2003–NM–144–AD; Amendment 39–13254; AD 2003–16–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4547. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and –11F Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–357–AD; Amendment 39–13253; AD 2003–16–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4548. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting pursuant to section 204(a)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974, a report on Investigation No. TA–204–9 entitled, ''Steel, Monitoring Developments in the Domestic Industry,'' and a report on Investigation No. 332–452 entitled, ''Steel-Consuming Industries: Competitive Conditions With Respect to Steel Safeguard Measures''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. House Resolution 364. Resolution of inquiry requesting the President to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution the report prepared for the Joint Chiefs of Staff entitled ''Operation Iraqi Freedom Strategic Lessons Learned'' and documents in his possession on the reconstruction and security of post-war Iraq; adversely (Rept. 108–289, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 383. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 3) to prohibit the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion (Rept. 108–290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 1474. A bill to facilitate check truncation by authorizing substitute checks, to foster innovation in the check collection system without mandating receipt of checks in electronic form, and to improve the overall efficiency of the Nation's payments system, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–291). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. OTTER):

H.R. 3213. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a comprehensive review of Federal agencies and programs and to recommend the elimination or realignment of duplicative, wasteful, or outdated functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. HART, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KELLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PENCE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BASS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CASE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FARR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HILL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WOLF, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3214. A bill to eliminate the substantial backlog of DNA samples collected from crime scenes and convicted offenders, to improve and expand the DNA testing capacity of Federal, State, and local crime laboratories, to increase research and development of new DNA testing technologies, to develop new training programs regarding the collection and use of DNA evidence, to provide post-conviction testing of DNA evidence to exonerate the innocent, to improve the performance of counsel in State capital cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. HALL, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. GOODE, Ms. HART, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 3215. A bill to establish a commission on tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3216. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow a participant in the military Survivor Benefit Plan who has designated an insurable interest beneficiary under that plan to designate a new beneficiary upon the death of the previously designated beneficiary; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOYD:

H.R. 3217. A bill to provide for the conveyance of several small parcels of National Forest System land in the Apalachicola National Forest, Florida, to resolve boundary discrepancies involving the Mt. Trial Primitive Baptist Church of Wakulla County, Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 3218. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify that willful failure to depart from the United States by an alien against whom a final order of removal is outstanding is a continuing criminal offense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL (for himself, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. GORDON):

H.R. 3219. A bill to establish an independent committee to oversee the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Space Shuttle return-to-flight plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FORBES, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 3220. A bill to regulate certain State taxation of interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3221. A bill to amend the War Powers Resolution to require the President to include post-conflict strategy in the report required under the Resolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 3222. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 300 Quarropas Street in White Plains, New York, as the ''Charles L. Brieant, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 3223. A bill to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to provide appropriation authorization and improve the operations of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3224. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Office of the Secretary of Defense Exceptional Public Service Award to journalists who accompanied units of the United States Armed Forces or coalition partners into Iraq during Operation Iraqi Freedom, a process referred to as ''embedding'', in order to provide first-hand and timely reports on the progress of the United States and coalition forces and the liberation of the Iraqi people; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota):

H.R. 3225. A bill to permit startup partnerships and S corporations to elect taxable years other than required years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEXLER (for himself and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3226. A bill to establish commissions to review the facts and circumstances surrounding injustices suffered by European Americans, European Latin Americans, and Jewish refugees during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOTTER (for himself, Mr. CAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan):

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States deeming Presidential nominees to be appointed at the time of nomination subject to disapproval by the Senate within 120 days of receiving the nomination from the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution urging that the United States file a complaint in the World Trade Organization against oil-producing countries for violating their obligations under the rules of that organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SOLIS (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BACA, Mr. FROST, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 384. A resolution supporting the goals of the Immigrant Workers Freedom Ride; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. MCNULTY):

H. Res. 385. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the U.S.-R.O.K (South Korea) Mutual Defense Treaty as a momentous occasion and as an excellent opportunity to reaffirm a mutual commitment and to continue to deepen cooperation and friendship between the United States and the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 386. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Althea Gibson, a pioneer who left an indelible mark on sports, breaking the color barrier in the sport of tennis in the 1950s and helping pave the way for future generations of black athletes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. FORD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OSE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. WAMP):

H. Res. 387. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Rest and Recuperation Leave program for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom should cover all travel and transportation costs necessary to return members of the Armed Forces granted such leave to their homes located throughout the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas:

H. Res. 388. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that ''Put the Brakes on Fatalities Day'' should be established; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of September 30, 2003]

H.R. 31: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 218: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 284: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 290: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 303: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. MAJETTE.

H.R. 324: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.

H.R. 331: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 339: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 348: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 391: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 401: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 466: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 490: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 571: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CANNON, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 594: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, and Mr. BOOZMAN.

