United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 2003 No. 34

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 4, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for 5 minutes.

UNDERAGE DRINKING

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk to my colleagues about an important subject that has a significant impact on our national public health and on our children: underage drinking. My interest in this topic began as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations with jurisdiction over ONDCP, the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

During my first year on the committee, I was surprised to discover that although Congress had appropriated $2 billion to conduct a media campaign directed at the illegal use of drugs by children, ONDCP had inexplicably left out their illegal use of alcohol. I was surprised by that because while drinking under the age of 21 is illegal in all 50 States, over 10 million kids in the United States consume alcohol illegally, starting on average at age 13.

The research on the damage caused by underage drinking is dramatic, and let me cite just two examples: The first is based on research by the National Institutes of Health that found that young people who begin drinking before the age of 15 are four times more likely to become alcoholics than those who begin drinking after the age of 21. The second, and perhaps most compelling finding, is the one with a direct relationship to illegal drug use based on the study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, known as CASA. This study found that underage drinkers are 22 times more likely to use marijuana and 50 times more likely to try cocaine than kids who do not drink under the age.

In 1999, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I attempted to add underage alcohol use to the ONDCP's youth antidrug media campaign. The Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, the National Crime Prevention Council, and a number of other organizations long associated with these issues, supported our efforts. Unfortunately, very powerful interests in the alcohol industry lobbied against the amendment to include warnings to parents and kids about the dangers of underage drinking, and our amendment was defeated by the Committee on Appropriations.

Since that time, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), and I have introduced legislation to establish a separate national media campaign to reduce and to prevent underage drinking. Over 80 of our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, have sponsored this bill. Unfortunately, we have not been successful in passing the bill to date, but we will continue to make this fight.

The importance of this fight was again highlighted last week when the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University, CASA, reported extremely troubling findings newsworthy enough to have appeared in the media across the Nation. CASA at Columbia University reported that teenagers account for nearly 20 percent of the alcohol consumed in the United States every year. Adding to this troubling finding is the fact that Dr. Susan Foster, who led the CASA study, published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, said that she believed that these new estimates were very conservative.

The President of CASA, Joseph Califano, a former secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and co-author of the CASA study, reported that approximately 5 million high school students admitted that at least once a month they consume five drinks on one occasion. This is extremely alarming since research suggests that alcohol, especially in large amounts, can harm the still developing teenage brain, not to mention the huge toll alcohol abuse has on the Nation, due to car accidents, injuries, high-risk sexual behavior and alcohol poisoning.

To address this looming crisis, Mr. Califano and three former U.S. surgeons general; Dr. Julius Richmond, who served under Jimmy Carter; Dr. David Satcher, who served under President Bill Clinton; and Dr. Antonia Novello, who served under George W. Bush; issued a nationwide call to action, asking parents, the public health community, and the alcohol industry

Printed on recycled paper.

to join forces to stop this looming tragedy among our youth. Among their recommendations were that information about the dangers of excessive and underage drinking be included on labels as is now done for cigarettes. They also recommend that the nutritional content of alcohol products including calories appear on the labels. Mr. Califano and the surgeons general further recommend that Federal and State governments mount a public health campaign to curb alcohol abuse, particularly among children, teens, and college students.

Mr. Speaker, we need to do everything we can to stop the illegal spending of $22.5 billion on illegal alcohol in this country, and we will continue to work together with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) and others to make sure that we address the serious crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk to my colleagues about an important subject that has a significant impact on our national public health and our children: underage drinking. My interest in this topic began as a member of the Appropriations subcommittee with jurisdiction over ONDCO—the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

During my first year on the committee, I was surprised to discover that although Congress had appropriated $2 billion to conduct a media campaign directed at the illegal use of drugs by children, ONDCP had inexplicably left out their illegal use of alcohol. I was surprised by this because while drinking under the age of 21 is illegal in all 50 states, over 10 million kids in the United States consume alcohol illegally starting, on average, at 13 years of age.

The research on the damage caused by underage drinking is dramatic. Let me cite just two examples. The first is based on research by the National Institutes of Health that found that young people who begin drinking before the age of 15 are four times more likely to become alcoholics than those who begin drinking after the age 21. The second, and perhaps the most compelling finding, is the one with a direct relationship to illegal drug use based on a study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University—CASA. This study found that underage drinkers are 22 times more likely to use marijuana and 50 times more likely to try cocaine than kids who do not drink.

In 1999, Congressman FRANK WOLF and I attempted to add underage alcohol use to the ONDCP'S youth anti-drug media campaign. The Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, the National Crime Prevention Council, and a number of other organizations long associated with these issues, supported our efforts. Unfortunately, very powerful interests in the alcohol industry lobbied against the amendment to include warnings to parents and kids about the dangers of underage drinking, and our amendment was defeated by the Appropriations Committee.

Since that time, Congressman FRANK WOLF, Congressman ZACK WAMP and I have introduced legislation to establish a separate national media campaign to reduce and prevent underage drinking. Over 80 of our colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, have sponsored our bill. Unfortunately, we have not been successful in passing the bill to date, but we will continue to make this important fight.

The importance of this fight was against highlighted, last week, when the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University—CASA—reported extremely troubling findings newsworthy enough to have appeared in the media across the Nation. CASA at Columbia University reported that teenagers account for nearly 20 percent of the alcohol consumed in the United States every year. Adding to this troubling finding is the fact that Dr. Susan Foster, who led the CASA study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, said that she believed the new estimates were very conservative.

The President of CASA, Joseph Califano, a former secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and co-author of the CASA study reported that approximately 5 million high school students admitted that at least once a month they consume 5 drinks on one occasion. This is extremely alarming since research suggests that alcohol, especially in large amounts, can harm the still-developing teenage brain, not to mention that huge toll alcohol abuse has on the Nation due to car accidents, injuries, high-risk sexual behavior and alcohol poisoning.

To address this looming crisis, Mr. Califano and three former U.S. surgeons-general—Dr. Julius Richmond, who served under President Jimmy Carter, Dr. David Satcher, who served under President Bill Clinton, and Dr. Antonia Novello, who served under President George W. Bush—Issued a national call to action, asking parents, the public health community, and the alcohol industry to join forces to stop this looming tragedy among our youth. Among their recommendations were that information about the dangers of excessive and underage drinking be included on labels, as is now done for cigarettes. They also recommend that the nutritional content of alcohol products, including calories, appear on the labels. Mr. Califano and the surgeons-general further recommend that Federal and State governments mount a public health campaign to curb alcohol abuse, particularly among children, teens and college students.

In order to create a barrier to the purchase of alcohol, particularly among teens, who illegally spend $22.5 billion a year on alcohol, the former surgeons-general recommend increasing state and federal taxes on alcohol, so kids can't afford to spend a lot of money on illegal drinking. I believe these are common-sense recommendations that will help to curtail the severe problem in which 20 percent of our Nation's alcohol is consumed illegally by our children. Morally and practically we cannot afford to continue losing our children to alcohol abuse. Working together, buttressed by the best scientific evidence, I believe we can identify effective methods to protect our kids. I, with Congressman FRANK WOLF and Congressman ZACH WAMP, and the many other colleagues who have joined us will continue to work on this issue until we successfully address this public health crisis in our Nation.

I thank my colleagues for their interest in this important matter affecting our Nation's children and our Nation's future.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL ILAN RAMON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 30th day since the Shuttle *Columbia* disaster, and thus the end of what is for Jews around the world a traditional 30-day mourning period for the untimely death of Israeli astronaut Colonel Ilan Ramon. It is my privilege to rise here on the blue carpet of the House of Representatives as friends and family and leadership gather at this very hour in Jerusalem with the bereaved and with the family and children of Colonel Ramon to remember a life of extraordinary accomplishment.

Colonel Ramon's journey into space occurred in the midst of continued suffering in his homeland, a horrendous period of violence, and his bravery helped lift the spirits of his countrymen. No one understood the significance of his expedition more than Colonel Ramon himself. Before launching from the Kennedy Space Center on January 16, 2003, Ramon remarked ''Being the first Israeli astronaut, I feel I am representing all Jews and all Israelis. I'm the son of a Holocaust survivor. I carry on the suffering of the Holocaust generation, and I'm kind of proof that despite all the horror they went through, we are going forward.''

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Ramon rose from the lowest depths to the highest heights and brought his country, his people, and the entire world with him. He graduated as a fighter pilot from the Israel Air Force flight school and commanded a squadron of pilots in the raid on the Iraqi nuclear reactor at Osirak in 1981, saving Israel and the world from the threat of a nuclear Iraq led by Saddam Hussein.

Colonel Ramon died together with Christians from America and with a Muslim from Pakistan. He died living out the prophetic dream of unity in one purpose that is shared by all those who embrace the Abrahamic tradition of faith. His life is a testimony to the great idea that one man can truly change the world, that a child from any background, any faith, any social status can indeed turn out to be an Ilan Ramon.

Mr. Speaker, Colonel Ilan Ramon did more than die a hero as part of *Columbia* seven. He lived as a hero. May his memory be blessed and his family comforted among the mourners of Zion and Jerusalem and America this day.

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY TAX GAP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, an old maxim ''the more you know, the better

your decision,'' underlies my introduction of the ''Corporate Accountability Tax Gap Act.'' We need this legislation because of the growing gap between what corporate America claims as giant profits to lure investors—called ''book'' profits and what it reports as little income to the Internal Revenue Service—called ''tax'' profits.

While not compelling closure of this gap, this bill would require publicly traded corporations to report, and in some cases, to explain the discrepancy. Like the canary in the coal mine, a little bit of transparency in accounting would be a ''WorldCom,'' ''Enron,'' and all those other corporate scandals ''early warning system'' to avoid a repeat of this past three long years of stock market losses and to root out abusive tax shelter schemes.

To those who say ''what you don't know can't hurt you,'' I submit as Exhibit A a new 2,800-page report on the Enron scandal that has been reviewed before the Senate Finance Committee.

Those 2,800 pages represent essentially about 2,800 reasons why ''trust'' is no longer a substitute for ''verify'' when it comes to corporate income. This report on Enron's financial and tax shenanigans is longer than any Charles Dickens novel but no less bleak.

This report released by the Joint Committee on Taxation documents that in four years Enron glowingly bragged of $2.3 billion in income to its shareholders, while at the same time it was reporting $3 billion in losses, not income, to the IRS.

The $5 billion Enron credibility gap is not unique. In the last year for which we have data, there was an estimated $159 billion gap between book earnings that corporations report to investors and taxable earnings reported to the IRS.

Too often investors read a rosy earnings report, while at tax time, Uncle Sam hears only regrets written in red ink. In the words of Wall Street Journal columnist Alan Murray, ''it's increasingly clear that lying to shareholders and lying to the IRS are just opposite sides of the same coin.''

The ''Crooked E'' had many enablers, but ultimately much of the blame belongs right here in this Congress, which was unwilling to make the changes necessary to prevent Enron-type debacles. Last year, the Senate Finance Committee demanded the Enron report and held hearings. In the House, unfortunately, the Committee on Ways and Means washed its hands of the entire matter. It was not interested in inspecting the Enron reports. It refused to hold a hearing, much less report a bill out of committee. The Republican leadership feared that if we lifted that rock just a little, the public would be outraged by what crawled out concerning corporate misconduct.

I ask today that my colleagues help me lift the rock, just a little, by supporting the ''Corporate Accountability Tax Gap Act.''

In this Enron report, one tax promoter touts itself as an ''Architect of value.'' This architect, though, only built facades, created only virtual value to defraud investors and the government alike.

□ 1245

This report shows that Enron patterned some of its tricks after what other corporations were doing. Indeed, in only the last few days we have had a spate of corporate scandals, including the grocer Ahold and the phone company Sprint, which indicates that much more work remains to be done.

Certainly not all of the book/tax gap comes from accounting gains, but a Harvard Business School study last year determined that more than half of the gap could not be explained by common tax deductions. Tricky leasing games and off-balance sheet transactions can hide financial difficulties while artificially inflating earnings.

If a corporation's biggest profit center is its tax department, the investors need to know it.

Under my bill, publicly-traded companies would disclose the bottom-line net income tax that they paid as well as the federal income tax expense they reported to the Securities and Exchange Commission. The gap between the two would be exposed for all to see and to explore.

Continued secrecy is not in the public interest. A host of Enron executives have demonstrated the truth of former Chief Justice Earl Warren's remark that ''it would be difficult to name a more efficient ally of corruption than secrecy.''

Finally, my bill would commit the Treasury Department, working together with Congress, to report promptly on a study of this troubling book/tax gap and recommend further appropriate changes. The scope of the problem and the harm it can inflict on hard-working investors, especially seniors with limited retirement income, have motivated strong public interest and an endorsement from Citizens Works and Taxpayers for Common Sense.

Allowing a few to dodge their fair share of support for our national security and other needs means increasing the burden on honest Americans. Restoring investors' confidence in the market means arming them with more than glossy, self-serving, shareholder reports. Protecting hard-working Americans' investments means approving the ''Corporate Accountability Tax Gap Act'' to assist the public in deciding whether financial reports are based on facts or fairy tales.

CARGO PILOT SECURITY MEASURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, at few other times has national security been more important. In the 107th Congress, we enacted many pieces of legislation that sought to strengthen the weakness of our homeland security. That weakness was apparent on 9–11. Yet, Mr. Speaker, a lot remains.

I rise today to address the security of our airline pilots and the fact that there seems to be serious differences in the scope of security that exist between different types of pilots, namely the cargo pilots.

Tens of thousands of cargo pilots are not able to enjoy the same level of security that has been put into place for many of the pilots of our Nation's passenger airlines. Little attention has been given to thousands of cargo jets that dot American skies each day. Terrorists are going to look for the path of least resistance, much like water; and it is merely a matter of time before men realize that their chances for success are higher in the cargo wing of an airport, where security is significantly more relaxed.

With the passage of the homeland security bill, passenger pilots were given the right to carry arms, but for some reason this same security measure has not been afforded to our Nation's cargo pilots.

If compromised, some cargo jets could become significantly more dangerous than those of the planes used on September 11. With increased fuel payloads and oftentimes dangerous cargos in their hulls, the impact from one of these jets would be devastating.

In recent months I have received several letters from cargo pilots in my district. These men and women are concerned that they are not getting the same attention as their passenger airline counterparts.

Cargo pilots fly the skies alone without the protection of Federal sky marshals or the possible support of a flight crew or hundreds of passengers. These pilots are in dire need of a last-ditch defense that will protect the cockpit, their cargo, and potentially thousands of lives on the ground.

The pilots of major cargo carriers, like UPS and Federal Express, are concerned and have voiced the fact that they no longer feel safe. Many of these jets weigh upwards of 800,000 pounds and carry over 50,000 gallons of fuel. The impact created by one of these planes would be unimaginable.

I feel that the message has been sent to potential terrorists who realize this and that we need to do something to protect innocent lives.

The FAA desires one level of security for all pilots, and I feel it necessary we should provide it for the cargo pilots. Political maneuvering by the cargo industry has shielded them from the level of security screening mandated for the passenger terminal. The entire burden for the security of the aircraft rests on two or three pilots who are in that cockpit.

There is little cargo pilots can do to defend the aircraft against a terrorist

attack. Stripping these men and women of the ability to carry firearms in the post 9–11 environment is not right.

It is time that we address this obvious loophole in cargo security. In a maneuver that seemingly took place at the eleventh hour, the word ''passenger'' was inserted in the House bill's provision for arming pilots, and a similar change took place in the Senate version shortly thereafter. The effect of this single-word change is that it exempts all cargo carriers from the Federal mandate to arm pilots in a bill intended to enhance the pilot's ability to protect the airplane.

I feel that this back-room deal defies the initial intent of the bill and the will of our Congress. This body voted overwhelmingly to mandate firearms for all airplane pilots, not just those in the passenger service. We displayed our bipartisan support for this mandate with votes of 310 to 113 in the House and 87 to 6 in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to fix this disparity and close the loophole once and for all so that all pilots in this country enjoy the same level of security.

BUSH BUDGET AND HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss an issue important to my community, and that happens to be health care.

I am concerned by the President's health care proposal for this year's budget. The President's Medicaid proposal will not help the poor, the sick, the elderly and the disabled, in my opinion. In fact, the President's proposal weakens the health care safety net for millions, millions of people.

Currently, Medicaid is an entitlement as we know it, which means that States receive funding based on the number of people in their State who qualify for this coverage. The Bush proposal would encourage States to eliminate Medicaid funding for many people insured by the program in return for a small amount of so-called fiscal relief.

This proposal requires States to choose between short-term fiscal help and damaging long-term financial constraints. It raises out-of-pocket costs and reduces medically-necessary benefits to the poor, and it fails to address the increasing problem of the uninsured.

We have all heard from our States and our Governors about the budget cuts that they are soon going to be implementing and the impact it will have on Medicaid.

For example, in my own State of California, our Governor has proposed cutting optional programs like adult dental care, physical therapy, and diabetes management, a bill that I carried in the House when I was a member of the Senate.

So one would think during these difficult times our priority would be on reinforcing Federal support for Medicaid programs. Instead, at this time when States are seeing rising rates of Medicaid enrollment for young children and families, this administration wants to change the rules of the game.

We have unemployment rates in my district as high as 9 percent. Nine percent. That is astronomical. And you are seeing this administration taking a position to scale back the help to the working poor and low-income families and disabled people who rely on Medicaid.

Let me be clear: I support flexibility in Medicaid programs. But to me flexibility means that the States should have the opportunity to help more people in need, to design programs which fit the needs of their residents, and to come up with creative solutions covering most of the uninsured, if not all. Flexibility does not have to mean that we put everything in block grants and cut off services.

As Chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Health Task Force, I want to take this opportunity to talk a little bit about what the Bush Medicaid block grant proposal will do to the Latino community.

Nationwide, 37 percent of non-elderly Latinos are uninsured, a rate that is double that of whites. Medicaid is a critical source of health care for Latinos. Forty percent of poor Latinos are covered by this program.

If we scale back Medicaid coverage, we are going to be scaling back the health care for many young families, Latino families; and as we know, when we scale back access to health care in the guise of saving money, it ends up costing us more in the long run. When people do not have access to doctors in order to prevent disease, we end up paying much higher costs when people have to go to the emergency room, which is happening right now in my district.

Uninsured children are 70 percent more likely than insured children not to receive medical coverage for common illnesses like ear infections. Thirty percent are less likely to receive medical attention when they are injured. It simply does not make sense to scale back Medicaid at a time when we have over 40 million people without health insurance in this country.

In addition, the Medicaid proposal in the administration's budget either largely ignores or endangers the health priorities of the Latino community. The budget misses a critical opportunity to lift the ban on health care for legal immigrant children and pregnant women.

The President's budget also reduces funding for environmental health programs at the CDC by $2 million. These programs help us combat and prevent diseases caused by toxic substances in our neighborhoods. This is very critical in my community, where we are faced with heavy air pollution and water contamination and we have many children facing high rates of asthma.

Bush's budget does not prioritize the well-being only of the Latino community, but of millions and millions of people. In fact, the President's budget proposal represents a substantial setback for the Hispanic Americans and their aspirations for a future that includes greater economic opportunity, quality education for their children, and access to better health care.

For example, the President's budget also fails to reform the unemployment insurance system for which many Latinos are ineligible due to the program's restrictive rules that prevent part-time and low-wage workers from qualifying for employment insurance. After all, they have earned it. They worked, but they are not eligible to receive this benefit.

In terms of education, the President proposes budget cuts in programs that have proven to lead to academic gains for Hispanics. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program provides funding to community-based organizations and schools to sponsor after-school programs. He plans to cut this. In his budget this year, 570,000 children will not receive this benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to work with us so that we can ensure that all Americans have access to quality health care, education, and a clean environment.

TIME FOR AMERICA TO SLOW DOWN AND CONSIDER OPTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the recent cavalcade of events surrounding the actions of the United States in Iraq and other foreign affairs has compounded the apprehension that many have felt these last 8 months. It is time for the United States collectively to slow down, take a deep breath, step back and consider our options.

Comments I have received from constituents at home, from my Web site, as well as just simply reading the many conflicting poll results, suggest that most Americans would appreciate a reflective pause.

Terrorism is the greatest threat to Americans at home and abroad, despite the recent obsession with Iraq. Notwithstanding the performance by the Department of Homeland Security, which resembled a ''Saturday Night Live'' skit with talk of duct tape and plastic, terrorism is still serious business.

I am not opposed to the United States using force when appropriate. I think most of us now wish we had done so to deal with the genocide in Rwanda. Previously, I supported military action in the Balkans when some of the

now-hawkish Republican colleagues of mine would not support force to stop genocide in the former Yugoslovia.

□ 1300

It is clear that we have mishandled the northern situation; that we have been less than diligent with Pakistan; that we have missed opportunities to retire weapons and nuclear material from the former Soviet Union. Moreover, the administration clearly did not provide adequate money for reconstructing Afghanistan in its most recent budget.

It is in an effort to highlight this situation that I have chosen to cosponsor a resolution offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), to rescind Congress' authorization of force passed last year. Even though this proposal is unlikely to be approved by the House, it is important to send the right signal to the administration. It is not too late to be more strategic and to learn from our past mistakes.

Most important, especially if we are going to follow the route the administration is pursuing, a proper foundation is critical. If we expect multilateral cooperation and accountability from our friends, allies, and other world powers, we must demonstrate those characteristics ourselves. It would be outrageous if, as part of a deal with Turkey to secure their support, we end up selling out the Kurds in Iraq, the only people that have a modicum of self-determination.

Should we go to war, the American people are unprepared by the administration for the probable consequences of the inevitable United States short-term victory. Even supporters of the Bush policy admit that a post-Saddam situation in Iraq will very likely resemble Yugoslavia without Tito. There, after hundreds of thousands of lives were lost and billions of dollars spent, we still have 20,000 troops in the Balkans and the region remains a basket case. Our past actions should give people pause.

The United States gains little by rushing to war with Iraq. We should continue to work with our allies, pursue a program of coercive inspections, and marshall a much broader coalition in support of our effort.

Just as critically, we must try to stop the situation with North Korea from spinning out of control while reconnecting with South Korea. More time and money and effort should be expended on the Nunn-Lugar program to invest in decommissions of weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union. Pakistan and its activities with the North Koreans and potential links to terrorists need to be elevated in our awareness and policy issues. Nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction are much less likely to come from Iraq than they are from North Korea, from dissident elements in Pakistan, or remnants of the former Soviet Union.

Most important, we need to acknowledge that the threats posed to America at home and abroad come primarily from terrorism. We should provide resources for the cash-strapped States and localities that have been dealing every day since September 11 with the consequences and potential for terrorism at home. This is beyond homeland security, this is hometown security, and deserves priority.

Our actions overseas should be appraised carefully as to the impact on our efforts to track down terrorists and prevent future attacks. It is important that the administration and Congress level with the American people that this is an expensive, arduous, complex task. It will require money, commitment, and, most important, patience over the long haul.

We certainly should be clear about the costs of any action in Iraq, and prepare the American public for the likely consequences our policy will have in that volatile part of the world. Americans may be conflicted about Iraq and anxious as to terrorism, but I know they are willing, as never before in my lifetime, to come together for the protection of their communities and the greater good of our country and peace in the world. Should we not take advantage of their interest and intention, we will regret this lost opportunity for years to come.

THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION HAS NO PLANS TO PROVIDE REAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS FOR SENIORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning, President Bush announced his prescription drug benefit plan for senior citizens in this country. When it was all said and done, at the end of the speech it became clear that there really is no plan for prescription drugs from the Bush administration for the seniors in this country.

The President said he wanted to give seniors more rights to choose and it be more flexible, but the fact is, there is nothing to choose and nothing to be flexible about. He promised comprehensive benefits, but he refused to define what a comprehensive benefit was. He said he wanted to protect against high drug costs, but he refused to say what a high drug cost was. He said he wanted to provide catastrophic care, and yet he refused to say what that catastrophic figure would be so that the seniors could take benefit of it.

Why is that so? Because the prescription drug benefit announced by the President today is no different than the one that was announced just a few months ago; that is, he does not use prescription drugs to benefit the seniors of this country that need it to maintain their health, to prevent diseases and illnesses, and to help them recover from illnesses; rather, he uses prescription drugs to beat down the Medicare system.

The plan he announced today is the same as he announced before: seniors must leave the Medicare system. In order to get a prescription drug benefit, they must leave the Medicare system that has served millions and millions of seniors so well over the last 40 years. It has provided them the health care they would not have otherwise been able to have; and it also kept millions of them out of poverty, because it provided that health care. It has improved all of the health statistics with respect to seniors.

Now the President says if they want a prescription drug benefit, they have to leave that system. They have to go into the HMO system. In the last several years, millions of senior citizens went into the HMO system. They enticed them with glasses, hearing aids, with prescription drug benefits. Only later did the seniors find out, as they read in the newspaper, that their HMO was going bankrupt, that their HMO was withdrawing service from that area. Millions of rural seniors have found out that the HMOs are not available to them if they do want to take advantage of them. Hundreds of thousands of seniors in northern California participated in the HMOs. Now those HMOs have gone, and they are looking for health care somewhere else.

Why would we do that again? Why would we rerun that history of trying to bait and trick the seniors out of the Medicare system, where every day they have health care coverage, where every day they are able to choose their doctor, where every day they are able to choose their physician, where every day their physicians should be able to do what is best for them?

The President wants to use prescription drugs to trick the seniors out of that system. That is not the answer. That is not the answer. Later this morning, the Democrats introduced a prescription drug benefit. It has no tricks, it has no sleight-of-hand, it has no gaps, it has no secret thresholds, it has no small print. It simply says that we will provide a prescription drug benefit to the seniors of this country in the Medicare system, all of those who are eligible, for $25 a month with a deductible of $100 a year and co-insurance. The beneficiary will pay 20 percent of all drugs, and Medicare will pay 80 percent. After one reaches $2,000, the government will pick up the rest.

That is the prescription drug benefit that essentially Federal employees and Members of Congress enjoy. That is what the President stood here and said he wanted for America's seniors; but that is not the plan, that is not the plan that the President offers to America's seniors. Instead, what he offers them is a plan to dismantle the Medicare system, to do away with it; and for those who stay in the Medicare system, he offers them a discount card, a

discount card. That is not a prescription drug benefit.

So for those seniors who leave and join an HMO, lose the choice of their doctors, lose the choice of their pharmacy, lose the choice of their drugs; for those seniors, they will get a prescription drug benefit of minimal coverage, of minimal coverage. When the HMO goes bankrupt or refuses to see them, they will come back and they will not have their drug coverage.

He wants to make whether or not your drugs are covered based on where you get your health care as opposed to what your illness is, as opposed to what the doctor says you need, as opposed to what all of the indices say you might need for a particular illness. His determination is whether or not you are in Medicare.

That simply does not comport with the health care needs of America's seniors. America's seniors today need prescription drugs, just as they need coverage for doctors' visits, for surgery, for outpatient and inpatient care. It is part of the continuum of health care.

The President should not, the President should not do a bait and switch with America's seniors so that they can get a prescription drug benefit. Every Medicare beneficiary should be covered for prescription drugs, and that is what the Democratic bill does that was introduced today.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Norris A. Keirn, National Chaplain, the American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, You have been our shield and strength from the birth of our Nation to this present day. Our homeland has been preserved in the palm of Your hand. By inspiration of Your Holy Spirit, we have continuously moved to develop a more perfect union that would mirror Your divine purpose.

Through Your guidance these representatives have been raised to make laws and direct efforts for the enduring betterment of the peoples of this Nation and world. Grant great wisdom so that Your righteous purposes would be fulfilled. Afford each one the strength of will to be diligent dispensers of truth and justice. Bless them with solidarity that transcends personal views and political affiliations. Grant a bipartisan unity that would bring You glory.

Bless also those who defend this democracy and place themselves in harm's way. Dispatch Your angels to protect and to bring them home with victory over the evil forces that would attempt to destroy freedom. Enable them to break the bondages of oppression as You have so graciously granted in the past.

In the name of the Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). 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 Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BEREUTER 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.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise honored to wear the special scarf today to highlight the global fight to stop violence against women.

We know that women account for 85 percent of the victims of domestic violence, but only half of all female victims of violence report an injury, and of those, only 20 percent seek medical assistance.

I will shortly be reintroducing legislation to provide women over 18 with domestic violence screening and treatment services. Routine screening by a health care provider for domestic violence would unlock options a woman might not otherwise pursue and allow her to see that shelter and advocacy services may be useful to her.

Mr. Speaker, this year, Lifetime Television recognizes the importance of including men in the dialogue to combat violence. This is critical.

I encourage my colleagues to participate in the week's events and reiterate the need for fathers, coaches and other male role models to teach boys early and teach them often that there is no place for violence in a relationship.

SIMPLIFIED FAMILY CREDIT

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks I intend to introduce a bill to create the simplified family credit, real tax relief for working families with children. My proposal would help grow the economy, simplify the IRS code by merging an array of tax benefits, the earned income tax credit with approximately 4.3 million families eligible Americans, including 1.7 families with children, who, today, do not get, because of the complexity of the code, the child tax credit, the additional child credit, and the dependent exemption into a single credit, thereby shrinking well over 2,000 pages of the IRS Tax Code down to 12 easy questions.

This would also go a long way toward significantly reducing the marriage penalty, rewarding work and making the Tax Code more child friendly. Regardless of what political party we come from, we should all agree that these goals and that the Tax Code ought to reflect these values.

Despite the prospect of a war with Iraq, a stubborn recession, 2 million more unemployed Americans, urgent health care needs for the additional 4 million American that are without health care, we insist on debating a tax cut for the wealthiest in this country rather than focusing on those who need it most. A simplified credit in contrast is less, and far more responsive to the needs of working families.

PERMANENT PEACE

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation seems to be stumbling not just toward war with Iraq, but permanent war. We cannot end terror with bullets alone. If so, when do we stop shooting? When we find bin Laden? When we find Saddam? Or is there no end to war?

Instead, we should be talking about a permanent peace. We should be asking how to sustain societies before they crumble instead of asking how to destroy those that have already lost their way.

We should be asking how to educate children so they do not become terrorists instead of asking how we are going to kill those children once they do become terrorists.

We should be asking how to strengthen the United Nations instead of threatening to make it irrelevant.

As a Nation, we must emphasize finding alternatives to war. It is a matter of priorities.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings on motions to suspend the rules on which

a recorded vote or on which 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 after 6:30 p.m. today.

CONGRATULATING LUTHERAN SCHOOLS

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 106) congratulating Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 106

Whereas the Nation's Lutheran schools deliver high-quality education and challenge students to reach their potential;

Whereas there are 4,841 Lutheran early childhood centers, elementary schools, and secondary schools in the United States served by 40,076 teachers;

Whereas the Nation's total Lutheran school student enrollment is 572,877;

Whereas Lutheran schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, and morals by providing an environment that encourages honesty, trust, respect, and responsibility; and

Whereas the week beginning on March 2, 2003, has been established as National Lutheran Schools Week for the purpose of recognizing the vital contributions of the Nation's Lutheran early childhood education centers, elementary schools, and secondary schools: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of National Lutheran Schools Week, which is celebrated by several synods that have educational institutions, for the purpose of recognizing their academic achievement; and

(2) congratulates Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 106.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 106. This resolution honors Lutheran schools and their students, parents, teachers, administrators and congregations for their ongoing contributions to education.

I would like to thank the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Chairman of the Committee on Education, and the Workforce for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

In 1524, Martin Luther said that a city's best and greatest welfare, safety and strength consists rather in its having abled, learned, wise, honorable and well-educated citizens. Lutheran churches and schools have long been active in meeting this mission by providing education opportunities as early as 1640 in what is now Delaware, my home State.

In Delaware, I am proud of the contributions of the nine Lutheran schools, the names of which I will submit here for the RECORD.

Concordia Lutheran Preschool, 3003 Silverside Rd, Wilmington, DE 19610, 302.478.3876.

Faith Lutheran Preschool, 2265 Red Lion Rd, Bear, DE 19701–1849, 302.834.3417.

Our Redeemer Preschool, 10 Johnson Rd, Newark, DE 19713, 302,737.617.

Little Ones Lutheran Preschool, 7 Bay Vista Road, Rehoboth Beach, DE, 302.226.7860.

St. John's Elementary School, 1156 Walker Rd, Dover, DE 19904, 302.734.3767.

St. John's Early Learning Center and Day Care, 119 Lotus St, Dover, DE 19901, 302.734.1211.

Hope Lutheran Child Care, 230 Christiana Rd., New Castle, DE 19720, 302/328–7909.

St. Paul's Lutheran School, 701 S. College Ave., Newark, DE 19713, 302/368–0553.

Zion Lutheran Preschool/Kindergarten, 2101 Lancaster Ave., Wilmington, DE 19805, 302/655–7874.

Lutheran schools deliver high quality education where individuals are challenged to reach their full academic potential. The Lutheran school system is the largest Protestant school system in the United States and consists of 4,841 early childhood centers, elementary schools and high schools, over 40,000 teachers and more than 570,000 teachers.

Lutheran schools serve a diverse population. For example, in the schools affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, one-third of the students and one-quarter of the staff are persons of color, many of whom are not Lutheran. In Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod affiliated schools, 44 percent of elementary school students and 37 percent of high school students are not Lutheran.

Lutheran schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values and morals by providing an environment that encourages honesty, trust, respect and responsibility.

National Lutheran Schools Week, celebrated this year from March 2 to March 8, recognizes the vital contributions of America's Lutheran early childhood education centers and elementary and secondary schools. We congratulate Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education and urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume, and I rise in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for introducing this resolution because it is a good resolution, and it gives me an opportunity to highlight the importance and value of education in our Nation.

H. Res. 106 recognizes the contribution of Lutheran schools to the mix of fine educational opportunities available to American children. We are very fortunate in the United States to have such a diverse system of education.

The goal of the education system in America, both public and private, is to give every child in every State the opportunity to succeed, and that recipe for success, Mr. Speaker, certainly includes Lutheran schools, as well as other religious schools, non-religious private schools and, of course, our public schools. It is this variety, this diversity that makes our education system a success and makes America a strong, strong Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we recognize the educational contributions that Lutheran schools make to our Nation, let us recognize, too, the importance and value of all the many different types of schools in America and the contributions they make to the lives of our children and our Nation.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the leadership of the committee for bringing this resolution to the floor in such a timely fashion.

Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of a Lutheran Elementary School myself, St. Paul's Lutheran School of Utica, Nebraska, and an individual well acquainted with the many first-rate Lutheran educational institutions in his congressional district, this Member rises today to congratulate Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education.

Lutherans have long been active in providing education for children. As mentioned by the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the first Lutheran school was established in the colonies in 1640 by Swedish Lutherans, and it was located in the State of Delaware. There is evidence that Lutherans from Salzburg, Austria, started schools in what is now the southern part of the United States in the 1730s.

Pastor Henry Muhlenberg, known as the patriarch of the Lutheran Church and father of two members of the 1st

Congress, one the first Speaker of the House, established a significant number of Lutheran churches and schools in Pennsylvania.

□ 1415

By 1800, some 400 Lutheran schools dotted the east coast from New York to Georgia.

Today, our Nation has a total of 4,842 Lutheran schools, which are served by 40,076 teachers. This Member is proud of the 122 Lutheran early-education centers, elementary schools, and secondary schools in Nebraska, as well as the three Lutheran colleges and universities in this Member's district, and those Lutheran schools located throughout the Nation which deliver high-quality education opportunities and challenges students to reach their full academic and spiritual potential.

Not only are Lutheran schools known for their academic quality but for their ability to aid in their students' moral development. These institutions provide spiritual guidance to students, instilling fundamental values that are crucial to personal development. Through their education, Lutheran schoolchildren gain an appreciation of the importance in their lives of family values, community service, and in their religious faith. This in turn has helped shape students of Lutheran schools into good civic and educational leaders for America, past, present and future.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, this Member urges his colleagues to support the resolution honoring the contributions of Lutheran schools in American education; and I thank the cosponsors of the resolution, which are numerous.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for bringing this piece of legislation rapidly to the floor. As my kids went to school yesterday, I got a chance to drop them off and in front was a big banner saying ''Lutheran Schools Week.'' So I got to do it officially yesterday and I get to do it, I guess, officially now on the floor today; but I rise today in recognition of National Lutheran Schools Week, which began on March 2 of this week.

Mr. Speaker, I am a graduate of a Lutheran school, Holy Cross Lutheran School, in my hometown of Collinsville, Illinois. My father also attended this school. And a known fact is that my first grade teacher was my father's first grade teacher, a patriarch of education in Collinsville, Miss Bohland. It is a story I like to tell quite a lot. I also had a fifth grade teacher, Mrs. Richter, who taught me and who I tried to keep from retiring so that I could tell the same story for my sons, or so they could tell the same story. But she retired to an enjoyable life and is still very active in the church.

That is really something to be said, when you have that longevity in a teacher in a grade school. Two generations. And it is something that makes Lutheran schools a critical aspect of our society. My three sons now attend. David is 10, Joshua is 7, and Daniel will be attending next year in the preschool program, but who does get involved in the Sunday school program on Sunday and the weekends. My wife even teaches music at Holy Cross Lutheran School with the church programs and the choirs and all that stuff. So Lutheran schools have been a key component of my life for many, many years.

Before I became a Member of Congress, I returned to Illinois to teach government history at a Lutheran high school, Metro-East High School in Edwardsville, Illinois. As a teacher, I had the opportunity to instill the fundamental values and morals of the Christian faith, which is involved in the total educational aspect of the school. Parental involvement is key in Christian education; and Lutheran doctrine talks a lot about law and gospel, how we are condemned by the law but saved through God's saving grace, which is a critical aspect of the Christian faith, but it ties very neatly into the educational program.

In teaching kids to achieve all they can achieve, we know that you can never get 100 percent all the time, and there are failures along the way. That is where in the law and gospel aspect of education, the foundational principle of what makes Lutheran schools an exciting place to be, is that the constant love and compassion and actually the gospel aspect of forgiveness is involved in the educational setting.

Today, approximately 572,877 students attend Lutheran schools; and over 40,000 teachers provide an environment that encourages honesty, trust, respect, and responsibility. This also is a benefit to society because that are half a million kids that are not burdening, if we would call it a burden, to society. It is not an additional cost to the public school system. So the parents who choose Lutheran education, or perhaps Catholic education or other types of private schooling, take these kids out of the public school arena where more of the tax dollars can then work in public education, which I think is an additional benefit. Sometimes we forget that.

I am proud of the education that the students are able to receive from dedicated parents and teachers because of the efforts of Lutheran educators. Students throughout my district in central and southern Illinois receive spiritual guidance through an outstanding learning environment. I would like to congratulate the Lutheran schools, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations across the Nation for their outstanding work in educating our youth.

One of the primary aspects of Martin Luther, when he changed the course of history, in essence the Protestant revolution, was education of the great masses, actually the education of children and youth. That is why the Lutheran faith education has a critical pillar in what we do on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I also thank the sponsor for bringing this legislation forward.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a new member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I too want to join with my colleagues in congratulating Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, and members of the congregation for outstanding contributions they have made and continue to make in education.

In my congressional district, they are indeed the mainstay for early childhood education. Lutheran Family Services provides any number of early childhood education programs; and we are fortunate to have one of the top high schools in the State, Trinity Lutheran, in our congressional district, where practically all of the young people who come through end up going to college. It has been, and continues to be, an outstanding institution.

I want to commend and congratulate all of those who are a part of the Lutheran congregations for the outstanding contributions that they have made and continue to make to education.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that we support this resolution, and I am proud to be here doing that.

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

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the sponsor of the legislation and the other cosponsors with him, as well as all those who came to the floor to speak today about this subject of a great deal of significance in terms of education in this country; part of the overall global education that means so much to our young people. I encourage everybody to support this legislation.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lutheran Schools for their continuing contributions to educating young Americans. Lutheran schools impact not only the intellectual life of our Nation's youth but also their moral, physical, and social lives.

The Lutheran schools in Louisiana deliver high-quality education and challenge students to reach their potential. The administrators and faculty provide students an environment that encourages honesty, trust and responsibility.

This year more than half a million students in the United States will be enriched by their Lutheran school education. America's Lutheran schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence and can boast a student-teacher ration of 14 to 1.

During National Lutheran Schools Week and throughout the year, I salute the Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for allowing me to offer my comments congratulating Lutheran schools.

In his 1524 letter, ''to the councilmen of all cities in Germany that they establish and maintain Christian schools,'' Martin Luther wrote, ''My dear sirs, if we have to spend such large sums every year on guns, roads, bridges and dams, and countless items to ensure the temporal peace and prosperity of a city, why should not more be devoted to the poor neglected youth—at least enough to engage one or two competent men to teach school?''

Since this very humble request, the Lutheran Church's role in educating our young has flourished. There are currently 4,821 Lutheran schools operating in America, instructing over half a million students. These schools not only provide a traditional education, but also produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, and morals by providing an environment that encourages honesty, trust, respect, and responsibility.

In a world which faces such grave social, political, and economic choices as ours today, it is especially important to remember the words of Martin Luther and recognize the contribution that the Lutheran Church has made to education in our own Nation and around the world. I congratulate our Lutheran schools and I thank them for all that they have done for the spiritual and educational well-being of our youth.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 106.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CASTLE. 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.

ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION WEEK

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 54) expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 54

Whereas visiting nurse associations (VNAs) are nonprofit home health agencies that, for over 120 years, have been united in their mission to provide cost-effective and compassionate home and community-based health care to individuals, regardless of the individuals' condition or ability to pay for services;

Whereas there are more than 500 visiting nurse associations, which employ more than 90,000 clinicians, provide health care to more than 4,000,000 people each year, and provide a critical safety net in communities by developing a network of community support services that enable individuals to live independently at home;

Whereas visiting nurse associations have historically served as primary public health care providers in their communities, and are today one of the largest providers of mass immunizations in the medicare program (delivering over 2,500,000 influenza immunizations annually);

Whereas visiting nurse associations are often the home health providers of last resort, serving the most chronic of conditions (such as congestive heart failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, AIDS, and quadriplegia) and individuals with the least ability to pay for services (more than 50 percent of all medicaid home health admissions are by visiting nurse associations);

Whereas any visiting nurse association budget surplus is reinvested in supporting the association's mission through services, including charity care, adult day care centers, wellness clinics, Meals-on-Wheels, and immunization programs;

Whereas visiting nurse associations and other nonprofit home health agencies care for the highest percentage of terminally ill and bedridden patients;

Whereas thousands of visiting nurse association volunteers across the Nation devote time serving as individual agency board members, raising funds, visiting patients in their homes, assisting in wellness clinics, and delivering meals to patients;

Whereas the establishment of an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week would increase public awareness of the charity-based missions of visiting nurse associations and of their ability to meet the needs of chronically ill and disabled individuals who prefer to live at home rather than in a nursing home, and would spotlight preventive health clinics, adult day care programs, and other customized wellness programs that meet local community need; and

Whereas the second week in May is an appropriate week to establish as National Visiting Nurse Association Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that there should be established an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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 gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 54, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), expresses the sense of the Congress that there should be established an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week.

Mr. Speaker, visiting nurses provide an invaluable medical service to countless people across our great country. For more than 120 years, these admirable citizens have helped to promote health and to prevent disease by providing skilled nursing care in the homes of millions of sick Americans each and every year. These caring nurses treat illnesses of all varieties, from the initial symptoms of the common cold and flu to the gravest stages of heart disease, of AIDS, and of cancer.

I would like to just give an example of one such person. Her name is Marcia Nowc, and she lives in my district, the Tenth Congressional District of Michigan; and she truly epitomizes the hard work and selflessness demonstrated by visiting nurses across our great country.

Her profession is nursing, and while she makes her living doing this, she also volunteers for an organization called Neighbors Caring for Neighbors Outreach Clinic. This clinic provides medical services, laboratory tests and x-rays to some of our most vulnerable families and individuals, often free of charge, thanks to the volunteer efforts of visiting nurses, like Mrs. Nowc. Nurse Nowc's volunteer activities are supported by 16 churches in Macomb County, Michigan; and oftentimes visiting nurses, just in their everyday work, truly demonstrate how faith-based initiatives can provide an essential support system within our communities.

Many of these visiting nurses literally work miracles every day because they give so generously of their time and of their spirit and because they recognize the dignity of every citizen and the possibilities of every life. Many times visiting nurses provide care to those that might be considered on the outer fringe. Perhaps they are underinsured; they may be the working poor or may even be homeless.

Visiting nurse associations are nonprofit home health agencies located throughout the United States that aim to enhance the quality of life of all through comprehensive home and community health services. Often, these organizations provide in-home services that are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to Americans in need. It is truly worthwhile for this House to honor the compassion and the sense of obligation exhibited by visiting nurses for well over a century.

It is not an exaggeration to say that America's visiting nurses are some of our Nation's greatest treasures and greatest traditions. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 54.

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

□ 1430

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) for all of the gentleman's excellent work on this legislation.

This is the kind of thing that kind of mystifies the American public sometimes, they do not understand that 80 percent of everything that we do, we agree. Most of the time they only focus on the 20 percent where we disagree. For the vast majority of issues, there is a consensus in terms of what our country should be doing and where we agree. Today I am proud, with these other great Members, to offer this resolution to establish an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week in honor of the army of health care heroes, who every day comfort, care for and assist our loved ones.

I appreciate the support and the dedication of the Visiting Nurse Associations. Every Member of Congress does, as does every American. Visiting Nurse Associations of today are founded on the principle that the sick, the disabled and the elderly benefit most from health care when it is offered in their own homes.

They are nonprofit home health agencies that provide cost-effective and compassionate home and community-based health care to individuals, regardless of their condition or ability to pay for services.

Through these exceptional organizations, 90,000 clinicians dedicate their lives to bringing health care into the homes of over 4 million Americans every year.

In the face of rising costs and drastic changes in our health care system, visiting nurse associations have continued to deliver high quality health services for over 120 years.

When Henry Wadsworth Longfellow read of the work of Florence Nightingale, he penned a poem, Santa Filomena, that spoke of the keep appreciation owed by all of us to those dedicated to service in the ultimate caring profession, the visiting nurse. He wrote of her as he could have written of every other visiting nurse. ''Whene'er a noble deed is wrought, whe'ever is spoken a noble thought, our hearts, in glad surprise, to higher levels rise.

''The tidal wave of deeper souls into our inmost being rolls, and lifts us unawares out of all meaner cares.''

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to say my own thank you to our Visiting Nurse Associations. Through their work and their philosophy of nursing, they teach us every day about human kindness, the strength of human character, and the true definition of what it means to care. I thank them for their sharp minds, their watchful eyes, their nerves of steel; and, of course, their hearts of gold.

In recognition of their hard work and dedication that visiting nurses bring to the nursing profession, and the comfort and quality care that they provide to patients, I ask Congress to please support this resolution to set aside one week each year to recognize and honor visiting nurses across the country. Democratic, Republican, liberal, conservative, each of us owes them an enduring debt.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) today on this resolution establishing a national Visiting Nurse Associations Week.

As we were growing up, doctors visited homes and nurses visited homes. Today it is seldom that a doctor visits a home unless it is a personal friend; but the visiting nurses just keep right on trucking.

Serving communities around the country for over 120 years, congressional recognizing and gratitude for these nonprofit health agencies is long overdue. The nearly 500 VNAs across the country collectively provide home and community-based services to over 4 million Americans each year. Founded in the 1890s, VNAs have continuously served as charitable providers in their local communities, creating a safety net for the poorest and most chronically ill and functionally disabled individuals. VNAs serve the majority of Medicaid home health beneficiaries and represent nearly one-half of all nonprofit home health agencies in the United States. On average, Medicare and Medicaid represent approximately 82 percent of VNAs' revenue, and this percentage is even greater in rural areas such as my rural congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, this fact is significant because rural America has always been shortchanged in the Medicare payment system. My rural providers are asked to provide the same level of care with less Federal dollars, even though wage rates have largely equalized between rural and urban areas due to the current workforce shortage. The Medicare home health reimbursement was slashed by 15 percent last October, and the 10 percent rural add-on is set to expire this April. Home health providers, including VNAs, are being crippled by these cuts and I will continue to fight as co-chairman of the Home Health Working Group to resist them. In the meantime, I am pleased to introduce this resolution with my colleague from Massachusetts to demonstrate our continued support for these under-recognized heroes.

In a country struggling with staggering health care costs, the Visiting Nurse Association continually and successfully works to achieve its mission of cost-effective and compassionate home and community-based health care to individuals, regardless of the individuals' condition or ability to pay for those services. They are a leading provider of mass immunizations in the Medicare program and constitute over 50 percent of all Medicaid home health admissions. The association relies heavily upon volunteer nurses and reinvests any budget surplus into charity care, adult day care centers, wellness clinics, Meals-on-Wheels, and immunization programs.