H.R. 713: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 728: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. NEY, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 742: Mr. WYNN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 806: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 819: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 852: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SABO, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 857: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 869: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 876: Mr. WAMP, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 936: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1070: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1093: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1117: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1125: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1155: Mr. OLVER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 1157: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1196: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1212: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 1220: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 1229: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1260: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1285: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1301: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 1345: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 1359: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1367: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1425: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1508: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1581: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1633: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1675: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1708: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1738: Mr. GORDON and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1749: Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 1755: Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1764: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1776: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1828: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1861: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1874: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1914: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 1943: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 1958: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1994: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1999: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2045: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. RENZI, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2047: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 2094: Mr. CANNON, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 2181: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2202: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 2347: Mr. CHOCOLA and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 2369: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2379: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2404: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2481: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2475: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2511: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. RUPPERBERGER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 2512: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2521: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 2538: Mr. KELLER and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2540: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 2571: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

H.R. 2574: Mr. HONDA and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2582: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2585: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2602: Mr. CANNON and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 2625: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.

H.R. 2640: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 2671: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 2685: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. BALLANCE.

H.R. 2705: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 2732: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2768: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2801: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2816: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CASE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2821: Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. WALSH Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2823: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2828: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2827: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2849: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HYDE, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2852: Mr. AKIN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. DEMINT.
H.R. 2891: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2908: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2932: Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2954: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2990: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FROST, and Mr. DREIER.
H.R. 2998: Mr. FLETCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 3002: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 3004: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3012: Mr. QUINN and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 3022: Mr. EMANUEL and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3023: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 3035: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 3049: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3051: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3052: Mr. HAYWORTH and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3053: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 3058: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 3069: Mr. BISHOP of Utah and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3092: Ms. DUNN, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 3099: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FORD, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3104: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3119: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. OBBORNE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BAKER, Mr. JANKLOW, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. CHOCOLA, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 3120: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 3125: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3130: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 3133: Mr. OLVER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 3149: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 3166: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3167: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. QUINN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. REYNOLDS, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 3171: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 3189: Mr. WEXLER.
H.J. Res 56: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.J. Res 62: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. TIBERI.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. ISAKSON.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 218: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. WOLF.
H. Con. Res. 264: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H. Con. Res. 275: Mr. CLAY.
H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OTTER, Mr. MOORE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. CASE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. NEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. VITTER.
H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. FARR and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H. Res. 42: Mr. WU.
H. Res. 103: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H. Res. 362: Mr. BUYER and Mr. ENGLISH.
H. Res. 373: Mr. GORDON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FRANK of Massachsetts, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WALSH, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

[Submitted October 1, 2003]

H.R. 20: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 31: Mr. SCHROCK.
H.R. 36: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 110: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 135: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 195: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 251: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 303: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 594: Mr. ROGERS of Kennedy, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. FORD, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H.R. 645: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. COLE.
H.R. 664: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 857: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 920: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 930: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 936: Mr. BECERRA and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 962: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1057: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1081: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1105: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1136: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1160: Mr. GALLEGLY and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1177: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 1236: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1322: Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1358: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 1381: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1385: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1422: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1532: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FROST, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1547: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1554: Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 1592: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1622: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 1684: Mr. BACA, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 1692: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 1704: Ms. BERKLEY and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 1708: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1742: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 1749: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1778: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 1793: Mr. COX, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 1819: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1905: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1910: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 1916: Mr. JOHN, Mr. NEY, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 1919: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HALL, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 1924: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1943: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 1983: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 2022: Mr. BEAUPREZ and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2133: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 2154: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 2203: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2214: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 2224: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 2232: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2318: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 2347: Mr. SHADEGG and Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 2353: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2366: Mr. BALLANCE, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 2371: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2379: Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2404: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 2515: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2539: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2553: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2558: Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2568: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 2632: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2637: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 2700: Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.
H.R. 2706: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 2728: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2729: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2730: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2731: Mr. AKIN, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TOOMEY.
H.R. 2732: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2733: Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 2743: Mr. DEMINT and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 2759: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 2823: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2849: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 2849: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2863: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2880: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2911: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs.

NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2929: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2932: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 2952: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. EVANS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3009: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 3015: Mr. BLUNT, Mr. FLETCHER, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3022: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3053: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3084: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 3085: Mr. REYES, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 3099: Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3104: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 3108: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. COLE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3111: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 3119: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. TERRY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 3122: Mr. QUINN

H.R. 3125: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 3129: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 3152: Mr. FROST, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 3157: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3160: Mr. GINGREY, Mr. FROST, and Mr. BURNS.

H.R. 3165: Ms. HARRIS.

H.R. 3166: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 3167: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WALSH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 3184: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 3190: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 3197: Mr. REYES, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3200: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 3208: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OSE, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.J. Res. 70: Mr. COOPER.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. NUNES, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. OTTER.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 87: Ms. WATSON.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. TANCREDO.

H. Con. Res. 106: Mr. WYNN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. NEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CANNON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Ms. HART, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. MOORE.

H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. OWENS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. WYNN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H. Con. Res. 280: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. BURNS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H. Res. 21: Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 198: Mr. BLUNT and Mr. NUNES.

H. Res. 254: Mr. EMANUEL.

H. Res. 268: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H. Res. 320: Ms. WATSON.

H. Res. 378: Mr. ENGLISH Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. WALSH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of September 30, 2003]

H.R. 3193: Mr. PORTER.

[Submitted October 1, 2003]

H.R. 1078: Mr. MILLER of Florida.