This resolution will establish an annual National Visiting Nurse Associations Week in order to increase public awareness of the charity-based organization. They unquestionably deserve recognizing for their noble services; and by establishing this resolution, Congress would support the continuation of their mission.

I want to particularly mention, too, Ruth Ann Nerlich, who has been a part of VNA in Venango County as long as I have been aware. When I served in the State legislature, she was the go-to person State-wide. She was the person that best understood and best sold the message of home health care delivered by the VNA. And also Betsy Roberts of Elk County, who for decades has been a leader in providing home health care.

I want to conclude my comments with when the Balanced Budget Act was passed, there were problems in this country, mainly with for-profit home health care agencies which were really taking advantage of the system. Unfortunately, Congress, at that time, squeezed the system equally, and the Visiting Nurse Associations, scattered around much of this country, were not fat and wasteful. They raised millions of dollars to give free care to those who could not pay. They were made up of boards of local people, in health care and out of health care, who cared about and helped deliver the services that they provided.

So when the Balanced Budget Act cut them and squeezed them about 30 percent, it squeezed some of them out of business. Some of the VNAs in my district today, the only reason they stayed in business, they borrowed money to continue providing those services. They have debt to service today.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that this 15 percent cut is taken away, and it is vital that the 10 percent add-on that was proven was needed for home health care is continued on past April.

With that, I am proud to recognize these individuals and the invaluable contributions of our VNAs by cosponsoring this legislation, and urge the support of my colleagues.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the National Visiting Nurse Association of America, VNAA, is the official association for not-for-

profit, community-based home health organizations known as Visiting Nurse Associations. VNAs care for patients of all ages, from infants to the elderly, and offer comprehensive services that begin with maternal-child health programs and end with hospice care. VNAs provide a broad range of essential home health care and support services to patients in the security and comfort of their homes. These services include skilled nursing, rehabilitation, physical and occupational therapies, speech-language pathology, home medical equipment, and behavioral and mental health counseling, to name just a few.

Many VNAs provide homemaker services that help patients remain independent in their home while reducing the burden on family members. These services can include cooking, housekeeping, shopping, transportation, personal care, and a variety of other essential nonmedical services.

These services are critical at a time when the latest projections from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, published in the November 2001 Monthly Labor Review, estimated that more than 1 million new and replacement nurses will be needed by the year 2010. The U.S. Department of Labor projects a 21 percent increase in the need for nurses nationwide from 1998 to 2008, compared with a 14 percent increase for all other occupations.

Furthermore, according to a July 2001 report released by the General Accounting Office titled Nursing Workforce: Emerging Nurse Shortages Due to Multiple Factors (GAO–01–944), ''a serious shortages of nurses is expected in the future as democratic pressures influence both supply and demand. The future demand for nurses is expected to increase dramatically as the baby boomers reach their sixties, seventies and beyond.''

As baby boomers age, the role of visiting nurses is more important, as patients spend less time in the hospital and demand the same quality of services at home. VNAs contribute to the well-being of the Nation, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as we pay special tribute to those who come into our homes, into our places of being, and bring not only their technical and professional services, but also bring the individuality of their care.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 54, expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week.

Our health care system is in a state of crisis. Our health care costs are rising exponentially, but it seems that these added expenses are not translating into rising access to quality compassionate care for the American people. Instead, it seems that too often, profits are driving our health care system—rather than the needs of the sick, our children, and the elderly.

Pharmaceutical companies are making record profits, while people in America are choosing between food and the prescription drugs their doctors have prescribed. Reimbursements for Medicare and Medicaid treatments are so low that many health providers are turning away sick patients. Due to massive tax cuts for the wealthy, the Administration has not left adequate funds to help financially-strapped State and local governments to continue health care programs for the poor and underserved. For example, this has led to the recent closure in my District of two mental health clinics, that serve 1,400 adults and 240 children. Yes, this is a crisis.

But in the midst of that crisis, there are some shining examples of groups that truly seem to embody what health care can and should be. The Visiting Nurse Associations (VNAs) fall into that noble category. Visiting Nurse Associations are non-profit agencies that, for over 120 years, have been working toward their mission of providing cost-effective and compassionate health care to millions of individuals per year, regardless of their condition or ability to pay.

Nurses from VNAs go into communities and individual homes, providing primary care of all sorts, and prevention such as immunizations. Such care dramatically improves quality of life for seniors and the disabled who would prefer to live in their own homes, in their own neighborhoods, but need a bit of help from a visiting professional. Besides providing comfort and dignity to those in need, VNAs also save us millions of dollars in hospital and long-term care costs.

I am very pleased with the excellent work of the VNA of Houston. Their 50 nurses partner with social workers, physical therapists, home health aids, occupational therapists and speech therapists, in order to provide services to some 1,600 to 1,700 hundred patients per day in the area of Harris and the surrounding counties. This kind of care is the way of the future—helping people stay in the comfort of their homes, where they want to be.

I am sometimes frustrated when I ask members of the medical community, why they do not spend more time pushing prevention and education. They often reply that doctors don't have the time to talk to their patients for that long, or that a doctor's time is too expensive to spend on education. I am bothered by this, because as most people know, nurses and physician's assistants and auxiliary health professionals, are often much better communicators than their physician colleagues anyway. Expanding our utilization of nurses is a cost-effective way of improving American health.

The problem is that we have a nursing shortage. Our clinics and hospitals are being forced to squeeze too much out of the nursing staffs they have. The added workloads are driving many qualified nurses out of the field, and may be jeopardizing treatment for some patients. We need to find ways to recruit more nurses and to maintain the one we have.

For example, I have introduced HR 87, which would alter H–1C non-immigrant visa requirements, in order to make it easier to bring in qualified foreign nurses to fill in some of the gaps in our own nursing workforce. I would like to see some action on that bill soon.

Today's bill, H. Con. Res. 54, represents another way of improving our pool of nurses. By establishing an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week, not only will we be honoring an excellent and deserving group of health care professionals, but we will also be raising awareness of the important role they serve in our communities. I hope that by focusing Congressional and public attention on Visiting Nurse Associations, we will inspire more bright young people to go into that noble profession.

I commend our nation's visiting nurses, and my colleague from Massachusetts for seeking to honor them. I support H. Con. Res. 54.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, our nation is facing a catastrophic nursing shortage. The average age of nurses in America is 43 years of age. Nurses are leaving the profession in droves, and fewer people are choosing to enter the profession. We have to do more to not only retain the nurses that we have but also to increase their numbers. We need to send the message that nursing is a rewarding and much needed profession. We need to do our best to make sure that nurses get the recognition that they deserve so that we can turn around the shortage. Nurses need to know that they are needed. I support H. Con. Res. 54 because it helps bring more recognition, not only to the individualized profession of visiting nurses, but also to the profession as a whole.

Visting nurses deserve all of the recognition that can be afforded. They are a valuable group of professionals that travel to the homes of some of the sickest individuals to ensure that they are receiving much-needed health care in the comfort and privacy of their own home. By supporting Visiting Nurses Associations we are supporting a system of health care that is compassionate and that allows patients to receive care while maintaining their dignity. In my district, The Visiting Nurses Association of the Inland Counties works hard to bring care to patients all over the area. I know that they are working to obtain the necessary grant money to implement essential technology so that they could treat more patients while offering the individualized care that every patient deserves. I applaud the effort of the nurses and I applaud the Congress for bringing recognition to their noble work.

Mrs. TUBBS JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Housing Concurrent Resolution 54, honoring the Visiting Nurse Association.

In 1902, 13 young women met in Cleveland to form a local organization that would become one of the earliest pioneers of a new concept called community health nursing. From those women the Visiting Nurse Association of Cleveland was born.

These nurses understand that most people prefer the comfort and security of their home to recover and rehabilitate from an illness or injury. Making home health care an essential part of health care today. The Visiting Nurse Association touches the lives of nearly every American in some way.

While the size of the Visiting Nurse Association has grown tremendously, the quality of health care that they provide to people regardless of their ability to pay, continues to be superb. The organization serves over 15,000 people a year in Ohio. I would like to honor the visiting Nurse Association for the hard work and dedication they continue to provide to those in need.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 54, a bill expressing the sense of the Congress that we should establish an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the visiting nurse associations are nonprofit home health agencies that, for over 120 years, have been united in their mission to provide cost-effective and compassionate home and community-based health care to individuals, regardless of the individuals' condition or ability to pay for services. There are more than 500 visiting nurse associations, which employ more than 90,000 clinicians, provide health care to more than 4,000,000 people each year—with 95,000 visits in Florida alone—and provide a critical safety net in communities by developing a network of community support services that enable individuals to live independently at home.

In my home state, the Visiting Nurse Association of Florida serves 13 counties with a complete array of home health services. With headquarters in Stuart since 1976, VNA last year provided more than $346,000 in charitable care to the most vulnerable in our communities.

The establishment of an annual National Visiting Nurse Association Week would increase public awareness of the charity-based missions of visiting nurse associations and of their ability to meet the needs of chronically ill and disabled individuals who prefer to live at home rather than in nursing homes, and would spotlight preventive health clinics, adult day care programs, and other customized wellness programs that meet local community needs. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me today in support of this important resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 54.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. 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.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF FRED ROGERS AND HIS DEDICATION TO CREATING A MORE COMPASSIONATE WORLD

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 111) honoring the legacy of Fred Rogers and his dedication to creating a more compassionate, kind, and loving world for children and adults.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 111

Whereas on February 27, 2003, neighborhoods across the Nation were saddened by the death of Fred McFeely Rogers, creator and star of ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'';

Whereas Mr. Rogers was born in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, in 1928, and moved to Pittsburgh in 1953, where he pursued his education at the University of Pittsburgh while attending Pittsburgh Theological Seminary;

Whereas in 1963, Mr. Rogers was ordained as a Presbyterian minister;

Whereas his landmark show ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'' inspired, taught, and encouraged children, families, and adults since its first nationwide broadcast on February 19, 1968, with messages of love, peace, and comfort;

Whereas Mr. Rogers created over 200 of his own songs for his show, which always began in a comfortable family living room as he changed into his trademark cardigan sweater and sneakers, to encourage the healthy emotional growth of children and their families through imagination and friendship;

Whereas Mr. Rogers encouraged millions of children across the world to love themselves and their neighbors and to deal with complex emotional issues in a safe, reassuring way;

Whereas on July 9, 2002, in recognition of the contributions of Mr. Rogers, President George W. Bush presented him with the Presidential Medal of Freedom at a White House ceremony and said, ''Fred Rogers has proven that television can soothe the soul and nurture the spirit and teach the very young'';

Whereas the final show of ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'' aired in August 2001, after having completed 33 television seasons and nearly 1,000 episodes;

Whereas Mr. Rogers received many awards and honors for his efforts, including lifetime achievement awards from the Daytime Emmys and the Television Critics Association, designation as one of the ''50 greatest TV stars of all time'' by TV Guide, a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame in 1998, and induction into the Television Hall of Fame in 1999; and

Whereas Mr. Rogers always remained humble and true to his philosophy, saying ''I have really never considered myself a TV star. . . . I always thought I was a neighbor who just came in for a visit'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors Fred Rogers for his legendary service to the improvement of the lives of children, his steadfast commitment to demonstrating the power of compassion, and his dedication to spreading kindness through example; and

(2) expresses condolences and sympathies to his wife Joanne, his two sons, and his two grandsons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here to both mourn the loss of a great American, Mr. Fred Rogers, who died last week at the age of 74, and also to celebrate what he has done, what he has meant to so many Americans and people around the world, and remember his legacy with joy and hope, and look forward to the continued impact that he will have on the lives of so many.

Mr. Rogers was born in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, and he studied child development at the University of Pittsburgh. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister. His television program, which debuted in 1964, continues on today, even though the last tape was taped in 2001 and aired last year or so. His program lives on, and I want to make a few comments about the man we all know as Mr. Rogers.

□ 1445

There is a magic that is Fred Rogers that really is not magical at all. He is not the creation of boardrooms or animators or high-tech special effects. He is who he is and nothing less. It is the transparency of being himself, with no pretense or facade, that enabled him to connect with millions around the world of all ages, of all walks of life.

When people think of Mr. Rogers, oftentimes the first thing that comes to mind is his television program of nearly 40 years for young children, though people of today know him well. We are recognizing him here in this Chamber not just for these generations of today, but so that future generations who read the RECORD in the years to come will be able to know about the moment, this moment in time and what we valued.

I had the pleasure of working at least a little bit with Fred Rogers in one area that was a shared passion of ours and that was quality early childhood education. He recognized that quality education makes an impact on the child's neurological development that lasts a lifetime. I might say when I had the time to sit down and meet with Fred, as anybody else would say the same thing, you sat in his office that had a piano, that had some soft furniture and a puppet or two, and you could not help within just a few moments of finding that you slowed down with your life, that he began to talk directly to you, and you felt things that perhaps you had forgotten in your own life of what was really important. He studied child development while he was studying for his degree as a Presbyterian minister and later worked regularly with Dr. Margaret McFarland, also an expert in child development. Their regular meetings was what created the programs that we now know.

Fred believed that childhood is not just a time you get through, because so many things happen during that time. He had tremendous respect for viewers, knowing that most were young children, all with their own needs but also knowing that he touched the child in all of us, seniors, adults, parents, those with disabilities, everyone.

When one watched his show, you watched him enter the room and you saw him change into his sweater and change his shoes and talk; you immediately entered the world, or rather through his simple magic with his show, he entered the world of children. He was childlike without being childish. He remained the adult, mature and wise, caring and comforting, safe and nurturing. Though his program earned awards that made him the envy of all in television, he was never an actor. He

was a communicator, saying above all else, You are special and so is everyone else in this world. The puppets he created in his Neighborhood of Make Believe would never have made it through today's TV boardrooms. Indeed he was asked to spice up his show with more action. He responded by working to build up public television.

The station WQED in Pittsburgh has been inundated with calls and e-mails that pour in by the minute, not just expressing condolences but people telling their stories, for example, a sports talk radio show in South Carolina finding that their show was taken over by people with their memories of Fred Rogers. Or a young woman who told me that when she was a child living in the neighborhood that Fred Rogers is from, one day she went up and knocked on his door hoping to see him.

He had a magic which was so important to all of us, and it is sad to see that go. But it is important for the children of the world to know that that program shall live on. The messages that Fred sent will continue, about people being special, about parents' love for their children, about being caring, and also the staff that I have come to know with ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood,'' such folks as Hedda Sharapan, David Newell, Bill Isler and many, many more will continue on with his legacy.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with his wife, Joanne, and with all whose lives he has touched. The joy will come in knowing that he will continue to touch so many more.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his kindness and consideration.

> Please don't think it's funny
> When you want the ones you miss.
> There are lots and lots of people
> Who sometimes feel like this.

Mr. Speaker, I borrowed that opening verse from one of the original songs written by Fred McFeely Rogers during his long and legendary career. He wrote over 200 such songs to help explain complex, confusing, and often frightening issues to children in a gentle, noncondescending, and reassuring manner. That is what Mr. Rogers did best, make generations of children in this Nation and beyond feel special, important, and most of all, loved.

Mr. Rogers always started his shows by changing into his familiar cardigan and comfy tennis shoes to give children a sense of comfort and consistency. As I don this cardigan, I know there are lots and lots of people in this Chamber and the world who will forever miss the neighborly comfort, love, and wisdom Mr. Rogers gave while wearing a sweater like this one on the show. It is in his honor that I have introduced House Resolution 111, and I sincerely hope all my colleagues join with me in celebrating the legacy of Fred Rogers.

Fred was born in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, about a half hour east of Pittsburgh, and lived nearly his entire life in the city I am proud to represent, Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh will always be Mr. Rogers' neighborhood. It was in Pittsburgh in 1954 that Mr. Rogers began his lifelong involvement with children's television, coproducing a 7-year run of ''The Children's Corner,'' which at the time was broadcast on the Nation's first community-sponsored educational television station, WQED in Pittsburgh. In addition to his duties as producer, Mr. Rogers also performed musical numbers for the show and manipulated the puppets. Such famous puppets as Daniel Striped Tiger, King Friday XIII, and Henrietta Pussycat from his show went on to live in what is perhaps the most famous neighborhood in the world, ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood.''

From his early and humble start in February of 1968, Mr. Rogers and all of his neighbors have the distinction of being the longest-running program ever on PBS, with nearly 900 episodes and 33 seasons to their credit. Although not comfortable in the spotlight, Mr. Rogers nevertheless has received much well-deserved recognition for his efforts, including the distinction as being one of ''TV Guide's'' 50 greatest TV stars of all time, four Emmys, and induction to the Television Hall of Fame. His messages of self-worth, respect, and understanding have long served as a calm refuge and important contrast in a world of children's television filled with frenetically paced and often violent cartoons.

My friends, we have had more than our share of destruction, violence, and fear in these uncertain times. World events play out very differently in the eyes of a child, and in our rush to give voice to our own personal opinions on the happenings of the day, sometimes we overlook the importance of taking the time to explain issues to our children in a calm and easy manner and thus help ease the trepidations of a child growing up in today's world.

Fred Rogers realized the importance of taking the time to communicate with children, a fact that was at the very heart of his goals and beliefs. Although he was an ordained Presbyterian minister, he never preached to his audience. But then again, he never had to. His message of unconditional love, peace, self-respect, and respect for one's neighbor is universal. He once said, ''When you are helping children feel safe, you are helping them use their energies for moving forward, toward a more hopeful future for themselves and for our society.''

Mr. Rogers helped children confront difficult real-world issues such as divorce, disease, and adoption by listening to them and engaging them on these topics, by talking to them in a manner that respected a child's developing intellect. I truly hope that the important messages that Mr. Rogers shared with us and our children continue on for the next generation of future Congressmen and- women, and I am confident that his legacy will continue, as I have heard that PBS is encouraging all local PBS stations to continue running the rebroadcasts of ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood.'' His legacy will also continue in the works of the nonprofit organization founded by Mr. Rogers, Family Communications, Incorporated of Pittsburgh.

In the words of Mr. Bill Isler, president of Family Communications,

> Mr. Rogers was a composer, minister, author, puppeteer, brother, husband, father, grandfather and a friend to every child in the entire human family. Those of us who worked with Fred Rogers share both the privilege and responsibility of continuing his work so that no child anywhere grows up without being told, ''You are special.''

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to leave you with something Mr. Rogers once said in regards to helping children understand and cope with terrible news events on television. He said:

> When I was a boy and would see scary things on the news, my mother would say to me, 'Look for the helpers. You always find people who are helping.' To this day, that is where I focus my attention, to the many caring people in this world.

Our world lost one of the greatest and most caring helpers when Mr. Rogers was called home, but his teachings and messages have instilled in us the responsibility, duty, and ability to carry on his legacy by being one of the helpers that our children look for and need.

Thank you, Mr. Rogers. We will always miss your special, caring way of helping and comforting us all. You will always be, for the children.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Rogers is someone that all Pennsylvanians were so proud of. Our hearts are sad today because of his leaving us, but he left behind a heritage that we are all so proud of and will always remember in such a wonderful fashion.

I think in Pennsylvania, in western Pennsylvania, if you are traveling around today, at the Eat'n Park restaurants on their lighted signs, they say it all: ''Fred Rogers, we miss you.'' He studied childhood development at the University of Pittsburgh. Then he went on to be an ordained Presbyterian minister. His landmark show, ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood,'' inspired, taught and encouraged children, families and adults since its first nationwide broadcast on February 19, 1968, with messages of love, peace and comfort.

Mr. Rogers created over 200 of his own songs for his show, which always began in a comfortable family living

room as he changed into his trademark cardigan sweater and sneakers, to encourage the healthy emotional growth of children and their families through imagination and friendship.

He encouraged millions of children across the world to love themselves and their neighbors and to deal with complex emotional issues in a safe and reassuring way. On July 9, 2002, in recognition of the contributions of Mr. Rogers, President George W. Bush presented him with the Presidential Medal of Freedom at a White House ceremony and said, ''Fred Rogers has proven that television can soothe the soul, nurture the spirit and teach the very young.'' We all know that does not happen on television every day on many programs, but it did on his.

The final show of ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood'' aired in August 2001 after completing 33 television seasons and nearly 1,000 episodes. He was always called on whenever we faced a crisis in this country that would put fear in the hearts of children, September 11 the most recent. But he had a calmness and a kindness and a love that changed the atmosphere in any room he entered. Yes, as the Eat'n Park signs say today: ''Fred Rogers, we miss you.''

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) and all Pennsylvanians and all people of good will throughout America as we pay tribute honoring the legacy of Fred Rogers and his dedication to creating a more compassionate, kind and loving world for children and adults. I quote:

''It's a beautiful day in the neighborhood,
A beautiful day for a neighbor.
Would you be mine? Could you be mine?

While singing this simple refrain, Fred McFeely Rogers would change out of his sport coat and into his zip-up cardigan, slip off his dress shoes and slip on a pair of blue sneakers and become Mr. Rogers of ''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood.''

''Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood'' was a daily whisper in children's ears. It whispered peace, serenity, honesty, comfort, and trust into small and developing ears that listened attentively about issues big and small. Mr. Rogers spoke to children about the virtues of civility, sharing, tolerance, obedience, and self-worth.

□ 1500

He talked with musicians, such as cellist Yo-Yo Ma, asking questions from a child's perspective, like how he learned to play the cello, had it been too big for him.

As the creator and host of the popular television show, Rogers became one of America's most beloved figures. His evolution as a children's television personality began in the 1950's, many years before public TV station WQED in Pittsburgh produced the first ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood.'' Rogers had been a puppeteer and voice character on the WQED show called ''The Children's Corner.''

Fred Rogers made his first on-camera appearance in the 1960's while working for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in Toronto. It was there that he produced a 15-minute daily program called ''Misterogers.'' By the mid 1960's, the shows were lengthened to 30 minutes and were moved to Pittsburgh. A Washington Post article on Rogers stated that ''Rogers often said he was guided by listening to children, discovering who they were and what was important in their lives. By providing answers to children's questions and addressing their uncertainties in their expanding world, he sought to aid their emotional development as individuals.''

As the Nation stands on the brink of war and the threat of terrorism as a constant reminder of the cruel world in which we live, who is listening to the children and addressing their uncertainties? Who on national television will be that reassuring and calming presence for the next generation of children?

On February 27, Fred Rogers, the gentle and soft-spoken host of ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'' died of stomach cancer at his home in Pittsburgh at the age of 74. Rogers received four daytime Emmy awards, a Peabody award, a lifetime achievement award of the National Academy of Television and Sciences, the Presidential Medal of Freedom, and more than two dozen honorary degrees for doing what too few of us have sought to do, make a commitment to enrich the lives of children. He was truly a gentle giant, and I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 111, ''Honoring the Legacy of Fred Rogers.''

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues in thanks for the life of Fred Rogers, for the heart of Fred Rogers, and for the wonderful efforts of Fred Rogers throughout his lifetime, especially for the children of the world. I have the neighborhood trolly from his program with me, and I think it symbolized a large part of who Fred Rogers really was. He was a uniter in a world of dividers. He was a believer in a world of skeptics. He was kind in a world of cynics. Fred Rogers set the example that every parent probably wishes they could set for their children, one that says, I like you for who you are, no matter your differences, no matter your failings. As he used to say, ''It's you that I like.'' He invited everybody to the neighborhood, Mr. McFreely, others, the king, the queen, all the funny little characters that children grew to love over the years, and interestingly enough, I am of the generation who enjoyed Fred Rogers as children and now our children are enjoying Fred Rogers, and hopefully through television generations to come will be able to enjoy and come to love Fred Rogers as we all did.

His loss is a great loss. His mission was a great mission. Where so many seek riches in this world, Fred Rogers sought to teach people to love and he succeeded. He leaves a legacy of love, of goodness, of kindness again in a world that lacks that all too often. I am fortunate to have lived in Pittsburgh and to have met Fred Rogers several times. Unfortunately, I did not get to know him terribly well. He was the kind of man one did not have to know terribly well to understand, to take a little bit of him with one as they went about their day.

I have three nieces and a nephew who now benefit from Fred Rogers and from his message and his love. I hope that we will all carry that with us through our trials and our difficulties throughout our lives and remember when we meet somebody, to think ''there is something about you that I like.''

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

I would like to add this final quote from Fred Rogers. He said, ''We live in a world in which we need to share responsibility. It's easy to say 'it's not my child, not my community, not my world, not my problem.' Then there are those who see the need and respond. I consider those people my heroes.''

Mr. Rogers has been a hero to us all.

I urge the adoption of this measure, House Resolution 111.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a mother and as a grandmother to honor Fred McFeely Rogers, known to millions of children and their parents simply as ''Mister Rogers.''

Since first broadcasting ''Mister Rogers' Neighborhood'' on Pittsburgh's public television station in 1966, Mister Rogers brought his message that ''everybody's special'' to children and adults around the world. Fred Rogers spoke to thousands of children every day, gently teaching each of them about the importance of acceptance—acceptance of others and acceptance of themselves. No matter what challenge children face in their lives it is always ''a beautiful day in the neighborhood'' that Mr. Rogers created for them.

Mister Rogers also acted as a role model for parents, suggesting creative ways for parents to listen—and to listen—to their children. Fred Rogers did not rely on fast-paced cuts and high-budget thrills to keep a child's attention. He wrote the scripts, was the host, operated the puppets, and even wrote the songs for each show. Mister Rogers' formula for making kids care about what he had to say was to listen to them.

Mister Rogers' co-workers at PBS honored his memory by carrying on his work. They quickly updated his website to offer advice to parents on how they can constructively talk to their children about his death. We can all honor his memory in much the same way: by carrying on his message, ''There's only one person in the world like to you,'' and then respecting those differences that make each of us so unique.

My condolences go out to Fred Rogers' family and I thank him for his work to improve the lives of children.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the legacy of Fred Rogers, the man loved by generations of children for his many years as television's ''Mr. Rogers.'' Perhaps no other American has done as much to foster the public's interest in child education and advocacy. He touched the lives of millions of children during his show's 33 seasons on the air, and I feel privileged to honor his life here today. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing this resolution to the floor.

For 33 years Mr. Rogers invited America into his living room and gave us a tour of his neighborhood. Mr. Rogers infused his world with a creative mixture of fact and fiction, introducing his young viewers to both the real world and a world of make believe. Children saw the insides of bakeries, police stations and glass-blowing factories. Meanwhile, they also learned the values of sharing, compassion, and community from the puppets who became characters in their daily imaginary lives. Fred Rogers showed us that not only is education important; it can also be fun.

On July 9, 2002, President Bush awarded Mr. Rogers the Presidential Medal of Freedom. I call on this body to offer its recognition of the life of a man whose personal mission to improve the lives of children made a difference in all of our lives.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to express my condolences to the family, friends and millions of children who have been influenced by the lovely man, Fred Rogers. He passed away on February 27, 2003, but this in no way means that his teachings and influence will end here.

Fred Rogers, known best as Mr. Rogers, with his safe neighborhood, was instrumental in teaching children for decades. He encouraged learning in innovative way through his TV show. Young children adored this man, his empathic lessons of being nice to your neighbor, and helped children enter school ready to learn and ask questions.

Fred Rogers taught our children how to make this world more compassionate, kind and loving. We remember him as someone who brought out the positive side of television, using it as a vehicle to teach children basic skills.

Mr. Rogers had a worldwide appeal for children, and many of his lessons preached tolerance and acceptance for those around you that may initially appear different. He used gentle themes and a friendly voice to convey his messages. Mr. Rogers had the ability to express his ideas and children were able to act on in their homes and lives. Such an example and contributor to American television deserves our utmost praise. My own children, Erica and Jason, were drawn to Mr. Rogers' knowledge and kindly approach—they learned alot!

I am a proud supporter of House Resolution 111, to honor his legacy. I do offer my most sincere condolences to his wife, Joanne, their two sons and two grandsons. Fred Rogers is certainly worthy of this honor.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, in a world where too often neighbors have become strangers, the meaning of ''Love thy neighbor'' has dwindled. Fred Rogers never lost that spirit. He accepted us into his neighborhood, into his home, and presented our children with a message that you should be loved for who you are.

''The whole idea,'' said Mr. Rogers, ''is to look at the television camera and present as much love as you possibly could to a person who needs it.''

Fred Rogers recognized the power of television to carry out that message of caring, and become involved in children's broadcasting during its infancy. In the early 1950s he began working in public television at WQED, the first community public television station in the nation. On his lunch breaks, he attended Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and graduated magna cum laude with the Class of 1962 with his Master's in Divinity. The day after graduation he was called to Canada to being MISTEROGERS, the show that would evolve into Mister Rogers' Neighborhood on his return to Pittsburgh a year later.

Mr. Rogers' teaching did not end at the close of each broadcast, or even when he left the studio. Through Family Communications, Inc., Fred Rogers was able to foster girls' involvement in math and science, educate children about the dangers of prejudice, and teach pre-schoolers anger management. Through Safe Havens Training Project, Mr. Rogers was able to educate childcare workers on how to deal with children that witnessed violence, proving them a place where they could feel safe.

Fred Rogers also remained active in the ministry, educating a new generation of ministers at the Pittsburgh Theological Seminary's Summer Youth Institute. Mr. Rogers would spend an afternoon with the teenagers, hoping to impart to them the importance of the doctrine of love and caring that he had made the center of his life.

Mr. Rogers was a teacher, an educator, and a presence in many of our children's lives. The neighborhood will miss him.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 111.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MURPHY. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 111.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 2003.

Hon. J. Dennis Hastert,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective February 27, 2003, I hereby resign from the Committee on Science due to my appointment to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY BISHOP,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 3, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Effective March 3, 2003, I hereby resign from the Committee on Small Business due to my appointment to the Committee on Armed Services.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please contact me at (202) 225–5261.

Sincerely,

TIM RYAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 106, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 54, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Res. 111, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

CONGRATULATING LUTHERAN SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 106.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 106, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—27

Becerra
Combest
Crowley
Dooley (CA)
Feeney
Ford
Gephardt
Graves
Gutierrez
Hart
Honda
Houghton
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
LaTourette
McHugh
Millender-McDonald
Mollohan
Oberstar
Serrano
Snyder
Stupak
Sweeney
Terry
Towns
Vitter
Wexler

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) (during the vote). The Chair would advise that there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1849

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 40, I was detained with constituents is the reason I missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote No. 40 attending to my constituents with the American Legion. H. Res. 106, if I had been present, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted an enthusiastic "yea."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the remainder of this series of votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL VISITING NURSE ASSOCIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 54.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 54, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 0, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—411

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost

Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—23

Becerra
Combest
Crowley
Dooley (CA)
Feeney
Gephardt
Graves
Gutierrez
Herger
Houghton
Jefferson
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Mollohan
Oberstar
Sanders
Serrano
Snyder
Stupak
Sweeney
Terry
Vitter
Wexler

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). The Chair would advise that there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1856

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF FRED ROGERS AND HIS DEDICATION TO CREATING A MORE COMPASSIONATE WORLD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 111.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 111, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Becerra
Combest
Crowley
Dooley (CA)
Feeney
Gephardt

Graves	Oberstar	Sweeney
Gutierrez	Sanders	Terry
Houghton	Serrano	Vitter
Jefferson	Snyder	Wexler
LaTourette	Stupak	
Mollohan	Sullivan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OTTER) (during the vote). The Chair reminds Members there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1904

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, my flight was inevitably delayed leading to circumstances beyond my control. Therefore I was not able to be present for the record votes on Tuesday, March 4, 2003.

Had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative for: H. Res. 106—Congratulating Lutheran schools, students, parents, teachers, administrators, and congregations across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for other purposes; H. Con. Res. 54—Honoring Visiting Nurses Association; and H. Res. 111—Honoring the legacy of Fred Rogers and his dedication to creating a more compassionate, kind, and loving world for children and adults.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 2003, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. Res. 27, COMMENDING MEMBERS OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 5, 2003, to consider in the House H.J. Res. 27; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that the joint resolution be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME ON THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 2003, CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13, MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 2003

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order on Thursday, March 6, 2003, to consider in the House H.R. 13; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that the bill be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 332

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 332.

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

There was no objection.

THE BALANCE ACT OF 2003

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, a massive digital revolution is unfolding before our very eyes. Like most breakthroughs in the past, this revolution has provoked deep concern and suspicion within the entertainment industry. In response Congress enacted the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

However, the law is flawed. It threatens fair use and First Amendment rights by imposing strict liability on the circumvention of technical restrictions. It has the potential to destroy the First Sale doctrine and to extend copyright terms in perpetuity. And in practice, it has chilled technological development and competition. That was especially evident last week when a Federal judge, citing the DMCA, issued an injunction chilling competition in the market for printer cartridges which have nothing to do with copyrights.

Today I am introducing the BALANCE Act of 2003 which seeks to restore the traditional balance of copyright law. I hope this bill will help move all parties toward the ultimate goal, a robust digital marketplace where DRM protects copyright holders, where the IT industry has freedom to create new and exciting devices and where consumers are given a broad array of lawful alternatives that are affordable, reliable, secure, and respectful of their legal rights and expectations.

A JUDGE'S OPINION

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a Texas State district judge for 20 years, I am aware, very aware, of the attorney-client privilege. This is one privilege that has withstood the challenge of liberal courts and is broader than the fifth amendment's protection against self-incrimination.

In the case of Swendler versus U.S., the Supreme Court ruled that the attorney-client privilege is so important it extends beyond the grave. We all recall Vince Foster, Clinton's deputy chief of staff, who investigated Travelgate. After killing himself, the Republican special prosecutor sought records from his attorney but was not able to get them because the Courts ruled that the attorney-client privilege survives the client's death to promote a full and frank communication between client and counsel.

Similar records are now being sought from Miguel Estrada today, and he is being refused confirmation because of those records.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with this picture? In this judge's opinion, Miguel Estrada deserves to sit on the bench of the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and should not be kept from it because he keeps sacred one of its oldest privileges.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

TITLE IX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, in 1972 Title IX became law. Title IX prohibits discrimination in education programs or educational activities based on gender. This has resulted in significant gains in women athletic participation. It has been a great thing for a great many people. From 1972 to 1999, there has been a tenfold increase in women's athletic participation at the high school and the college level. At the NCAA level, the increase was from 30,000 to 157,000 athletes, roughly a 500 percent increase.

However, there is another side, Mr. Speaker, to Title IX. Between 1985 and 2001, we lost 57,000 male college athletes. During that same period, we gained 52,000 female athletes at the college level, almost the same in number. Between 1992 and 1999, there were 386 men's collegiate teams that were eliminated.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, 171 of those were men's wrestling teams. The most common reason given for the elimination of these programs was to comply with title IX.

Recently, the Secretary of Education established a 15-member commission to

establish a study of opportunity in athletics. The purpose was to examine title IX and its impact on athletics.

This committee made 23 recommendations. Many of those recommendations were accepted with unanimous consent. However, there were eight recommendations that were not unanimous. Some people are now saying that since they were not unanimous, they should not be implemented. I would like to just retrace four or five of these.

First, one proposal was that the Secretary of Education be given some flexibility in implementing title IX. Currently, if 60 percent of a student body is male and 40 percent is female, then that means that 60 percent of the scholarships should go to males and 40 percent to females; and there is only 1 percent variance, so that means 59 percent would be the minimum.

We feel that this is impossible to implement because sometimes athletes quit, and sometimes they sign a letter of intent and do not show up. So a 1 percent variance is not workable, and the Secretary of Education needs variability.

Secondly, a recommendation was that private funds be able to be used if a sport was to be dropped because of noncompliance with title IX. For instance, if a wrestling program was about to be dropped because of noncompliance, then it would allow people to go out and raise money privately to keep that program going. It would not eliminate women's sports or women's opportunities; it would simply keep a sport going that is rapidly disappearing. That makes sense, but there are those who oppose this.

Another proposal is that slots on team rosters be treated the same as actual athletes. For instance, if there were 20 scholarships on the women's rowing team available, but only 10 women went out for the sport, the question is do you allow that as 20 opportunities, or do you say you just count the 10 women? If you just count the 10 women, that means you have to get rid of 10 men somewhere because of the slots not being occupied. That does not make sense. As long as the opportunity is there, we think they should be counted as certainly athletes who are in compliance.

Fourthly is the use of interest surveys to indicate school compliance with title IX. This is one of the three major problems in title IX, is the interest of the underrepresented sex being met? So the proposal is to allow interest surveys to be used, so if, for instance, there is no interest in a given school in women's rifle, then we should not have to offer women's rifle. That would make sense. But, again, this is being opposed by a few people because they feel that somehow this will undo title IX.

Lastly, there is the issue of walk-ons, something I know about to a fairly great extent. Currently, walk-ons are excluded because of the head counts. So if there were 200 female athletes at a school and 200 male, and the student body was equally divided 50–50, that would mean if you had 100 people who wanted to walk on who were male, who would pay their own way to school, pay for some of their own equipment, that they would not be allowed out unless there were 100 female walk-ons also. Statistical studies show that women simply do not walk on anywhere near the same proportion as men, so we have thousands of young men everywhere who are excluded from competition because of title IX. There will be no more Rudys. There are no more Rudys, in many cases. Again, that does not make any sense.

Mr. Speaker, I had two daughters who competed in athletics. I have two granddaughters. I hope they compete as well. I also had a son who competed and two grandsons whom I hope will compete. I coached 2,000 young men. So I am certainly not opposed to female participation. But we need to restore fairness and balance to title IX, and I urge my colleagues to support a letter we are circulating to this effect.

SUPPORT THE KOBY MANDELL ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on a subject that is very much on the hearts and minds of the American people, especially in these last 18 to 20 months, and that is terrorism.

Terrorism is the deliberate use of violence against civilians for the purpose of achieving a political end. Terrorism is very much on the front page of our newspapers, but it is not new to America at all. Terrorism has historical consequences, it has human consequences, and we must make sure that it has future punitive consequences as well.

This week we commemorate a sad anniversary, the 30th anniversary of the terrorist slaughter of two leading diplomats of our Nation. Thirty years ago this week, a group of Palestinian-based terrorists burst into the Saudi Arabian Embassy in Khartoum, Sudan, and held captive a group of diplomats, including some Americans. Evidence would suggest that upon orders from the leader of what was then known as the Palestinian Liberation Organization, what is now known as the Palestinian Authority, Mr. Arafat, a decision was made by these terrorists to first torture and then execute two American diplomats.

According to a National Security Agency report at the time, the murders were carried out by members of the Palestinian terrorist group known as Black September. According to a CIA report at that time, Black September was a cover term for Mr. Arafat's Fattah movement, and the murders were carried out at his orders.

This has very human consequences. Two diplomats serving their country who were murdered 30 years ago need to be remembered.

Cleo Noel was a native of Oklahoma. He graduated from the University of Missouri, earned his masters degrees from the University of Missouri and Harvard; and he had a distinguished career in the State Department.

The other murdered diplomat was George Moore, a native of Ohio who graduated from the University of Southern California where he also earned a masters degree. Mr. Moore also had a distinguished career with the State Department, and in fact was the highest-ranking African American in the Foreign Service at the time of his murder.

Terrorism must have future punitive consequences. Our Nation has been awakened to this great threat. Very recently on the 20th of February of this year the Justice Department achieved a major victory in our war on terrorism when it issued indictments for eight members of a terrorist organization known as the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, a group responsible for the murder of at least 100 civilians.

But we must have a more systematic approach to be successful in finding and bringing to American justice those who commit these acts of terror. The murderers of Cleo Noel and George Moore have never faced American justice over these last 30 years for the terrorism that they committed.

In order to give us more opportunity, more authority, to wage this war on terrorism, I have introduced the Koby Mandell Act of 2003, named after an American citizen whose life was snuffed out while outside of our country in Israel.

The purpose of this legislation is to create within the Department of Justice a permanent unit that will aggressively seek out those who have committed acts of terror against American citizens, wherever they happen to be in the world, so that American citizens can enjoy the protection of our law enforcement system wherever they may travel, most particularly in cases where the host countries are unwilling or unable to properly administer justice to those who commit such acts of atrocity.

This was the case in the case of our two martyred diplomats. The Government of Sudan released them very shortly after their arrest. They were turned over to what was then called the Palestinian Liberation Organization, and nothing happened: no trial, no meaningful prosecution, no punishment. The word went out that the price of an American life, the price of a life of an American diplomat, was nothing.

We believe differently. We respect the value of every human life, of every person of every country. We understand our obligation and our responsibility to stand forward and protect the lives of the people who have entrusted us with the governance of this Nation.

In cases where other nations are unwilling to mete out justice, we must do so. I would urge my colleagues to enlist as cosponsors of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY 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.)

ACTING UNILATERALLY NOT IN BEST INTEREST OF UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to state that unilateral military action by the United States against Iraq at this time is not in our best national interest.

Certainly Saddam Hussein must be disarmed and Iraq must be rid of weapons of mass destruction. Equally clear is our power to act unilaterally and successfully against Iraq, or any other country for that matter. I am proud we have that power, and we must sustain it. But the question is not whether we will prevail against Iraq. We will, with or without help. The real question is whether it is in our best national interest to unilaterally use our awesome power against Iraq. I believe it is not.

We may not need help to win a war, but we will need help the day after the war is won, and that help must come from a multinational or a United Nations effort. We need our friends to help with peacekeeping, with rebuilding and with international credibility, and that support will be absent if we take unilateral action.

This is not about winning United Nations permission to protect ourselves. We do not need that permission. This is about winning United Nations support to protect all civilized countries from the Iraqi threat. President Bush must forge a strong coalition through continued diplomacy before using American military power. If he does not, we will be isolated and less secure, and that is not in our national interest.

President Bush very skillfully won unanimous Security Council support last fall to restart the arms inspections, and he deserves great credit for that. After the initial success, however, the administration has not been able to maintain that unity and cannot even muster unity today among the five permanent nations of the Security Council.

What is the problem here? We are talking about an isolated country with a fourth-rate military and a leader who is a murderous tyrant that has no support and no friends in the United Nations. Yet the Security Council is split. Why is that? I believe it is because of the inept, bungled, cowboy diplomacy of the President of the United States and his senior advisers.

Six months ago, after a great deal of soul searching, I voted to give the President military authority to use force to rid Iraq of the weapons of mass destruction. The President asked for that authority and said he would exhaust all diplomatic options before using it. And his strategy worked. The inspections were restarted.

I am convinced that while those inspections have not been met with enough cooperation, the inspectors' presence in Iraq has made Saddam Hussein less dangerous for the time being.

The administration has had much less success since then, and the root cause is simple: cowboy diplomacy from this administration. Every diplomatic thrust has been met with rhetoric that belies and often contradicts the diplomatic efforts. Administration spokesmen speak nearly every day with rhetoric that implies we are bent on war, with or without U.N. support, with or without our traditional and closest allies. The implication is that diplomacy is just something to take up time and distract attention until all of our troops are in place.

The Bush administration spent much of its pre-9–11 days acting unilaterally on a variety of fronts, the environment, the ABM Treaty and many other ways, even though promising a new foreign policy run with humility during the 2002 election campaign.

□ 1930

In that broader sense, it comes as no surprise that so many of our allies are not joining us now.

Then last week, in the middle of this diplomatic standoff, the administration released its plans for a post-Saddam Iraq, which included the possibility of a civilian American government. I think that is a great mistake. It will certainly be necessary, if we invade Iraq, for there to be military occupation to keep people from murdering each other for a time. That occupation will be essential; but we should not impose an American civil government.

We should be looking for a multinational or a United Nations program to provide an interim civil government, and certainly our goal has to be to establish a representative and stable Iraqi government itself. The Bush plan smacks of colonialism, and could give ammunition to those who question our motives in seeking to disarm Hussein in the first place.

It is dangerous to conduct a unilateral invasion of Iraq. It will undermine our credibility and legitimacy that this country has built up over decades of global leadership. We must realize that when we question the motives of countries like Germany and France, they question ours. We must work with them.

I call on the Bush administration to renew its efforts to secure a broad multinational coalition or U.N. mandate to disarm Iraq.

NATIONAL SOLUTION NECESSARY FOR CRISIS OF MEDICAL LIABILITY COSTS AND OVERREACHING LAWSUITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the increase of medical liability costs in an environment where it has become all too commonplace to name the innocent in lawsuits, drive good doctors from the practice of medicine, and play games with the health care of vulnerable patients.

This crisis has reached my home State of Texas, and even reached the cities and towns that I now represent in Congress. For instance, my neighbor, Dr. John Marsden, a vascular surgeon in my district, must pay $6,600 per month for his medical liability coverage. That is nearly $80,000 a year just to purchase insurance to stay in business. I do not think we would find it acceptable if other kinds of businesses had to absorb that kind of overhead.

After being named in numerous unfounded lawsuits where there has been no affirmative finding in favor of the plaintiff, Dr. Marsden notes that if he sustains another increase in his medical liability rates, he will be forced to leave his medical practice. If he ceases his surgical practice, the city of Lewisville and the outlying areas of my county would no longer have ready access to a vascular surgeon, severely impacting the health of Dr. Marsden's elderly and institutionalized patients. They would then have to travel a longer distance to receive health care, or perhaps even a life-saving operation.

Another surgeon in my district, Dr. Hatton, has an equally similar situation. Dr. Bill Hatton is a surgeon at the Medical Center of Lewisville. In 1994, he performed an operation, a gall bladder operation, on a pregnant woman. At the time, he found she also suffered from appendicitis. The appropriate operation was done and the woman was sent home to recover from her surgery.

Four weeks later, the same woman was admitted to the hospital. She had signs and symptoms of infection. She had a very high fever. It was feared that she could be suffering from peritonitis, an inflammation of the lining of the abdominal cavity, and that the cause was a breakdown of the surgical site inside her abdomen. The symptoms were so severe the patient was in what was called high output congestive heart failure. If nothing was done, the

mother would surely die. However, in trying to save the mother, the child's life would be put in jeopardy.

Surgery was performed on the woman, expecting that there was this problem at the appendectomy site, but no evidence of an anastomotic leak was found. The child was delivered but, sadly, died of extreme prematurity; but the mother, after the operation, immediately improved, and within 24 hours, was nearly well and was discharged from the hospital a few days later.

After these tragic events, an attorney sued Dr. Hatton on behalf of the shocked and saddened family of this young woman. Every practitioner involved in the case was sued, but Dr. Hatton was the ultimate target. The case went to trial and Dr. Hatton prevailed. What the attorney should have recognized at the point of the depositions, had he not been blinded by greed, was the fact that, in this tragic and sad case, there was no negligent party.

However, that attorney continued to drag Dr. Hatton through a long and arduous legal battle, and delayed the time that that family could eventually heal from their psychological wounds. This was a costly, time-consuming, and an emotional process for both the doctor and the family, all for the agenda of a third party.

There are thousands of other doctors with similar stories. The crisis is at a breaking point. Doctors are being driven from their practices, leaving the Nation with a serious health professional shortage. The legal environment in which doctors must work is lopsided to favor a very narrow special interest group, that of the trial lawyer. Patients are losing access to specialized care that they need because doctors are being driven out of business.

Trial lawyers prey on vulnerable patients and doctors rarely in pursuit of justice, but frequently in pursuit of material gain. Nearly every State in the country now faces this crisis. A national solution is needed now. Fortunately for us, H.R. 5, which we will debate this week, will immediately address this problem by providing the national solution that is needed when it comes to the floor. I urge passage of H.R. 5.

GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk with my colleagues on a very controversial provision within the Social Security Protection Act which the House will be considering on the floor tomorrow. This legislation includes a number of important provisions to defend Social Security against fraud and abuse, and ensure that disabled beneficiaries are protected.

Unfortunately, this legislation fails to offer any protections to an equally important population: public employees who suffer at the hands of an unfair provision known as the government pension offset. In States where some public employees are not covered by Social Security, such as Texas, the government pension offset reduces spousal benefits by two-thirds, and, in some cases, eliminates these benefits altogether.

This provision unfairly penalizes public servants such as schoolteachers, firefighters, and police officers who educate our children, protect us from harm, and care for us during emergencies. This is a particular burden for widows, especially our public school teachers who had planned their retirement benefits thinking they would receive a full spousal benefit, because their spouses did pay into the Social Security trust fund. The only way they can escape this unfair penalty is by working their last days in a job covered by Social Security and their retirement system.

Unfortunately, so many school districts and some law enforcement agencies in Texas do not have both their pension plan plus Social Security. Unfortunately, the legislation we are considering tomorrow would prevent teachers from using this benefit, forcing them to work 5 more years in order to receive a full spousal benefit. In other words, they would have to leave their jobs at the school district which may not be part of the Social Security system, because in 1983 Congress allowed public employees not to be included, to then work for a school district that is both under the teacher retirement system in Texas and Social Security for 5 years.

We should not punish teachers by stripping away this right unless we address the underlying problem, the unfair government pension offset, the GPO. The widow's benefit is vital to many individuals in my district, especially public school teachers, who have worked their whole lives trying to educate our children. It is not by their choice that they happen to work in a school district that does not pay Social Security; it is school district decisions by the board Members.

I have received literally hundreds of phone calls and messages from constituents who are hurt by this provision. They planned their retirement thinking that they would receive a pension benefit or spousal benefit if their husbands or wives die.

Let us be clear: Most of the impact of this provision is on women. At the time they chose their profession, teaching may have been the best opportunity for females; but they retire, to find that they are not eligible for their husband's benefit, their widow's benefit, because they receive a public pension that was not covered under Social Security. By that time, it is too late.

I could give many examples of people who have worked many years teaching our children, working as a custodian in our school districts, or helping serve food to our children whose husband passed away and they find out, well, sorry, you do not pay Social Security, even though your husband did all those years, and now you do not receive but a very small amount, or none, of Social Security widow's benefits.

H.R. 743, that is on the floor tomorrow, will make it harder for teachers and other public servants to get the benefits they deserve, but it does nothing to address the unfair system that created this situation in the first place.

I encourage my colleagues to stand up for public servants by opposing this legislation tomorrow, and to work instead to eliminate the government pension offset, the GPO. I am a strong supporter of legislation introduced by my colleagues, the gentlemen from California, Mr. MCKEON and Mr. BERMAN, which would eliminate the government pension offset and the windfall elimination provision, another quirk in Social Security that hurts public employees. That is legislation we should be considering tomorrow, but we are not.

I know my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON), has been a champion on this issue and is planning on introducing legislation which would provide a remedy for the government offset. We should consider these bills before we consider H.R. 743.

I urge my colleagues and the leadership to act on these bills and finally solve the government pension offset problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. EDWARDS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLANS STILL VITAL FOR JUSTICE IN UNIVERSITY ATTENDANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to share that today is the third anniversary of the march on Tallahassee in Tallahassee, Florida. It took place in 2000, to stand not only for justice by affirmative action in this State, but ultimately this country.

The adoption of affirmative action programs in the '60s reflected our Nation's aspirations to overcome long-entrenched injustices and become a society of equal opportunity, or at least to make sure that everyone has the opportunity in higher education that would like to have it.

Now, not only the President but the Governor of the State of Florida, Jeb Bush, has put forth a brief to the Supreme Court fighting against equal opportunity for all. I think it is important that we as Americans come together at a time such as this and commend those that have come forward.

One of the things that the State of Florida talked about as it relates to moving away from affirmative action was moving away from equal opportunity, not only for race or gender, but also moving away from what we believe makes us Americans.

I think it is important for us to note that some of these programs are more harmful than helpful. In Florida, they have the Talented 20 program. If this was to become the law of the land and philosophy of the land, if the Supreme Court does not uphold the Michigan decision, it is important, it is important that we make sure that we have as many inclusionary opportunities as possible, especially for those that are attending school for the first time.

In Florida, under the Talented 20 program, if you have school A, and school A is a school where the GPA of top 20 percent stops at a 3.5, and school B, where the top 20 shuts off at 3.3; say you have 2 students, they play soccer together, two girls, and you have one student in school A that will have a 3.4 GPA, and the one in school B has a 3.4 GPA, this school A student does not go to school and this one does, based on the capability of other students in their school.

The top 20 cuts off at different locations, different areas in every school; so a child should not be penalized on the fact that they go to a school that has more magnet programs or Rhodes scholars, future Rhodes scholars, whatever the case may be. They should not be penalized. When we move away from the practice of affirmative action, using race among many factors, we get into a very gray area that is going to end up hurting more Americans than helping them.

As we start looking at the fact that, I must say, my President and yours was able to get into school under a legacy, I think it is important that we remember that everyone did not have the opportunity to have a parent or someone that was able to get a dormitory named after them to be able to get into school. That means every American.

I share with people constantly that it is very, very important that we remember that education is the number one key to help individuals provide for their families. I tell individuals when I go to speak at Rotary Clubs or at the Kiwanis Club, if they have a wife or daughter, which qualifies every man in this country, then they should be for affirmative action.

The Michigan case is supported by General Schwarzkopf and many others that are noted throughout the military, because diversity makes our country great and strong. I think it is important that Members, not only of this Congress but definitely of the Supreme Court and just everyday Americans, need to understand that if we have to get a football or a basketball, or we have to take our kids to an arts program where they can learn how to sing or what have you, dance well, to get into our institutions of higher education, I think that is the wrong thing.

Universities and institutions of higher learning would like to be able to have the opportunity to say that this child, based on the fact that they have great ability, will be a great asset, not only to our university but also to our society. I think it is important. I think it should not be just based on sports, and it should not be based on the fact that someone can sing or run. I think it is important that we remember that children and young people that want to move on into higher education should be able to do so based on their academic ability, and not on the academic ability of others.

□ 1945

So I think we really need to really look close to these fast, quick programs, affirmative action, things that are untested, unproven, and look at what the University of Michigan has put forth.

I commend the brief that has been put forth by Members of Congress supporting affirmative action, of supporting the Michigan case in the Supreme Court. I think we, as Americans, it brings us together. It does not divide us. When we start looking at voices and hearing voices that are willing to use race and use divisive kinds of languages like preference, things of that nature, divides us as Americans. I think it is important we redefine preference.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to really look close as we look at this national debate over inclusion, this national debate of education on behalf of fair play, making sure that every young person in our country has an opportunity to quality education and the best universities that we have that serve us. We do not want to go back to the day like my mother, who served in this House, in this Congress, who had to go to the University of Michigan not by choice but just on the fact that she could not get into an institution in Florida to be able to receive a master's degree. I do not think that we will get to that point because I know that Americans will stand up, and I am glad. And I commend the University of Michigan and the corporations and our men and women that are sponsoring them.

ECONOMIC MYTH OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk tonight about an economic myth. There is a myth that has been around a long time and that is that war benefits an economy.

The argument goes that when a country is at war it will create jobs and creat economic growth. This is a myth. During the time of World War II and following, they claim that the Depression ended, finally ended with the start of the second world war. And this is not true either because a lot of men were drafted and put into the military. Unemployment rates obviously went down, but there was no improvement in the economy.

Economic growth and really the ending of the Depression did not end until after World War II. So it is wrong to think there is an economic benefit coming from any kind of a war.

There are a lot of shortcomings from a war. During wartime it is much more common to have inflation, and the money presses are running so we can expect inflation from the military build up and the possible war that we are facing. Also, during wartime there is a bigger challenge to the currency of that nation that is at war, and already we see that the dollar in the past year has been down 20 percent. Although there are many other reasons for a weak dollar, the war is contributing to the weakness in the dollar.

Also, during wartime the country can expect that taxes will go up. I know we are talking about cutting taxes, and I am all for cutting taxes; but in real terms taxes will go up during wartime. And it is inevitable that deficits increase. And right now our deficits are exploding. Our national debt is going up nearly $500 billion per year at an analyzed rate.

The other shortcoming economically of wartime is that funds, once they are either borrowed, inflated or taxed, once the government spends these, so much of this expenditure is overseas, and it takes away from domestic spending. So this is a strong negative for the domestic economy. Another thing that arises during wartime so often is the sentiment for protectionism and a weak economy, difficulties with currencies in wartime will really build an incentive for protectionists measures, and we are starting to see that, which I think is a danger.

During wartime, trade is much more difficult; and so if a war comes, we can expect that even our trade balances might get much worse. There are a lot of subjective problems during wartime too. The first thing that goes is confidence. Confidence in general. Right now there is less confidence in the stock market and literally hundreds of billions of dollars lost in the stock market in the last year or two, again, due to other reasons; but the possibility of war contributes to this negative sentiment toward the stock market.

It is hard to judge the future. Nobody can know the future because of the unintended consequences of war. We do not know how long the war will last. How much it will spread? So there are a lot of uncertainties about this. There is fear. Fear comes from the potential of war or during wartime and a lot of confusion. And unfortunately, also when wars are not fought for national security reasons, the popularity of the war is questioned, that this may alienate our allies. And I believe we are seeing some of that already.

There is no doubt that during wartime the government expands in size and scope. And this of course is a great danger. And after war, the government rarely shrinks to its original size. It grows. It may shrink a little, but inevitably the size of the government grows and there is a tremendous incentive to increase the size and scope of government during wartime. This is a danger because when government gets bigger, the individual has to get smaller; therefore, it diminishes personal individual liberty.

So these are the costs that we cannot ignore. We have the costs of the war. We have the cost of potential loss of life, but there is a tremendous economic cost that even the best economists could not calculate what this war may cost us.

War should always be fought as the very, very last resort. It should never be done casually, and it should be done only when absolutely necessary. And when it is, I believe it should be fought to be won. It should be a declared war. It should be a war not fought under U.N. resolutions or for U.N. resolutions, but for the sovereignty and the safety and the security of this country. Under those conditions, it is explicit in our Constitution that only those wars that are fought in that manner should be declared by the Congress. And that is something that concerns me a whole lot because we have not declared a war outright since 1945; and if you look carefully, we have not won very many since then and wars tend to linger.

We are lingering in Korea. That is a mess over there. We have been there for 58 years, have spent hundreds of billions of dollars, and we are still messed up because we went in there under U.N. resolutions and we did not fight to victory. The same with Persian Gulf War I. We went in there without a declaration of war. We went in there under the U.N., and we are still there and who knows how long we will be there. So there are a lot of costs, hidden costs and some are overt. But the greatest threat, the greatest cost to war is the threat to individual liberty. So I just caution my colleagues that we should move much more cautiously and hope and pray for peace.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Utah, we bring good news. The good news is Colorado has got snow, and we are almost back to average. We are having a great year out there in Colorado.

I saw in one of the Eastern press papers lately that the Rocky Mountains, in our ski areas out there, are suffering because of our lack of snow and we have had great snow out there. That is the good news that I bring to you.

I want to bring another piece of good news to my colleagues that happened to the State of Colorado. In Colorado we have an area called the Four Corners. It is the only area of the country where four States touch in one spot, down near Cortez or Durango, Colorado, to give you a vicinity earmark so you know where I am talking about. The United States Navy, I had the privilege of being invited by the United States Navy to go to the Pascagoula, Mississippi shipyard. I have never been to a shipyard. In Colorado we do not have a lot of Naval presence. But the Navy decided to name one of their new ships after the national park down in the Four Corners. And the name of that national park is Mesa Verde, mesa verde meaning ''green table.''

It is a beautiful area. It is the only national park in the Nation that protects man-made objects, not objects just of nature. So to have a ship named in honor of that park, and I got to go down to the keel ceremony, Northrup Grumman is the builder of it, and I got to meet a lot of their employees down there. Great people. I had a great trip and I considered it to be a great privilege to be involved in the keel ceremony. So we in Colorado are proud about that, and of course we are proud of our members that serve in our military forces.

There a number of subjects that I want to visit about this evening, all dealing, of course, with the international situation that we face today.

First of all, let me talk about the success we had over the weekend. I notice we have had a lot of criticism of late of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a lot of criticism of the Central Intelligence Agency, a lot of criticism of the President of the United States, President Bush, and what I would call the A-Squad Team down there, criticism of the A-Squad Team that nothing is happening with terrorism, that for some reason terrorism has been forgotten.

I can tell you we had a great victory over the weekend, in fact, a huge victory over the weekend. I think I can quote my colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. GOSS), who said this was like freeing Paris in World War II. That is how significant it was. And that is that we were able to arrest, right below bin Laden, our second-highest target, Mohammed.

Now this Mohammed guy is a bad guy. And to get our hands on him, and we were even more fortunate, we also thought we had arrested one of his bodyguards. In fact, it turned out that this so-called bodyguard was not a bodyguard in fact, but was in fact a financier for the al Qaeda network. So we really hit a bull'seye over the weekend.

Now I find it very interesting that some commentators come out and say, oh, my gosh, we have arrested one of their top guys. This means more terrorist attacks. I do not know what we take out of a comment like. That because we go and arrest one of the lead terrorists in the world, one of the key people involved in September 11, one of the most horrific murderers in the world, that because we arrested him that that could perhaps mean we will have an uptake in terror activity, and their remarks are as if maybe we should not have arrested him, that we have might have offended some of his colleagues that intend to do harm to the United States or to the allies of the United States.

And then tonight, of course, comes up the subject of how do you question a suspect like that? And I hear some people out there saying, oh, my gosh, it is torture to deprive him of sleep. Keep in mind what this individual knows, and keep in mind on the one hand what the individual knows and on the other hand the public good. What this individual knows, I suspect is he knows of different attack schemes, different timing of attack schemes, different methods that they are going to attack the United States or its allies. And over here on the public good we have riding this issue, one, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, maybe millions of lives are dependent on whether or not we can get this information and take a preemptive strike, stop this terror strike before it occurs. And today I hear commentation on the fact that, my gosh, you better not deprive this suspect of his sleep. That is torture.

And I say to myself, What do you mean? This guy, this suspect who we know is one of the lead architects, if not the lead architect, of the September 11, you are going to say we are torturing him because we deprive him of sleep to get answers out of him, to get information out of him in hopes of preventing another September 11 or even a larger attack? Of course it brings up the debate of torture. At what point in time should torture be allowed or should it be allowed? And I think you have got to weigh that out. Think about it, and I know a lot of people, right when you use the word torture, it is a word that if you ask 100 people, do they have a positive or negative feeling about the word torture. Out of 100 people you will get 100 people who will say they have a negative feeling about the word. So right off the bat you are on the defensive side.

So I am asking some of my colleagues tonight to not draw a rapid conclusion, but put in your own mind to what extent should we be allowed to use different methods, and what type of methods should we be allowed to use on a suspect we know probably has information that if we do not get that information in a timely fashion could very easily result in the deaths of hundreds of thousands, perhaps even more, a more significant amount, even one, of innocent human beings out there that could be the victims of this kind of terrorist strike.

□ 2000

I can tell my colleagues that I would be interested for my colleagues to hear what they have to say. I am not going to carry the debate on tonight other than to tell my colleagues that I think the United States and its allies are perfectly obviously within international law and obviously within the national interests of this country to deprive a suspect of his sleep, to deprive a suspect of certain other privileges that he might enjoy as a prisoner, to see if, in exchange, we can get information from him to avoid a future attack on the United States.

It does amaze me, there is a group of people out there that protested globalization, and before that protest, they were out there protesting global warming. Now they have joined up in some of the protests. They are just professional protestors looking for a place to go and now we are going to see it.

The day after we make the arrest, now we are seeing some of these people pop up and saying, oh, my gosh, the United States is treating this suspect badly. Of course, they do not know how we are treating this suspect, but just to get the word out, they are just arousing people about it. On a commentary I heard tonight, well, they are depriving him of sleep. Give me a break. Look at the reality of the situation we are playing.

This is not a nice guy's game. This is not Mr. Nice Person. This is about human life. This is about mass destruction. This is about innocent people. This is about unprovoked attacks upon innocent people. This is about a group of individuals who are very sick in their means to reach an end. This is about people who become the victims of that means to reach an end, and if that does not broaden the parameter of what my colleagues think we ought to be entitled to do to solicit information from an individual, then I do question whether or not you have a place at the table to debate.

I want to move from that and, of course, talk about the subject at hand. I do not usually like to stand in front of my colleagues and read, and I especially do not like to read a commentary that is of much length, but I would ask my colleagues just to bear with me this evening. I want to read about two pages of content of what I think sums up very well the situation we face in Iraq, and after I discuss that, I then want to go through some of the points.

I have met with some peace protestors. Let us just say protestors. I am not sure peace is the accurate description, but protestors. I have met with people on different sides of the issue, and several questions have been asked of me by these individuals, and I thought this would probably be an appropriate forum to discuss some of those questions, which were legitimate questions, and by the way, the right to protest is very legitimate in our government. In fact, it is part of the checks and balances. So I thought I would go through some of those and give my responses to those under the current situation that we have.

Let me first of all, though, begin by reading this commentary, and I hope my colleagues bear with me. I hope they listen to the words because we know in the history of the world that history tends to repeat itself. Not exactly. History does not repeat itself exactly, but history is a good barometer of the weather, and we all know our barometer does not give us the exact weather pattern, but most of the time what the barometer says is the kind of weather we see. It is the same with history. A good study of history gives us a good study of the future, not an exact study of the future, but a good study of the future.

I think this article of a little history, much of this history before many of us were even born is worth considering. Again, bear with me.

The author of this is Alister Cook of Britain: ''I promised to lay off topic A—Iraq—until the Security Council makes a judgment on the inspectors' report and I shall keep that promise.

''But I must tell you that throughout the past fortnight, I've listened to everybody involved in or looking on to a monotonous din of words, like a tide crashing and receding on a beach—making a great noise and saying the same thing over and over. And this ordeal triggered a nightmare, a daymare, if you like.

''Through the ceaseless tide I heard a voice, a very English voice of an old man—Prime Minister Chamberlain saying: 'I believe it is peace for our time.'" I believe it is peace for our time—''a sentence that prompted a huge cheer, first from a listening street crowd and then from the House of Commons and next day from every newspaper in the land.

''There was a move to urge Mr. Chamberlain should receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

''In Parliament, there was one unfamiliar old grumbler to growl out: 'I believe we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat.'" One voice, one lone voice in the House of Commons. I think we have suffered a total and unmitigated defeat.

''He was, in view of the general sentiment, very properly booed down.

''This scene concluded in the autumn of 1938 the British prime minister's effectual signing away of most of Czechoslovakia to Hitler.''

So we are leaving the transcript for a moment.

It was when Hitler demanded that Czechoslovakia be signed over to him, and it was Chamberlain who said it is a time for peace and they adopted the doctrine of appeasement, give him Czechoslovakia and people cheered, cheered, and they booed the one dissenting voice which was the gentleman of which I just spoke. Let me go back to the text now.

''The rest of it, within months, Hitler walked in and conquered.

''Oh dear,' said Mr. Chamberlain, thunderstruck. 'He has betrayed my trust,'" speaking of Hitler. Chamberlain said, ''He has betrayed my trust.''

''During the last fortnight a simple but startling thought occurred to me—every single official, diplomat, president, prime minister involved in the Iraq debate was in 1938 a toddler, most of them unborn. So the dreadful scene I've just drawn will not have been remembered by most listeners.

''Hitler had started betraying our trust not 12 years, but only two years before, when he broke the First World War peace treaty by occupying the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland.

''Only half his troops carried one reload of ammunition because Hitler knew that the French morale was too low to confront any war just then, and 10 million of 11 million British voters had signed a so-called peace ballot.'' Ten million of 11 million British voters had signed the peace ballot.

''It stated no conditions, elaborated no terms, it simply counted the number of Britons who were 'for peace.'

''The slogan of this movement was 'Against war and fascism'—chanted at the time by every Labour man and Liberal and many moderate Conservatives—a slogan that now sounds as imbecilic as 'against hospitals and disease.'

''In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him.''

Let me repeat that paragraph. ''In blunter words a majority of Britons would do anything, absolutely anything, to get rid of Hitler except fight him.

''At that time the word 'pre-emptive' had not been invented, though today it's a catchword.

''After all, the Rhineland was what it said it was—part of Germany. So to march in and throw Hitler out would have been pre-emptive—wouldn't it?

''Nobody did anything and Hitler looked forward with confidence to gobbling up the rest of Western Europe country by country—'course by course,' as growler Churchill put it.

''I bring up Munich and the mid-30s because I was fully grown, on the verge of 30, and knew we were indeed living in the age of anxiety.

''And so many of the arguments mounted against each other today, in the last fortnight, are exactly,'' exactly ''what we heard in the House of Commons debate and read in the French press.

''The French especially,'' and please note this sentence that I am pulling out of here. ''The French especially urged, after every Hitler invasion,'' negotiate, negotiate, negotiate.

''They negotiated so successfully as to have their whole country defeated and occupied.

''But, as one famous French leftist said: 'We did anyway manage to make them declare Paris an open city—no bombs on us!'

''In Britain the general response to every Hitler advance was disarmament and collective security.''

Collective security, keep in mind, have my colleagues heard that buzz word lately? ''Collective security meant to leave every crisis to the League of Nations. It would put down aggressors, even though, like the United Nations, it had no army, navy or air force.

''The League of Nations had its chance to prove itself when Mussolini invaded and conquered Ethiopia.

''The League didn't have any shot to fire. But still the cry was chanted in the House of Commons—the League and collective security is the only true guarantee of peace.

''But after the Rhineland, the maverick Churchill decided there was no collectivity in collective security and started a highly unpopular campaign for rearmament by Britain, warning against the general belief that Hitler had already built an enormous mechanized army and superior air force.

''But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested.''

Keep in mind this and let me reemphasize this sentence. ''But he's not used them, he's not used them—people protested.

''Still for two years before the outbreak of the Second War, you could read the debates in the House of Commons and now shiver at the famous Labour men—Major Attlee was one of them—who voted against rearmament and still went on pointing to the League of Nations as the saviour.

''Now, this memory of mine may be totally irrelevant to the present crisis. It haunts me.

''I have to say I have written elsewhere with much conviction that most historical analogies are false because, however strikingly similar a new situation may be to an old one, there's usually one element that is different and it turns out to be the crucial one.

''It may well be so here. All I know is that all the voices of the '30s are echoing through 2003.''

There is a history to the League of Nations. Many, many years ago, there was a concept that the world could live in peace. They could hold hands. The war was not necessary. I saw tonight on TV a lady, she says, if we do not get rid of war, in the next few years, war will get rid of us. That is a great quote. Tell me how it is done, and back then, I mean people throughout the history of mankind have tried to figure out how do we avoid conflict. We try and figure out how to avoid conflict every day on the streets of our communities with our police officers. How do we avoid conflict?

But we face up to the fact that there be circumstances where conflict is inevitable. We face up to the fact that in certain circumstances, violence is necessary. I am sure that wakes up a lot of my colleagues. Violence is necessary? Of course, if we have a bank robbery in process and the bank robber walks out and shoots somebody, how do my colleagues think we stop him? A police officer stops him, hopefully peacefully, but if the police officer does not, our society gives the right to our local police officer. I do not care if it is a town of 200 people or if it is a town in New York City. We give a right to our local police officers to act with violence, to stop because we look at the larger public good. What is the larger public good?

For the League of Nations, people thought, and I think with good merit, hey, let us try this concept of the League of Nations. It will be collective security. We will act as a body, and what happened after World War I, the Germans signed on to an agreement. They would not use poison gas anymore, we promise. So the nations said all right, well, we need to have inspections; we want to come over and check out your country to make sure you are not having these gases anymore, that these gases are not being produced. So Germany says, okay, they sign the agreement.

Pretty soon, no inspections. Pretty soon, no cooperation. So what do they do? They turn it over to the League of Nations, say, okay, you are our collective security. In theory we have collective security. Go in and solve it. What does the League of Nations do? They issue resolutions. They have great talk. The French, as usual, say negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. Guess what happens? League of Nations becomes a paper tiger. The League of Nations cannot do it, and in some circumstances, we can look at exactly at the United Nations.

Keep in mind the make-up of the United Nations. The United Nations has 189 different countries. How many of those countries supported U.S. policy and what percentage of the time have they ever supported U.S. policy? I mean, the United Nations is an outfit that just appointed Libya, Libya. Remember Libya? All of those people that want peace and believe in human rights, which all of us believe in but are real strong advocates of human rights, Libya ought to come right up at the top of their radar one of the most abusive countries of human rights.

□ 2015

Guess what the United Nations just did? They named Libya head of the Human Rights Commission at the United Nations.

My point here is this: we see in the 1930s the way that they dealt with Hitler. They appeased him. They said he will never use those weapons on us. The French said negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. We face a similar situation today, a similar situation if we do not do something with Iraq. And let me just say that, with credit to a man I think is a very brave and a strong leader, President Bush, as well as DICK CHENEY, Dr. Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell, these people are very focused on the future of this country. That team down there wants this country to be strong, not necessarily military, but they want this country to have a beautiful, positive future. They want peace as much as anybody wants peace. But they also know that we have to have security; that under some circumstances, no matter how deeply we desire security and peace, we cannot get it because there are people out there who wish us ill will. No matter how good we are to them.

So let us bring this back to the present situation in Iraq, and that is what I want to move on to next, to talk specifically about what our situation is in Iraq. And I want to bring up some of the questions that were asked of me by some of these people who are protesting the United States actively enforcing the U.N. resolutions and saying that Saddam Hussein cannot continue down his path of production and storage of weapons of mass destruction.

So let us start. I have often said that Saddam Hussein is like a cancer, and I think that is a good comparison. Now, there are a lot of different ways people deal with cancer. Some people will say to the doctor, when the doctor first gives them the diagnosis of cancer, they say let us go in and cut it out now, Doctor. I want to go to the hospital today, I want to go in chemotherapy today, I want to go into surgery today, I want to do whatever is necessary to aggressively and preemptively take out that cancer if we can possibly do it.

Other people take the attitude that this just cannot be happening to me. I am going to go home and go to sleep, and tomorrow I am going to wake up and find out it was a bad dream. Other people say, Doc, I do not think we need to take that kind of radical approach and attack the cancer. I think we have to be a little gentler about our approach. What I want to do, Doctor, is to go home and pray about it. Now, do not get me wrong. Prayer is, in my own personal belief and opinion, a very strong medicine. But a lot of times we need more than prayers. The prayer is kind of a supplement that we have.

Other people ignore it completely. They say, Doctor, I do not believe you. I do not believe cancer is that kind of threat. I think you have overstated the health problem for me, and I will go down my own path.

The other day I saw a cartoon that illustrates, I think very well, exactly what I am saying about the situation with Iraq, or what this Nation is saying about the situation with Iraq, and thank goodness what the President and the executive branch believe about Iraq. I refer my colleagues here to my left. Here is the doctor. We can see the patient is named ''The World,'' and growing out of his back is a growth, and it is the face of Saddam Hussein. And the doctor says, ''It's cancer. But I am sure it will go away if you leave it alone.''

That is what I am saying here. We have a cancer. Now, I know nobody

wants to go to war. The previous speaker up here on the floor, the doctor, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), he said we do not want to go to war because it impacts our economy. Of course it impacts our economy. But even that is insignificant compared to the biggest impact that all of us face. In fact, most of us in these Chambers have some member of our family right now serving in the Armed Services, whether it is in the support service in the United States or whether it is on the front line in Kuwait or waiting in the harbor in Turkey to deploy into Iraq, if that becomes necessary. We all have a lot invested in this situation.

None of us wants to see a conflict. But the fact is none of us really want to go through the pain of chemotherapy. None of us really want to go through maybe losing a foot to cancer. The fact is it is not going to go away. We have to act aggressively. And the United States has always reserved the right to act in its own national interest, and the only way the United States can do that is to act boldly and decisively. We are dealing with nothing less than a very horrible cancer; and it is a cancer that if we do not do something about it today, we know where it will be in a few years when we go back to the doctor's office, so to speak.

If we do not act, we will have a North Korea on our hands. People say, why do you not deal with North Korea? We are dealing with North Korea. That is a big problem. The situation is we should have dealt with North Korea about 8 years ago. How did we deal with North Korea? Just the same as Europe dealt with Hitler in 1938. We appeased North Korea. We offered North Korea a payment. We offered them free oil. All they had to do was raise their right hand and say they would not use the oil for military purposes. We helped them build nuclear reactors, and all they had to do was raise their right hand and say they would not use it for military purposes, but for the generation of electricity. That is how we dealt with the threat in North Korea. And look what has happened; now it is the biggest threat.

I think all of us in this House representing the people of this fine Nation have an inherent obligation to the next generation behind us. It is an inherent obligation to the next generation behind us to make sure that we deliver to them a country that is strong and secure. President Bush knows his numbers have dropped in the polls. Does anyone think Churchill did not recognize that he was booed in the House of Commons when he suggested they not appease Hitler? Sometimes it is a lonely world out there doing the right thing. But that is what is required of leadership.

The fact is we have an obligation to get rid of this cancer. The other fact is we are not going to get rid of it by saying let us not go to war; let us just look the other way. Let us just go back to the United Nations, which has been dealing completely with defeat, completely ineffectually for the last 12 years to try to get this cancer, to get this guy to disarm.

Saddam is not going to disarm. The disarmament, by the way, that we have seen up to this point in time, is ironically, in large part, the very weapons that he has denied he has. And the only reason that that has occurred to this point is because of the military might that the United States has put right on his border, the United States and its allies. And I want to speak for a moment about that too, in a second. The United States and its allies. Does anyone think Saddam Hussein would be doing this if we did not have military forces all around his country? Does anyone think he would be cooperating because the United Nations called him on the phone and said, ''Saddam, we want you to cooperate. We want you to disarm. This is the United Nations calling, and we want you to disarm, Saddam.'' Does anyone think he is cooperating because of that? Of course not. He is cooperating because he is looking down the barrel of a gun, and that gun happens to be our gun. We are bound and determined to disarm that regime.

And, yes, the world will be safer. And, yes, it is in the national interest of the United States. And, yes, it is in the interest of the United Nations. But who is going to act? It appears more and more every day that the United States and its willing coalition are going to be the ones that have to step forward and carry the heavy weight on this job. Not uncommon for this country. This country carried the heavy weight in World War I. We carried the weight in World War II. This country carried the heavy weight in Vietnam, in my opinion; and in the Persian Gulf this country carried the heavy weight. We do not mind. I do not think it is fair. I think we should have burden-sharing. But the fact is we are a great country, and as a leader we are expected to lead. Sometimes that is required.

Now, let me just leave here a moment and talk a moment about the allies and this willing coalition. I talked to somebody today who says the United States is going to go it alone. I said, the United States is not going to do this alone. In fact, I believe that the United States will have a larger coalition if we have to go to war. The United States under the leadership of our President and that leadership team we have got down there, will have put together a larger coalition than we had in Persian Gulf War Number One. That is right, that is what I said, a larger coalition this time than we had last time.

Now, by reading the international media, by looking at the protester signs out there on the street, one would think America and Europe have split the sheets forever. There is a big split in Europe. We have a lot of countries in Europe that support the United States. We have a lot of countries in Europe that believe that of the entire world the United States is the bus they want to get on, the United States offers the most hope in the future, and the United States is who they are willing to stand by in the foxhole.

Now, sure, we may have a country like Poland or Hungary that does not have a lot to offer militarily. But they do not care. They would go out there with a rubberband and stand next to us. That is how gutsy some of those people are. We have some major European powers that are supporting the United States. Take a look at Spain. Take a look at Italy. Of course, Great Britain has always been a long-time ally. Well, maybe not always, a few hundred years ago. But as of late, the last hundred years or so.

Talk about Tony Blair. There is a guy that has guts. There is a guy whose photo ought to be hung in the Profiles in Courage hallway. Because he knows, by their own history, by the history that Churchill defined, by saying the doctrine of appeasement, give them what they want and they will go away, or as the doctor would say, wait long enough and it will go way. Tony Blair, President Bush, DICK CHENEY, Condoleezza Rice, and Colin Powell know that it will not go away. We all know this danger is not going to go away.

We have an opportunity today to do something about Iraq. We have that opportunity so that we are not dealing with a second North Korea here in just a few short years.

Let me move on.

Mr. Speaker, can I get a time check, very briefly?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier in my comments about some of the questions that have been asked of me by some of the people that are participating in these protests, and I thought it would be appropriate to go through some of these that I can recall being asked one by one. Because, I think I said earlier, these are legitimate areas of debate. They are legitimate questions.

Now, I am not sure in my discussions with these people whether they wanted to hear what I had to say. I think they had predetermined their thoughts. But nonetheless, they asked the questions; so let us go through the questions.

First question: Does Iraq pose a threat to our security?

I would bet that 10 years ago, 15 years ago, before North Korea began the construction of their nuclear facilities, I bet there were a lot of people that said, why do we have American forces in North Korea? Do they pose a threat to our security? Today, especially the younger generation of South Korea, people are again asking the question, does North Korea pose a threat to our security? Take a look at it.

Does Iraq pose a threat to our security? Maybe not today, although I happen to think that they can. I will tell

my colleagues why I think today they pose a threat to our security. In my opinion, if Saddam Hussein can develop a nuclear or biological or chemical weapon and put it on a missile, his number one target would be Jerusalem or Tel Aviv. He will hit Israel with that weapon. And that has a significant impact on the security of the United States of America because, in my opinion, Israel will retaliate, a massive retaliation; and we could easily have the next nuclear war in the Middle East, all started because of the fact that some in this country, when we had an opportunity to disarm a madman, to disarm Saddam Hussein's regime, insisted we look the other way; that we thought as the French thought with Hitler, you can negotiate, negotiate and negotiate.

Iraq is a threat today. And for those of who do not think it is a threat today, mark my word, just as I mentioned in the poster I had up here earlier of the cancer, mark my word, it will come back to haunt maybe not our generation, because many of us will be out of office here in a few years, but it will be back to haunt our children. And every one of us owe it not only to the children but to the children of the people we represent to make sure that even if we do not think it is a threat today, and we know it will be a threat, we have got the opportunity to fix it today. There is a problem, and we can fix it today.

□ 2030

Next question: Are we rushing to war? Boy, do I hear that. Why do we rush into war? Bush wants to take us into war.

Mr. Speaker, we are not rushing to war. Look at what we have dealt with, and let me just show Members. Again, referring to the poster, these are the United Nations resolutions from 1990 to 2003: 678, 687, 707, 949, 1060, 1134, 1154, 1205. Members get the message. Every one of these resolutions had very intense debate and was directed to Iraq over a 12-year period of time to disarm. Every one of these resolutions was like a League of Nations' attempt to hold hands, talk peacefully, and that this guy would listen to the international community.

I often hear comments he just cares about the sovereignty of his country, or this is all about oil. If Saddam Hussein cared about the people, about the people that he rules over, and it is not a democracy. In his last race, he had no ''no'' votes against him in the country. If he cared about those people, he would disarm and become a member of the international community. He would use those oil reserves for the benefit of his people. He could make Iraq one of the wealthiest countries the world has ever known. He could provide his citizens with freedom, with schools, with the finest universities, with the finest things that money can buy. But that is not his intent. He has no intent of listening to the international community.

Those people who are saying we are rushing into war, where have they been the last 12 years. We have tried economic sanctions. We have tried resolution after resolution after resolution. We have moved our forces to their borders and demanded that he disarm, and now he is throwing out a couple of pebbles every once in a while to pretend like he is disarming. The fact is, we should have taken care of this in the Persian Gulf War, number one. We should have gone into Baghdad and switched that regime to a regime that cared about the people of Iraq. Why could we not do? Because we listened to the community of the United Nations which said, wait a minute, free Kuwait, leave Saddam Hussein alone. He will not be a threat anymore. After all, he has promised us that he is going to get rid of those weapons of mass destruction.

Speaking of those weapons of mass destruction, there is a question that says: What weapons does he really have? These people say to me, I do not want you telling me what weapons he has. We cannot trust you on what weapons you think Saddam Hussein has. We want a verifiable source that tells us weapons, Saddam Hussein. What is a better source than Saddam Hussein himself.

This is what Saddam Hussein says he has: 2,8500 tons of mustard gas. Mustard gas will shrivel a population up into a pile of ashes. Sarin nerve gas, 795 tons. A thumbnail full of sarin gas can wipe out a subway. VX nerve gas, 3.9 tons, a deadly gas. Tabun nerve agent, 210 tons; anthrax 25,000 tons. Remember the envelopes we got here in the Nation's capital here last year, little drops of powder, not tons, not pounds, not ounces, fractions of ounces in a little envelope, and look what it did. It killed people in this country. He has got 25,000 tons of it. Uranium, 400 tons; plutonium, 6 grams.

He is the one that told us what weapons of mass destruction he has. He is the one that has not brought those weapons forward to show us in good faith, in keeping with the resolutions that he himself signed, that the United Nations themselves, resolution after resolution after resolution, put forward for him to get rid of.

What is the next question I am often asked? Will attacking Iraq yield more terrorism in retaliation? I actually have had people come up to me and say we should not go after Saddam Hussein because some of the people will get mad at us and they will carry out further terror strikes against this country. I am in disbelief. I said to this person over the weekend, whose name was John, John, you are telling me that in our community, we should say to a police officer before you arrest a suspect, we need to determine whether that suspect's family or friends will be mad at us and they might commit more crimes if we arrest the criminal? You name for me, John, one city in this country, one community in this country, one village in this country, that instructs its police officers before they make an arrest to determine whether or not making that arrest will result in members of the suspect's family or friends of the suspect will commit more crimes against the community, therefore, you should not arrest him.

That is not how we do it in our communities, and we cannot do it that way on an international basis. They showed that they will do whatever they can to destroy America. They showed that when they ran their boat into the USS *Cole*. These people will do anything they can through any method to destroy us, and they take special enjoyment in doing this when we assist them, when we, through the doctrine of appeasement or our own citizens, say they are harmless. Give them what they want.

It happened in 1938 in Hitler, it has happened throughout history, and it is going to happen here.

Next question. Should the United States seek permission from the United Nations? I think the United Nations is an institution that has a proper place in society. I think where the United Nations serves most effectively is in nation-building. What I mean by that, in Ethiopia, for example, where they have massive starvation, I think the United Nations is an appropriate agency to go in and teach people how to farm and assist these economies. I think the United Nations has a place in our worldwide fight against AIDS, which is a horrible disease every country faces. The United Nations has a delivery system, not necessarily the most effective delivery system, but they have a place there.

But does the United Nations, which really does not have an Army or Navy or Air Force, can the United Nations be depended upon to go to battle when battle is necessary. It did not happen in the Cold War. They did not take sides in the Cold War. In the Korean War, they issued a resolution that had the United States do it for them. With Iraq, they knew they had to face up to Iraq, and the way they handled it, they, time and time again, issued resolution, resolution, resolution. Keep in mind what I was talking about in 1938 what they talked about there. Every British citizen thought something had to be done about Hitler. They were willing to do anything to get rid of Hitler except fight him. That is what it said in that article that I read.

Next question. Should the United States act unilaterally? First of all, the United States is not going to have to act unilaterally. The coalition that we have built will exceed the coalition that we had in the first Persian Gulf War. We will have at our side many countries, and many European countries will be standing at our side. So the United States will not have to act unilaterally. It will not be necessary, and the United States is not acting unilaterally.

Will it become necessary for the United States to act without the

United Nations? That may be necessary. We are not about to let the United Nations sit by as a paper tiger and look the other direction as this cancer spreads. We do not want to see a repeat of history of 1938 where the League of Nations turned the other way and hoped Hitler would be a good boy and go on and modify his behavior to become a part of the world community. We may have to act without the United Nations, but it is not because we did not give the United Nations every chance. For 12 years, the United Nations has had an opportunity to resolve this, and they have not done it.

I notice with some humor that they constantly refer to the second resolution that they are debating right now and will vote on shortly. Where did they come up with the idea second resolution? Try 17th or 18th resolution. Try 12th year. We have given the United Nations every opportunity to disarm. Do you think the United Nations would have put forces on these borders if it had not been for the leadership of this President and the leadership of the United States Congress? The answer is, no.

Should the United States act preemptively? Of course we need to act preemptively. When it meets certain standards, the United Nations needs to reach out. We cannot defend this country against terrorism completely. We cannot do it. We cannot put a glass bubble over our country. It is like trying to protect your camp when somebody is on the top of the mountain taking sniper shots. At some point, you have to reach out and attack the sniper.

In the United States, we cannot wait for terrorists to come to the United States and commit an act of terrorism before we are authorized to go after them. We have to reach out and get them. That is what we are doing throughout the world. We have every right to act preemptively, just as every community in this Nation allows their police officers to act preemptively, allows their police officers to go out, and if there is a crime in progress, and there are certain standards that police officer can meet, that officer has the right to act preemptively. We do not say to our police officers the first shot, the criminal gets the first shot, and we should not say to the world community that the terrorist or Saddam Hussein or North Korea gets the first shot. Our country is not going to allow these countries to take the first shot if we can avoid it. We always retain the right to preempt.

Finally, is North Korea a more important issue? They are all important issues, but that is the way that the question was asked to me. Of course it is an important issue; but, if we do not do something about Iraq today, Iraq will be North Korea 10 years from now. What we are doing today, if we do not stand up and deal with this today as our obligation requires us to do it, we are handing the problem over to the next generation. Unfortunately, the problem will not be in the same proportion. The problem will have grown greatly unproportionately, and the problem that we hand over to the next generation will be much more horrific to deal with. Many, many more human lives, many more innocent human lives will be lost as a result of deferring the action on this.

We are going to have to deal even more significantly with North Korea, but it does not mean that we turn a blind eye to the next North Korea that is coming down the pike. We know who it is and where it is; and we know we can do something about it, and I am here to tell Members that we are going to do something about it. This United States Congress had enough courage several months ago to stand up and give the President of the United States, on a bipartisan basis, Democrat and Republican, give the President the authority to take this country and stop and fix the problem. We can fix it.

Let me say to Members one other question that is not on my poster, and that question is Iraq, who are they hurting? We should just leave them alone. The United States is being a bully. Why do we need to go after Iraq. Saddam Hussein is a madman, and forget the fact that women have no rights. Every woman's organization in the world ought to be standing up and ought to be walking in the streets of the world by the hundreds of thousands. Every man and woman should be protesting the way he treats women. Ask how many women ever get an opportunity of individualism or education. There is nothing in that country that is fair. But some people stand aside and say what have they ever done.

Mr. Speaker, this is what Iraq has done with its weapons of mass destruction: August 1983, mustard gas, 100 Kurds, they killed them.

October 1983, mustard gas, 3,000 Iranian Kurds, they killed them.

February, 1984, mustard gas, another 2,500 people killed.

March 50–100 Iranians killed.

1985, 3,000 Iranians killed, mustard gas.

1986, mustard gas, 8,000–10,000 killed.

1987, mustard gas, 5,000 people killed.

Time after time after time this man, this dictator, illustrates to the world that he will go and use any weapon that is necessary, not only against his enemies or perceived enemies, but his own citizens.

□ 2045

In this great country of ours, do you remember back in the war protests, I think it was Ohio State, where 14 students or maybe four, I think four students were killed by the National Guard? This country went nuts. Our own National Guard killing our own citizens, four of our own citizens? Yet some of these very people that I am sure, my age, that will remember that, that protested about that remain unfortunately and dishonorably silent about the horrible and egregious murders that this guy is carrying forward.

This is not an innocent country, this man. We can do more for the Iraqi people, not under an American colony. We are not trying to make Iraq an American colony. We are not going over there and saying they should adopt our democracy. But we do say one thing to the people of Iraq. We say to the people of Iraq, you will be better off. You are entitled to some individual rights. You are entitled to some enjoyment of human life. And we say to all the neighboring countries, including our friends Israel, Saudi Arabia, other countries, you are entitled to live without the threat of these weapons being rained down on your communities one day. And we say to the citizens of our own Nation, you are entitled to know that the next generation is not going to have to cure the problem that this generation ignored.

Let me say in summation, I know, and I think it is healthy that we have protests out there. I think it is. I know that some people have come out. I am amazed by some of the local city councils and communities that come out with resolutions. I do not remember a Member of Congress, I do not remember sending resolutions to some of these communities to fix their streets, but some of them have felt it sufficient to send us resolutions about not going to war with Iraq. I know there is a lot of feeling out there. But, please, take a look at what happened in 1938. Take a look at the history, more recent history, of what Saddam Hussein has done during his dictatorship of that country, the tens and probably hundreds of thousands of people. By the way, this has nothing to do with religion. We will do a little quiz here. Do you know what man in history has killed more Muslims than any other man known in history? You guessed it. Saddam Hussein. Responsible for more Muslim deaths than any other man in history.

This is a country that is a country that has a great deal of strength, built of its people, built of debate. These protests make it healthy. We have all examined this. None of us want to rush off to war. Nobody is rushing off to war. But everybody in the world must know that when the United States pulls its sword from its shield, it means business. It takes a lot for this country to do it. I think we have exercised extreme patience. For 12 years we have begged the United Nations to do something about it. For 12 years we have sat on the bench waiting for the quarterback to run a play, the United Nations. For 12 years they have done nothing but fumble and fumble and fumble. Somebody has got to step onto the field. The United States and its allies, which I want to stress again, we will exceed the number of allies we had in the first Persian Gulf War. We will go onto that field and we will do what needs to be done. And, mark my word, 15 years from now or 20 years from

now, the next generation will look back and say, thank goodness they took care of that problem because we do not know what would have happened if they had ignored it like Europe ignored Hitler in 1938.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to discuss the need for a prescription drug benefit for seniors. I would also like to take some time to contrast what the Democrats proposed today and essentially what the Democrats have been saying as a matter of principle, what they would like a prescription drug benefit for seniors to be like and contrast that with what President Bush has proposed in terms of a prescription drug plan. I have to say that I must stress that I do not really believe that the President's proposal is one that really provides any significant benefit or prescription drug plan to seniors. I hesitate to even discuss it as a benefit program because I do not really think that there are many people, if any, that would benefit in a significant way from it. What the Democrats proposed today is very similar to what they tried to pass in the Congress, in the House, in the last session of Congress. Basically, it is simply an extension of Medicare.

Those of you who are familiar with Medicare know that right now if you are over 65, you are eligible for a Medicare program that essentially pays most of your hospital bills and also pays for your doctor bills if you agree to pay a premium of so much a month. It is somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 or $50 a month. What the Democrats are saying is that we would simply expand Medicare to include a new part D, similar to the existing part B that covers your hospital bills; and the principle would be very similar to what you do now with your hospital bills.

Under the Democratic proposal, beneficiary seniors would pay a premium of about $25 a month. They would have a deductible of $100 a year. If, for example, your prescription drug that you have to buy on January 1st or 2nd is $100, you would have to pay that out of pocket, but then after that $100 expenditure out of pocket, the deductible, the rest of your prescription drugs for the remainder of the year would be paid for by the Federal Government, 80 percent, and there would be a 20 percent copay or coinsurance payment.

This is exactly what you have now for part B to cover your doctor bills. Then you would pay out of pocket for your essential coinsurance, in other words, up to $2,000. After that, if you had additional coinsurance because you had tremendous drug bills, 100 percent of the cost of the drugs would be paid for by the Federal Government. So most importantly, essentially, what is happening here is that for most people, most of their drugs, 80 percent of their cost would be paid for by the Federal Government with a 20 percent copay.

Before I get into the specifics, because I do want to do that, I want everyone to understand how significant this is and how important it is for seniors to have something that is just like what we do now under Medicare for their doctor bills, as opposed to what the President has proposed. The President spoke today before the American Medical Association, the AMA, the association of physicians. Basically, what he said is that he would provide for seniors who are in the traditional Medicare program, which is about 85 percent of the seniors, only a couple of things in terms of a drug benefit.

First of all they would get a prescription drug discount card which he claims would reduce their cost of prescription drugs by about maybe 10 or 15 percent, although I have to say that that is strictly voluntary. There is no reason why that kind of prescription discount card would really effectuate those kinds of savings. Then he said that if your prescription drug bills are above a certain amount, a catastrophic amount, say, $5,000 or $6,000, the Federal Government would pay for them. But for all the seniors who do not have tremendous, catastrophic drug bills and who remain in the traditional Medicare program, the only thing that they would be able to get is the use of a drug discount card, which most of them can get today on their own.

They do not need the Federal Government to do it. In other words, there is no guaranteed benefit that you are going to get any kind of Federal benefit to pay for your prescription drugs. The President makes two exceptions to that. On the one hand he says if you are below a certain income, and he does not define at this point what that income is, but if you are a low-income senior, below a certain income, he would give a $600-a-year subsidy to help you pay for drugs. The other option is that if you join an HMO, if you agree to join an HMO or some other kind of private insurance, not your traditional Medicare program, then you can get your prescription drugs paid for in a significant amount. It is not clear how much. Basically, it might be 50 percent, it might be 60 percent of the cost, we do not know exactly, but you have to join an HMO in order to be able to have any kind of guaranteed prescription drug plan.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think that the way the President is going about this is very unfair, and it is not going to be helpful to most seniors. I say that because if you do not provide a guaranteed benefit under the traditional Medicare program the way the Democrats have laid out, similar to what we do now with part B for your doctor bills, then the likelihood that most seniors are going to really benefit in any way is almost nil. I say that because we have the experience of seniors trying to join HMOs in some parts of the country, including my home State of New Jersey; and generally speaking that has been an utter failure. Most seniors, first of all, do not want to join HMOs because their choices of doctors and hospitals are severely limited. So one of the reasons why so few, less than 15 percent of seniors are in HMOs is because they want to have a choice of their doctors. They want to go to the doctor that they have been going to for years. They want to go to the hospital that is nearby. They do not want to have to be limited in what doctors or hospitals they go to. But in addition to that, there are a lot of parts of the country where there is no HMO, States, in fact, where there is no HMO available. So you do not even have the option.

Beyond that is the fact that in many States, including my own of New Jersey, and I can give you some examples, even when seniors initially joined HMOs, the HMOs eventually dropped them or they provided a prescription drug benefit initially that might have been fairly generous, maybe provided 60 percent of the cost of the coverage, but eventually increased the amount that the seniors had to pay out of pocket so much that the benefit was not even worth anything. In fact, there was a report that came out just a couple of weeks ago by Public Citizen's Congress Watch; and in that report they did a survey across the country that basically confirmed that Medicare privatization does not work for seniors. The report says that in my home State of New Jersey, nearly 80,000 of the seniors who were in an HMO in the last 2 years were dropped after basically the private HMOs concluded that it was simply not profitable to have them as part of the program.

The main thing I am trying to get across here, Mr. Speaker, is that even if you opted under the President's proposal for an HMO because that was the only way you were going to be able to get some kind of drug plan, there is no guarantee under the President's proposal what that HMO is going to provide you with in terms of a drug plan. So not only will most seniors not want to join the HMO, first of all, many seniors will not even be able to find the HMO. But even if they can find one, they lose the choice of doctors and hospitals; and even with that, there is nothing under the President's proposal that says that the HMO has to provide a specific type of prescription drug coverage or has to say that 80 percent or 60 percent of the cost is going to be paid for by the HMO. There is no guarantee. There is no benefit that is guaranteed. That is what we need. Seniors need to know that if they pay a premium, like the Democratic proposal, $25 a month, that they have a defined deductible, $100, that they have a defined copay, 20 percent, and the Federal Government is going to pay 80 percent of the cost.

The other thing that we do with the Democratic plan, which is totally different from the Republican plan, is we say in the legislation that the Secretary of Health and Human Services, who now represents about 40 million Medicare beneficiaries, has to negotiate with the drug companies to reduce the cost. We estimate that because he has the purchasing power, negotiating power of these 40 million or so seniors, that he is probably in a position to reduce costs for the prescription drugs maybe by as much as 30 percent. So you have a built-in discount, if you will, on your drugs that is required by the law before you even get to the point where the benefit program kicks in and you are paying 20 percent and you are getting 80 percent of your cost paid for by the Federal Government. So what the Democrats have proposed is really a good deal. The Republican plan, by contrast, really is no deal at all.

I wanted to go into some more specifics, if I could, about what the Democrats proposed today because I think it is important. This is a very important issue for seniors. I know a lot of seniors are asking what this is going to be about, whether we are going to have success, what the different proposals are; and if I could just go through a little more detail. As I said, House Democrats are committed to providing a comprehensive benefit that is affordable and dependable for all beneficiaries with no gaps or no gimmicks in coverage, exactly like what you do for your hospital bills. The Medicare contractors, those who contract, the drug companies, with the Department of Health and Human Services basically have to guarantee price reductions.

□ 2100

The Secretary has the authority to use the collective purchasing power of Medicare's 40 million. In addition, the proposal reduces drug prices for everyone by stopping big drug company patent abuses.

I should mention that as well, Mr. Speaker. I did not. That in democratic legislation we plug up some of the loopholes with the patent laws that make it easier for generics to come to market. So actually, everyone would benefit, not just seniors, because they would be able to get lower-priced generics, whereas now they are not able to because of patent extensions or abuses of the patent system by the named brand drug companies. So this is something that would actually benefit everyone, not just senior citizens.

The most important thing, though, Mr. Speaker, I have to stress, is that under the Democratic proposal, seniors do not have to leave traditional Medicare to get their drug coverage. They do not have to join the HMO, they do not have to give up the choice doctors or the choice of hospitals.

The Republicans talk a lot, and even the President has talked a lot about choice, and somehow suggested that the nice thing about the Republican proposal is that seniors have a choice. They have a choice of staying in traditional Medicare, they have a choice of joining an HMO. But again, those kinds of choices which hinge on whether they get the coverage are not the kind of choices that I find that the senior citizens in my district want. They want a choice of doctors. They want a choice of hospitals. They want to know that they do not have to give those choices up in order to get a prescription drug benefit.

Secretary Thompson was on the Today Show this morning, and I just want to read one quote, and then I would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) who has come down so often on the floor to talk about senior issues and health care issues in particular. But Secretary Tommy Thompson of the Health and Human Services Department was on the Today Show this morning, and this was quote that I took down. It says ''Seniors are going to have choices. They are going to be able to stay on their own current plan and get prescription drug coverage with high out-of-pocket expenses if, in fact, they want to do so without additional cost, or they can go with an enhanced plan which is going to cost seniors a few dollars, but it is going to be a great program. It is going to be the same program that I have, that Senators have, that Congress has, that the President has.''

What I do not understand is what if one cannot afford it, what if one does not have the option of paying more or what if one does not want to go into the HMO? Again, it goes back to the same old thing. Choice is not really an issue unless they have the ability to make the choice that is actually to their benefit, and the problem with the choices that the Secretary is providing and that President is talking about, they are choices that limit their other choices.

If they join the HMO, then they get the drug coverage. We do not know what drug coverage they are going to get, but they get something, but then their choices of doctors or hospitals are limited, and I know when we talk to senior citizens, they do not particularly like the idea that they have to join an HMO in order to get the drug coverage because the experience that they have had with HMOs has generally been pretty bad, and there are a lot of places where one cannot even join the HMO anyway.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say, let us stop with the gimmicks. Let us stop with the suggestion that somehow the Republican proposal is going to give seniors something. It is not giving them anything unless they trade off something that is just as important, and I do not think that is a fair way to go about treating people who are senior citizens.

I yield now to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) who has spent a significant amount of time on this issue and has been in the forefront on all healthcare issues including the need for a prescription drug benefit.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman for being here tonight and taking the time to talk to our constituents throughout this country about a critical issue, and that is prescription drug coverage. I still have a lot of my seniors that are still battling to pay, and we have been playing games. We have been playing games back and forth. So I am really angry at the proposal that has come before us, and I want to take this little time to talk a little bit about what the administration has proposed.

Mr. Speaker, today I came over to rise today to express my great concerns over the administration's answer to the prescription drug coverage and to their plan, one that he promises our Nation and he promised it during the presidential campaign, and he talked about addressing the problem of prescription drug coverage. However, I believe our seniors deserve better. They deserve more than the recent proposal that we have received from the administration. Today the President spoke before the American Medical Association and unveiled the major points of his plan. The President would create a prescription drug benefit for seniors who opt to leave the traditional Medicare program and enroll in private plans to get coverage. First, that presupposes that they have additional money to be able to pay about $300 a month for that additional coverage. B, when we look at Hispanics, almost 48 percent, close to 50 percent, the only thing they have is Social Security, and they have no other form of income. So it becomes a little difficult.

Secondly, we have HMOs in my area, and I represent a lot of rural area. So PacifiCare, a lot of those companies have chosen not to provide access to care in the rural areas. So I have my rural constituency that have no options there and they are not going to be able to be served on this, and the reason they have had difficulties is because the profits have not been there for the private sector, and we understand that in this area one of the other difficulties is that also, in order for the senior to be able to qualify, they have to leave Medicare, which means that they would lose their ability to choose their own doctor. They also would not be guaranteed access to needed prescriptions.

The seniors would also even lose the access to their local pharmacies. So we have got to consider those things that are very important in those rural communities in terms of their pharmacies, in terms of seeing their own doctors. In addition, on top of that, it would be a complicated plan with enrollees having to dish more out of their own pockets and huge gaps in coverage.

So when we have seniors on fixed income, to expect them to pay more for

Medicare, where even the private companies are choosing to shy away because they cannot make the profits from our seniors because it is understood that when they become a senior, a lot of them get sick, and yet when they are healthy, they will take care of them, but as soon as they get sick, they will find a way to get rid of them. So this plan just does not work.

The President's plan also calls for $400 million for the next 10 years, and we know this falls short of what is needed to adequately address the problem, and the Congressional Budget Office, and the President knows this, projects that the total drug spending by the Medicare population will grow from $95 billion, not million, but $95 billion, in 2003 to $284 billion by 2013. When we boil this down, it means that seniors and disabled beneficiaries will be paying a lot more over time to cover the prescription drug cost.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined as original cosponsor of a House Democratic bill, which we call the Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit and Discount Act. This bill provides guaranteed relief for Medicare beneficiaries struggling to cover their expenses. In 1999, for example, 38 percent of seniors and Medicare beneficiaries with disabilities had no drug coverage. According to the recent studies also, the average annual out-of-pocket drug spending was $996 in 2003.

And remember, this is, on the average, almost $1,000 on the average per senior. So that means that there are beneficiaries living on fixed incomes who pay more than that figure right now. There are some that pay up to $4,000 to $5,000, and this is of the sickest and most vulnerable population in this country. The House Democratic bill established a part D prescription drug benefit under the Medicare program. It is a guaranteed benefit with a reasonable premium and cost-sharing plan. The plan gives the Secretary the authority to use the collective powers of the 40 million Medicare beneficiaries to negotiate fair drug prices.

And I would like to make one last point. Our States are right now in the middle of a budget crisis and are looking to the Federal Government for relief. The Medicare prescription drug benefit will provide vital help to these States. Not only will it help them to take care of that dilemma, but it also addresses a problem that we are encountering. Here we are, we are elected to come up here to address problems. We have a problem before us and what are we doing? We are playing games.

So we have the opportunity to address this problem by putting sufficient resources behind it and, secondly, helping the States take care of the most critical problem that they are encountering with their own budgets, and we could help them with that, and at the same time, help our seniors that are the most vulnerable. And we know that the private sector has difficulty making a profit on them because the reality is, as I had just indicated, for the average senior it is close to $1,000 per year in terms of prescription drug coverage.

So there is no way that the private sector and the insurance companies understand that. That is why they are shying away from the President's proposal because they know it is a sham. They know it is a little game that is being played. They know they are not serious about really addressing the problem that exists out there. And I have spoken to many of my State legislators from back home, and I know that they do not want to cut vital programs, but they will be making difficult decisions in the months to come.

One of the proposals that we have in Texas is considering the elimination of the CHIP program, and this has been brought up in Texas because of the fact that they do not have sufficient resources. That is the worst thing that could happen.

So I ask my colleagues, and I want to thank the gentleman again for coming before us, here we have a unique opportunity to revitalize the economy again and answer that problem in terms of putting some resources into the economy and addressing the problem of our seniors and helping the States to help with their budgets and their costs of which the highest cost that each of those States have usually is in the area of health.

So we have an opportunity to address this issue, and I was really extremely disappointed with the President and his proposal. It is a proposal that does not address the needs out there, and he had talked about it during the campaign when he was running for President about meeting that need. That was 2 years ago. He is going to be coming up again 2 more years from now, and this problem is still before us. We have a unique opportunity to address that now and to work on a bipartisan effort to try to respond to that, and I am hoping that we can make that happen. And once again, I thank the gentleman very much for being out here tonight and talking about this important issue.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Texas. He brought up a bunch of points that I think are really important to stress, if I could just dwell on them a little bit. First of all, I think it is really important that we stress to everyone that the President was criticized by even some of our Republican colleagues because he basically, in his State of the Union address a couple of months ago now, said that the way they are going to get a prescription drug benefit under Medicare was if they joined an HMO under a private plan. A lot of people, even on the other side of the aisle, criticized that because they realized that seniors did not want to or could not, practically speaking, join HMOs or would not really benefit from it because it was not defined what kind of drug benefit they would get. The HMO would essentially decide. So I was hoping today when he talked about this plan and defined it a little better that there was going to be something for people that were in traditional Medicare. But the only thing he came up with was a discount card which was nothing because they can go get one now.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. It is a sham.

Mr. PALLONE. And he said that he was going to have some catastrophic above $5,000 or $6,000 out of pocket, but that is only going to be a very small percentage of seniors that have that kind of catastrophic drug coverage, and even there he did not define what it was going to be. But the one thing that he came up that was new was this idea if they are very low income, they get a $600 subsidy.

Now again, that is meaningless because, as the gentleman knows, for most seniors the $600, first of all, we do not know how low their income has to be to get it, but for most seniors that is not going to be enough, either because their drug bills are very expensive, and what the Democrats have proposed, of course, is just a guaranteed benefit across the board for everyone. Regardless of income, they are going to get 80 percent of their bills paid for by the Federal Government.

And the one thing that I forgot to mention that I did want to mention was that in the same way, under part B now for hospital bills, if one falls below a certain income, the Federal Government pays the premium. That will be true for this program as well. So right now if their doctor bills under part B, if their income is low enough, they do not have to pay that part B premium, and if their income is a little better, then they would pay that premium on a sliding scale, because I have a lot of my constituents that do not pay that $40, $50 a month for the premium for their doctor bills because they are low income, or maybe they are only paying $20 or $30 on a sliding scale because they cannot afford it.

□ 2115

We do the same thing here. Low-income people, with the Democratic plan, that premium, that $25, if you cannot afford it, it is paid for by the Federal Government.

The other thing that the gentleman said, and I think it is so important because I know in my home State this is so crucial, is under the Democratic proposal, because it is covering everybody, regardless of income, the money that States are putting out now, if they are already providing some kind of prescription drugs, they will have saved, because they will not have to put out that money.

For example, in my State, which is hurting right now, we have cut back on the CHIP program. We do not cover single adults. We do not even cover the parents now of a lot of the kids who are eligible for the CHIP program. Why we have had to cut back is because we want to continue to pay for a low-income prescription drug program which we now have, State financed.

But this money, if the Democratic plan is adopted, that money will go back and the States will not have to pay for that. So there is a significant savings to the States at a time when they are hard hit to pay for Medicaid, CHIP, and all of these other programs, that they will save that money and will not have to cut back on health insurance for children and other people who really cannot afford it. So there is a big savings there, a big benefit for the States. I forgot about that.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one of the things that I think that we forget is that one of the reasons why we have Medicare, and as I recall one of the stories about President LBJ, that I remember him having a lot of difficulties with the medical association and with the insurance companies over establishment of Medicare. I remember there is a little story where he brought in the insurance people, and the story goes that as he is talking to them, he says, ''You know well that you take care of them when they are young and they are healthy, and as soon as they get old, that they are costing you.'' And we see the statistics here that most seniors on the average spend $996 per year for prescriptions.

He told them, ''You know you cannot make a profit on them, and we know that, and that is why you have been dumping them. You are dropping them off your plans.'' He said, ''I will do you a favor. Let the Federal Government come forward with a plan that will respond to the needs of our seniors, because you are not meeting their needs.'' Finally they let go and allowed that to happen.

The industry right now also understands that they cannot make a profit on our seniors, because they know that our seniors are the most vulnerable in this country in terms of the ones that more likely will get ill and sick. Yes, there are seniors there that are healthy, and they will continue to make a profit on them. But as soon as they get sick, they are not going to make a profit.

That is why in my counties, and I can tell you about some of my HMOs that were not making profits in certain of my counties, they chose not to drop certain individuals; but they dropped the whole county. They are going to do the same here and choose not to participate.

That is why I think if LBJ were here, he would have established Medicare with prescription drug coverage back then, if we had been using prescription drugs for access to health care the way we do now. So it is important for us that if we really want to provide access to our seniors, then we need to look at affordable prescription drug coverage, but also access to prescription drug coverage.

The other issue I know we have not talked about is our pharmaceutical companies and the obligation they have to provide affordable drugs, which we have had a difficult fight over. But the reality is now that the proposal that the administration has come forward with is again little games that are being played at the expense of our seniors, and I am sick and tired of that. I am tired, because our seniors are sincere when they come to us. They are sincere. They have tears in their eyes when the housewife says, I sometimes go without eating or without my prescriptions because I am buying them for my husband.

We ought to be ashamed of ourselves in this country if we do not work in terms of coming up with a plan that allows for appropriate, accessible prescription drug coverage for our seniors. This is not right. I am hoping we can go across the aisle and get Republicans and Democrats to come forward with a plan that responds to these needs.

When the President comes up again for reelection in 2 years for the Presidency, I want to ask him, and hopefully he will be able to take credit for coming up with a plan that responds to our seniors. At this point with what he has got, it is nothing; and it is not going to work when he comes up for reelection. I am hoping we can come up with a plan.

Once again, I want to thank the gentleman for being here tonight. I wanted to come up here and say my 2 cents worth, because I know when I get home, my seniors are concerned; and every time I go to church, they talk to me about those concerns, and I want to keep fighting until the day we can make it happen and be able to have access to good prescription drug coverage for our seniors in this country.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I do not want to keep prolonging the gentleman, because I see we have other speakers; but the bottom line is that the reason that Medicare came into existence from the beginning is because the private insurance market was not covering senior citizens.

This effort to try to bring HMOs into the Medicare program has not completely failed, but essentially it has been a failure, because less than 15 percent of the seniors are able to find an HMO or tap into an HMO that they want to use. So the notion that the President puts out that somehow privatization, taking money and going into the private insurance markets is going to work, it is not based on the historical fact. It is not based on what we have had to do in order to get seniors coverage.

The other thing that the gentleman from Texas mentioned that I thought was so important is he talked about the limitations that HMOs often put on the senior or the participant in an HMO program, not only in terms of choice of doctors or hospital, but also access to local pharmacies, that you cannot use your local pharmacy, or maybe you cannot use certain drugs. In other words, they will not allow you to use certain drugs because they are too expensive.

In the Democratic program, we make it clear that you can go to your local pharmacy, because this is just like what you do with your doctor. You have a choice of doctors; you have a choice of pharmacies. You can go to any pharmacy, and they have to participate in the program.

The same is true with regard to the type of prescription you get. You are guaranteed that you can buy the prescription drug that you need. There are not going to be limits on what kinds of brands or whatever you are going to be able to access.

I see some of my other colleagues are here. The gentleman from North Carolina, I appreciate the fact that he came down here. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker. I wanted to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), for this opportunity. I want to add my voice to that of my colleagues on this very, very important issue.

When I was running for this office, and I am a new Member, a little over 1 year ago when I started, and as I traveled around rural, poor eastern North Carolina, almost one-quarter of our State, my district covers 23 counties, the number one or number two, certainly the number three issue that always came up was that of a prescription drug benefit.

We kept talking to our constituents, and many of them were seniors. And I happen to believe that all across the country, this entire body put itself before our citizens for reelection, there were a lot of promises made on both sides of the aisle that when we get back to Washington we are going to enact a prescription drug benefit, many of us would say, for seniors.

I have a tremendous number of seniors in my district, particularly when it comes to those who are active and involved. I want to say in my prior life in the State legislature, we wrestled with similar issues that were important to seniors; and I always felt if you make a promise, you ought to keep it. And as I add my voice to that of my colleagues tonight, I really think of all of the voices all across northeastern North Carolina, across the rest of North Carolina and across this country, people who are hurting, who need help, who are demanding help. Many of these people, as the gentleman knows, are unable to afford their prescriptions. People are cutting pills in half and going without and taking one every other day, when they should be taking one every day.

Now, the President has proposed a plan that will not benefit these seniors, will not give them what we promised them. It will give them the label on the box, but the box is empty.

I am so proud that the Democrats have come up with a plan, and, very frankly, it ought to be bipartisan. It ought to be nonpartisan, because,

frankly, once we get elected, we ought to turn our attention to the people we represent. Our voices ought to mingle together like a choir, like a symphony, as we seek to produce those things that we have promised.

As I say, the time has come to deliver; and I am here tonight to support what I believe and what I see and what I have read to be an outstanding plan promised by the Democrats. It would ensure that even hard-to-reach rural communities, just like my district, are included equally in this much-needed and much-demanded prescription drug plan.

The premiums, as has already been said, would be affordable. The deductibles would be reasonable, and they would be similar to coinsurance.

I heard the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) talk about $25 a month, up to $100 a year, and then an 80/20 plan. I think that is imminently reasonable and fair.

The other thing, this plan is inclusive. It reaches everyone. It is a simple plan. It is straightforward. It gives seniors and those with disabilities the coverage and the drugs they need, and that not only they need, but they have been promised. The plan covers catastrophic coverage. It takes special note to include the poorest Americans, people earning between 150 and 175 percent of poverty level. That is about $13,500 a year. As I said, the coverage is fair and cost-effective, and in some cases it even has a sliding scale.

On the other hand, the plan that is proposed by the President would be very, very harmful to people in my district; and I consider it my responsibility, in particular, to speak up for those in rural eastern North Carolina and to say is this really a plan, or is this an empty promise?

This plan favors strongly HMOs. However, as we know from our history, HMOs are not particularly fond of rural and economically struggling communities; and, therefore, is this plan going to produce what it is promising, or is it going to leave our people holding a bag with nothing in it?

For years now we have been saying older Americans are being forced to choose between food and medication that they need. This plan would force seniors to choose between their doctors and prescription drug coverage.

Should Medicare benefits opt out of the President's plan, their only chance for drug coverage would be a discount card that we have also heard about tonight that gives a meager 12.4 percent discount. We know that that is little more than you can get with your bonus card at a supermarket. This is hardly the kind of relief that we need to give to our seniors.

The administration today claims their plan would provide eligible recipients with the same coverage afforded to Members of Congress and Federal employees. However, our researchers at the Congressional Research Service value the President's proposal as well under half of what it provides to Members of Congress. The Democratic plan would provide coverage to everyone the entire year with affordable costs to Medicare beneficiaries.

□ 2130

This institution, known as the United States Congress, has a great history. There have been times that we have responded to issues that have arisen throughout the country. We know how to respond. We have the ability to respond. The question today is, do we have the courage? It only takes a little bit of courage to give an honest answer and to keep our commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to act now on a favorable plan.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Speaker. He made a couple of points that I just wanted to elaborate on because I think they are so important.

The gentleman talked about the need for simplicity. It is true, the seniors, and not to say that the seniors cannot figure things out or that they are not sophisticated enough, but it is difficult for them oftentimes to figure out all these gimmicks.

If we look at the President's plan, there are a lot of gimmicks. It basically talks about this discount card. I have a lot of the drug companies in my district in New Jersey. They have all kinds of discount cards, but we have to figure out whether we are going to buy a discount card and how much of a percent we are going to get. There is no guarantee that we are going to get a particular percent.

The other thing is the gimmicks the HMOs are using. I remember when we first started the Medicare+Choice, where seniors were allowed to go into an HMO and use their Medicare to go into it. I started to see these advertisements in the local papers in New Jersey. One in particular said, if you came to a diner on Route 9 in Sayreville, one of my towns, on a given night, they would give you a free lobster dinner if you came and listened to the plan that was being offered.

All these senior citizens that I knew, because they came later to my town meetings and forums, went there because they got the gimmick of the free lobster dinner. It sounds funny, and I am kind of laughing; but it was sad because they ended up signing up. They did not know exactly what they were signing up for, what kind of benefit they were really getting with the HMO. They later found out that they had to pay a lot of money out of pocket, they were not allowed to go to the local pharmacy, and they were not allowed to have a choice of doctors.

It is very wrong, in my opinion, to put seniors into the position where they can be essentially tricked, because it is not simple. Our plan, the Democratic plan, is simple. It is just like what we get with doctors. As the gentleman did, he explained it in 30 seconds. We need that, not because seniors are stupid, but because they just—they should not have to face all these obstacles and all these difficulties in deciding what kind of a plan to take, because a lot of times they are lured into these things based on false premises.

I have seen it myself. I gave the example of the lobster dinner, and I can give a lot of other examples that are similar to that. The other thing that the gentleman mentioned which I think is so important, if we listen to the President and Secretary Thompson today, they keep talking about how they want to put seniors into a plan that is similar to the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program, what we have in Congress and what Federal employees have.

What they forget to mention is that what they have in mind is not exactly like what we get. They are talking essentially about a voucher system, where they give a senior citizen a lot of money like a voucher, and they go out and try to use it to get into an HMO or some kind of a private plan. That is not what we have. We have a choice of all kinds of plans.

I would venture to say that what the Democrats have proposed is more like what Congressmen or senior citizens get, because there is a guarantee that we are going to have a certain kind of prescription drug program.

I do not want people to get this idea that what they are proposing, what the President has proposed, is similar to what government employees get. It is not. Government employees do not have to make these choices in order to get the guaranteed benefit the way that the Republicans are proposing. They do not have to make those choices, and end up not having prescription drugs or having prescription drugs. It is not exactly the same thing.

Mr. BALLANCE. If the distinguished gentleman would just further yield, Mr. Speaker, I would say there has been a lot of talk about compassion. This is a great time for it to be shown. Anyone who has been in the senior centers that I have been in, that the gentleman has been in, that others of our colleagues have been in, and are going to go in again, we look around the room and look at these people who are there, and they are doing the best they can to get along in the world.

We are here, and we are their voices. I just hope the gentleman will continue to raise his voice and others will raise their voices on their behalf, and hopefully we can get a plan that will be beneficial to them.

Mr. PALLONE. I appreciate the gentleman and thank him for coming down.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has joined me so many times on this same issue. We may look a little weary, but we are trying, and we are going to get out there and talk about this prescription drug plan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE OF Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished from New Jersey for yielding to me. It is refreshing to hear from the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE), who has brought such a wealth of experience from the State legislature, and brings to the floor tonight his vast experience about seniors in North Carolina, which shows that this is so widespread.

Those of us who started in local government, and as the gentleman knows, I started in city council, saw these issues even before we came to Congress. That is why we are here night after night. We thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share an added story. It goes to the point of how one's position or issues can be misconstrued. I hope my colleague does not think I am going far awry, but it is an important point because sometimes even Members are misinterpreted.

One of my radio stations, KPRC 950 AM, called desperately this morning while I was in a Committee on the Judiciary hearing, wanting to get my response to the idea of the words ''under God'' in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Maybe because I have been so vocal on the question of going to war in Iraq, which is certainly a total different issue, it is a question of choices and options; and, frankly, I am going to discuss the fact that when we make choices and spend huge sums of money on war, there are questions about how we can spend dollars on needed prescription drug benefits; but they wanted to interview me about the words ''under God,'' and did I not object to those words being in the Pledge.

It so happens that I am a rabid and avid believer that those words should be in the Pledge and should be allowed to be in the Pledge, and have voted accordingly, and have defended it on the basis that it is protected by the first amendment; meaning that as we say the Pledge, we are not mandated to say it, it is by choice; and therefore, anyone who chooses not to say it can; and if they choose to say it, it can be said readily, as it is. We will see what the court does with it, but I believe that ''under God'' is appropriate.

This is what happens when you mislead, or someone hears incorrectly what someone says or believes. I am getting to what I understand or perceive has been said this morning about the proposed Medicare prescription drug plan offered by the administration. It appears to be one that is tied to Medicaid, or Medicare, rather, and it is not.

I would like to hear from the President to clarify that, because it appears that there was the impression given that this is all right, it is a guaranteed Medicare prescription drug benefit; and Mr. Speaker, it is not. What it actually does is it forces seniors out of the Medicare program into HMOs, unlike the program proposed by the Democrats, which clearly indicates that we are going to provide the safety net of a guaranteed prescription drug benefit under Medicare; an old shoe, if you will, and I do not want to interpret that as being a bad shoe, but something that we are familiar with and comfortable with; and we are going to strengthen the Medicare system. I think that is the way we should explain what we are trying to do.

Some would say, well, you are not fixing the Medicare system. The administration's proposal is new and fresh, and it is fixing it. No, we are going to strengthen a Medicare program that has actually worked. The difficulties in the Medicare program this Congress some years ago fixed when we attacked Medicare fraud; and when I say ''fixed,'' we went after it. We are still monitoring Medicare fraud. I know the Committee on Commerce constantly is in review of Medicare fraud, and looking at ways the system can be more efficient.

We want to do that. That is absolutely the right way to go. But one of the problems with Medicare has been that it has been weak and faltering because we have not had the resources to strengthen a very strong program. Why is it strong? Because since 1965, the actuarial tables will show that there has been a decided difference in the length of life of Americans pursuant to the passage of the Medicare Act in 1965; but now we come to a crisis.

I see my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas. I have listened to him time and time again. We both come from semi-rural areas, only because Texas is a big neighborhood, I call it. We have people coming in and out of our cities, but we claim ruralness even in our cities. The problem is, these are our neighbors. Over and over again, each of us has been to our respective senior citizen areas. I have unincorporated areas in my district and they are semi-rural, even though I represent parts of the city of Houston.

Seniors are living in these areas, sometimes left as widows or widowers in their homes. They want to be in their homes. They are able to stay because the mortgage is based upon a house that was bought 30, 40, 50 years ago. When they come to me, they are literally in tears, because I am forcing them to sell that house and maybe even move in not even with a child but a relative, or someplace that compromises the quality of life that they are used to. Why? Because they have to make choices between prescription drug benefits or paying for prescription drugs and, as well, rent and food.

So the President's plan is not a guaranteed prescription drug benefit. Seniors, listen to what we are saying. It is a proposal that forces them to go into an HMO. I do not want to be in one more meeting with close to 600 or 1,000 seniors when we are all there trying to find a solution to the HMOs who closed up shop in Houston, Texas, six of them at one time, leaving seniors without any kind of care whatsoever. We managed to grab one back in, and we are hanging on by for a string right now.

Basically, what the President's plan is forces them upon the insurance process that just a few years ago collapsed when it left many of our jurisdictions; and, in particular, left seniors, without, if you will, the idea of coverage.

The other thing is it forces Medicare into privatization, or it privatized Medicare. We have seen that that does not work because, again, I point back to the closing of the HMOs. The reason they closed was not because we were not nice, if you will, subscribers, enrollees; they closed because they were not making money because there were so many of us; when I say that, too many of the seniors. It was costly because seniors were using it. Well, that is what preventative medicine is all about. That is what Medicare did, it allowed seniors to have care so they could live longer. So it does that.

We found out that privatization did not work, just to continue what I have said, because that is why we went into the Medicare system, because pre-Medicare we had a much shorter lifespan for seniors in America or Americans, a much shorter lifespan. That is because they were not intervening sufficiently early enough to either treat or prevent the disease. So privatization is not what we want to see.

Four hundred billion dollars is what I understand is the President's proposal, certainly woefully inadequate in terms of the beneficiaries that need to participate, and the cost of prescription drugs. So this is inadequate.

Again might I say, I know that the debate is, of course, about our proposal: it is $800 billion. I am not ashamed of that, because I am sick and tired of not bringing home, if you will, the substance of what we have been promising to our seniors. It would have been less costly if we had done it 6 years ago when we were discussing it; but obviously we are projecting into the future, and it is time to do it now.

Clearly, with a $600 billion permanent tax cut, we could substitute the $800 billion proposal that we would have in order to ensure that we would be able to provide for these seniors.

The President's proposal also has gaps in coverage. Because we are dealing with an arbitrary budget number, beneficiaries will be forced to face a gap in coverage, and spend thousands of dollars just when they need the help most.

Specifically, I want to say this is what this means. It means that the President's plan does not specify how much seniors would have to spend before they would become eligible for catastrophic drug coverage. I think the other point is, what is catastrophic drug coverage?

So this plan is one that needs a lot of help. It also begs the question. It is like the radio interview that I was going to give this morning suggesting that I did not believe in the words ''under God'' in the Pledge. I do not

think it is documented anywhere that I have ever said that, and it had to be corrected.

So it is important that we correct the message and the substance of the President's plan. It is a forced privatization. It is utilizing HMOs, who may be good in every sort of way, but we have shown that if they do not make a profit, they leave. Also, it does not answer the question of when a senior is very, very sick, whether or not they are able to get prescription drugs that they need.

So I thank the gentleman very much, I say to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), I hope that we can find common ground and make the right choice, and spend the appropriate dollars effectively. I would like to see us use those dollars that we might be using for going to war for this. Certainly I would like to see it be the last option.

More importantly, I think it is crucial that seniors understand what choices they are being forced to make. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue. All of us want to be able to deliver help to our seniors, no matter where we live. I think that is a very important challenge we all have to work on.

□ 2145

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman and particularly with her insight there with regard to the HMOs which are not available in many places. She is exactly right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a State that neighbors my State, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLANCE), who was here tonight to talk about such an important issue.

Back in the year 2000, there was an election and everyone talked about the need to truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors. Two years went by and nothing happened. Then we had another election in the year 2002. Everyone talked about the need to truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors, and nothing happened. There are a few of us that are not going to rest until we see a Medicare prescription drug plan for America's greatest generation, our seniors.

We hear folks on both sides of the aisle talk about how seniors have to choose between their medicine and their light bill and paying their rent and their groceries. I am here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to state that that is not rhetoric. It is true. I am a small town family pharmacy owner, and before coming to Congress I saw too many seniors come through the doors of our small family pharmacy with a handful of prescriptions after going to the doctor, which Medicare covered, and having tests run on them, which Medicare covered; and then the doctor included the medicine they needed to get well. And they would come through the door of the pharmacy with a handful of prescriptions, and sometimes even one prescription, but sometimes they could not afford that one prescription or they could not afford to take it properly.

I live in Prescott, Arkansas, a town of about 3,400 people. We do not even have a hospital anymore. But living in a small town I see seniors that come through the doors of the family pharmacy we owned back home, that could not afford their medicine; and being from a small town, I would learn that a week later that they were in the hospital 16 miles up the road in Hope, Arkansas, running up a 10 or $20,000 Medicare bill simply because they could not afford their medicine or could not afford to take it properly.

This is America. We can do better than that by our seniors.

A few months ago, I ran into another senior citizen, a retired pharmacist in my district who happened to have been the relief pharmacist at the pharmacy my mom and dad used when I was growing up in the 1960s. She said back in those days which was not that long ago, she said if I had a prescription that cost $5, I would go ahead and fill the next one in line while I built up enough courage to go out and tell the patient that their medicine was going to cost $5. And I think that graphically demonstrates and tells a story about how today's Medicare was really created for yesterday's medical care.

Health insurance companies are in the business of making a profit. They have got it. They understand it. They now cover medicine. They now know it holds down the costs of doctor visits, needless hospitals stays, and needless surgeries. No one has accurately portrayed how much money we will save in Medicare part A and part B if we truly modernize Medicare to include medicine for our seniors.

Now, the President has another plan, and we have heard about his plan to provide seniors with a discount card. Anybody that watches late night TV, you can buy them every night on TV for $7.95. And if you buy one and take it to a pharmacy, chances are you will pay more money for your prescription; and when you have a savings, you will save 50 cents to $3. A senior with a $600-a-month drug bill on six medications, let us give them the benefit of the doubt and say they save $3 a prescription, saving $18 dollars on a $600 drug bill does not help seniors choose between their medicine and their light bill and their groceries and so forth and so on.

And now the President says we will give you some prescription drug coverage if you will sign up for this HMO and let us tell you who your doctor is going to be. That is wrong. And I am not going to rest until our seniors can walk into the pharmacy of their choice, pull out their Medicare card, and be treated just like they are when they go to the doctor and when they go to the hospital.

HALTING ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, it will be interesting as times goes by and as we begin the debate on the budget, which will come up in a relatively short order, it will be very interesting to hear our friends on the other side who have spoken so long and eloquently tonight about the issue of prescription drugs and the problem with the President's plan. It will be interesting to hear how they address the problem with the budget. My guess is, it is just a guess, of course, when the budget is presented, it will be attacked by our friends on the other side of the aisle for being too high and having too much of a deficit attached to it.

I ask, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it would not be appropriate for all of us to think about the fact that the plan that is being put forward by the other side is one that would, oh, say a trillion dollars I think is the last we have seen that would attach to it in terms of cost. And my guess is again we will not hear much about that when we discuss the budget.

At any rate, tonight I do want to talk more about a different issue than the budget. I want to talk about, of course, the issue of national security and the issue of immigration and how the two actually connect to each other.

A great deal of debate is ongoing in the country about the activities that the United States will be involved with in a relatively short time perhaps in Iraq, whether or not we should be and whether or not the President is right to, in fact, address this issue in the way that he is choosing to do so. And that debate is appropriate and it is healthy in our Republic. Some aspects of it are healthy. But the one thing that I seldom hear being discussed by anyone, frankly, on either side of the issue of the United States involvement in Iraq is the actual threat that is posed by the action that we will take in that part of the world, the threat to our homeland, the threat to American citizens here in the United States. And the threat is real.

No one, for instance, believes that our armies will be defeated in Iraq. No one thinks that we will fail in the desert of Iraq. Saddam Hussein does not think that we will fail there. No one believes that that is where the final victory in this huge endeavor we are involved with will be won. It is very possible, it is even predictable, I think, that various aspects of this battle against terrorism will be fought in a variety of places around the world, and we will experience casualties in places other than the desert of Iraq.

And those casualties may very well be here in the continental United States.

We know that Saddam Hussein and others have called for a greater level of terrorist activities be committed against American interests should we commence hostility in Iraq. And we know that that may very well be the commencement of hostility, that is, may very well be a catalyzing agent that will bring together many of the disparate forces in that part of the world in what is often referred to as a jihad against the United States, and we must be prepared for it. And we have heard how FEMA has put out various pieces of information and on the FEMA Web site people can go to it and figure out how to protect their homes and figure out what to do if they are at their business and something happens, some sorts of attacks occur, biological, chemical or nuclear. And we are preparing the Nation for this eventuality. We talk about it a great deal, and we should because it is a true possibility. It is, in fact, a probability.

Now, we know that and we talk about that on the floor of the House, and we encourage Americans to be vigilant, and we ask them to take measures to protect themselves against these kinds of terrorist activities which we anticipate in the United States of America on our ground. It is amazing to me then that there is such a silence, almost one would say a deaf silence, emanating out of this body, out of the administration, certainly out of any sort of aspect of the media by and large, I guess I should say, some aspect of the media. Do pay attention to what I am going to say and suggest that it is, in fact, something Americans should be made aware of.

But we hear very little discussion about the fact that our borders are porous and across them come people not just looking for a job, although many and in fact most do come that way and for that purpose. But many others come looking to do us great damage. And we talk about, we do pay lip service to things like the creation of the Homeland Defense agency and the reconfiguration of the INS and the Border Patrol within that umbrella agency we are calling Homeland Defense; and that I suppose is supposed to salve the concerns, that is supposed to make us all feel better and more secure: the fact that we are arranging the deck chairs, and that new boxes are being constructed with new names in them to oversee agencies with really important-sounding titles, all dealing with homeland security.

But, Mr. Speaker, I just came back from a trip to the border, to the southern border; and I will tell you and I will tell anyone who will listen that our borders are not secure, that our homeland is not secure, even though we have an agency for that purpose. It is not secure. It is incredibly vulnerable. People still by the thousands come across those borders at their will. Again, most I am sure are doing nothing more than looking for the kind of life, a better life that our, perhaps your grandparents, certainly mine, came here for. They are coming illegally; and, therefore, they should not be given any sort of sustenance here. We should not encourage that. We should not reward that kind of activity. And I do hope that we will begin to understand that you cannot create a sieve on the border that allows only those people who are looking for a better life to come through it illegally, while simultaneously stopping those people who are coming here to kill us. I do not know how to construct such a sieve. I do not believe anyone does.

□ 2200

Yet that is exactly what we are trying to do today. We are trying our best, and the government really should be given credit, certainly the administration, for the diligence that they have exhibited heretofore, that we have been able to see actually, perhaps stop certain activities and events from occurring, and we should praise the efforts of our various intelligence gathering services and parts of the homeland security agency, because there are things that I am sure could have happened to the United States, very bad things that have been stopped by their diligence, and I commend them for it.

Their job is overwhelming. It is made immensely more difficult because the borders are porous. We have embarked upon this interesting strategy that says we are going to try to find the people who have gotten into the United States and are here trying to do what they were sent to do, the literally thousands that we have been told are here in these sleeper cells, just awaiting orders to execute some act of terrorism against the United States, and we apply a great deal of our resources to that end, to trying to find them once they are here and stop them from doing what it is they are going to do.

We do not do what is, I think, most logical thing, the thing that our constituents ask us to do every time I think almost any of us go home and have a town meeting. Somebody usually, certainly in my town meetings, will bring up the issue of border security and ask why we are not trying to stop them at the borders, why we do not try to stop the people from coming into the United States and doing bad things, why is it that we are concentrating on trying to do something about the ones that are here now, and here is the answer. It is an ugly answer, but it is the answer.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that if we were to actually do what is necessary to prevent people from coming into this country to create havoc and to commit acts of terrorism, we would essentially end illegal immigration, and therefore, we will not do that. We will not secure the border. We will not defend American lives or property because it would end illegal immigration, and Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this body, there are people throughout the government that recognize the political peril that might develop as a result of doing what I suggest.

There are large segments of the American population who could be offended by us securing our own borders. I do not understand how that could be. I do not understand how any American, any American regardless of the hyphen, what word we put before the hyphen, I do not understand how any American could say please do not defend our borders because if you do, fewer of my countrymen would be able to come in. Because if you feel that way, then that it is your countrymen that we are keeping out, then you are not an American, of course. You are connected, at least mentally, to another country. Politically, emotionally, linguistically, whatever, you are connected to another country and your concerns about our borders should not be taken into consideration.

Anyone who believes themselves to be an American, it seems to me, would be willing to say, and in fact, they do in huge number, please protect the border, please stop people from coming into this country to do us great harm because it may be me, it may be my family that is the casualty and the casualties of the next terrorist activity, and because they have some sort of connection to our country, to the United States of America, because they want to see us survive, and they recognize that the world in which we live today is the world that does not, in fact, exist easily with things like open borders.

The world in which we live, the kind of world we have lived in this United States for a couple of hundred years where we felt so secure from the problems of other countries, the oceans protected us and that we could defend ourselves by sending armies to other countries, that world is gone. It no longer really exists.

Our Nation is at risk because our borders are porous, and no matter how many times somebody stands on the floor of this House or in front of the cameras at press briefings and says something like we are doing everything possible to defend the people of this country, no matter how many times they say it, it simply is not true. It is not true.

I can tell my colleagues that anyone who lives on the border, northern or southern, will tell you that the border is porous and across that border is coming thousands, thousands of people over the course of a year, millions of people, and that they will also tell you, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that their lives are being essentially destroyed, that their way of life is being destroyed, that their ranches and farms and homes along that border are being destroyed, literally and figuratively, destroyed.

We spoke to rancher after rancher in Cochise County on the border with

Mexico, and they talked about having lived there for generations and how something different was happening in the last 4 or 5 years where they have always had the issue of, in the past, illegal immigrants coming across their border or that border and on to their land, and it is a few here and there, and they would give them food. They would give them jobs many times frankly, and these people would either move on or move back to Mexico at certain points in time, and it really was not much of a problem frankly.

Something, they keep saying, has happened in the last 4 or 5 years, something very odd and very disconcerting, and what they say is that it is not just one or two people coming across. It is, in fact, hordes of people, thousands of people coming across the border, destroying the fences, depositing litter throughout the land and in areas that were heretofore pristine in nature. They are now essentially the local landfill, but there is no EPA to govern the problem and to constrict the use of this particular land.

People will come to what are called pick-up sites, Mr. Speaker, and they are all over the land in this area. There are places where people will cross into the United States illegally, continue on foot to a particular spot inside the United States where there is a road, and they will congregate there, sometimes in the hundreds. Over a period of time, maybe thousands will congregate in this particular area, waiting for their truck, semis, various other forms of transportation to get there, pick them up and take them into the interior of the United States.

The land becomes essentially destroyed where these sites are. There is so much trash that a person literally has to be careful as they walk through there because of what they might step on or what they might touch. I mean thousands and thousands and thousands and thousands of water bottles and trash and plastic bags because people are told they must discard everything. They must discard their backpacks, jackets, coats, shirts, whatever, get into these whatever kind of transportation is made available to them with as little as possible because they need more room. So they do not let them take in anything that they are carrying and they have to just simply drop it at that point.

The land is devastated. If this happened anywhere else in the United States, the Sierra Club would be going crazy. We would be hearing from them on the floor of this House every single day. Somebody would be getting sued. I guarantee my colleagues that. The cameras from ABC, NBC and CBS would be there every night saying, look what these people are doing to our land; they are destroying this property.

Yet, I really have not seen that kind of exposure of this particular problem. I have certainly not heard the Sierra Club or any of the environmentalist organizations out there in the United States condemn this activity and try to do something about it and suggest that maybe the government ought to take some action.

The trash that is deposited is not only unsightly and becoming something that becomes very dangerous at certain points in time, but it is also, of course, something that these ranchers have to put up with, and it becomes an economic liability for them because cattle eat the trash. They try to consume the plastic, and of course, it will kill them in a short period of time.

The human feces that is deposited in this area, oftentimes a rainstorm will occur in that, especially in that part of the country it occurs quickly. These arroyos fill up. The human waste is washed down. It gets into the water supply for cattle and eventually for human beings. It is a very dangerous situation, very ugly situation.

I talked to ranchers who spend most of their day trying to repair their fences instead of actually conducting the ranching operations that are necessary to keep them afloat. Many of these ranchers are in bankruptcy.

Then, of course, there are the even more dangerous aspects of this, because the people coming across the border, many of them are carrying drugs, illegal narcotics into the United States. They come with backpacks, 60 to 80 pounds on their back. Sometimes they come guarded by people carrying M–16s or various other automatic weapons. They come across the land in, again, droves, thousands. We have pictures of them.

These are very dangerous people. These are people who do not simply drop everything and run when they are confronted by either a rancher or a border patrol. They will want to many times shoot it out with them, and they have done so.

Even some of the people who are not necessarily directly connected to the drug trafficking have become very indifferent in their nature, very aggressive, very antagonistic to the ranchers in the area, have threatened them physically, have assaulted them, have broken into their homes, their barns, the buildings on their ranches, have vandalized the wells, have threatened the family members. Person after person we speak to is armed. Children go to school armed, 13- and 14-year-old kids. Their parents are afraid to send them that far alone or unarmed.

Ranchers have to keep shotguns or other firearms by their door, and as one rancher said to me, nobody should have to live like this. We have lived here for generations. Nobody ever locked their doors. Nobody ever locked their cars. This was the idyllic and picturesque rural life that most people thought existed in this country.

Everything has changed on the border. The government of Mexico has decided to move as many people into the United States as possible, as I was told by Juan Hernandez, who was the head of something called the Ministry for Mexicans Living in the United States, a newly-created ministry in Mexico. He was at that time the minister, and when I asked him the purpose of such an agency, I had never heard of such an agency before, he said, well, no, it is new, and I am the first minister, and the purpose is essentially to increase the flow of people into the United States from Mexico. I said, why do you want to do that? And he said there are several reasons.

He was very, very candid. I must tell my colleagues I was astounded by how candid he was when he said, well, the reason why we are trying to get as many people into the United States as possible is so that eventually we will be able to affect American policy vis-a-vis Mexico just by the number of people who exist there. He said, of course, these people send money home to Mexico. It is called remittance and it accounts for almost 30 percent of their GDP. It is a very important function. It is a very important part of the Mexican government and the Mexican economy.

It also serves another purpose, although he did not claim this, but it is certainly accurate to say that because of Mexico's enormous growth rate in the last 25 years, having doubled their population, they are now, and because they are still looking, they still have an economy is that is anything but robust. They have a huge unemployment problem and they have lots and lots of very young people who are unemployed, and as certainly we know, what that means throughout anywhere, any country, it means instability.

□ 2215

And so they want to move these people out of Mexico and into the United States.

Some people would even suggest that there are other reasons, that term ''reconquista'' is more than just an idle phrase; that people actually believe that they can reconquer that part of the United States, the southern part of the United States, by simply moving people into it. Well, there are many reasons why we are seeing this enormous number of people coming across the border, and Mexico may very well have their reasons for encouraging the flow into the United States. But we have absolutely no reason to accept this state of affairs except for the fact that we fear the politics. We fear the political reaction to any action we take to secure the border, both northern and southern.

Well, that is simply not good enough for me, Mr. Speaker. That is not a good enough reason for us to abandon our borders. Because it is imperative, I think, for any nation, in order to call itself a nation, to be able to control its own borders; and we do not do that. We do not wish to do that, and we suffer the consequences: increased costs for American citizens.

There is always this debate as to whether or not massive immigration of

legal and illegal workers, low-paid, low-skilled workers into the United States is a benefit to the country. Well, I will tell you to whom it is a benefit. It is a benefit to those who hire low-skilled, low-wage workers and pay them very little. Those folks do, in fact, get a profit from this migration activity and from the fact that our borders are porous, and they can therefore hire people who are desperate. That is profitable for them, but it is costly for the United States.

Many very reputable studies have been conducted that are designed to identify the actual costs. A lady at Vanderbilt University, a very well-respected economist, has stated often that the result of massive immigration into the United States of low-skilled, low-wage people creates profits for some, but costs for the many. And there is absolutely no way that the United States benefits in the aggregate from having millions of people here for whom housing is necessary, schooling is necessary, hospitals are necessary, and prisons are necessary.

Twenty-five percent of the prison population in Federal prisons is made up of people who are noncitizens in this country. It varies from State to State as to how many noncitizens end up in State facilities or in local lockups, but it is a significant number. And these are very expensive costs. And they are not paid back by the ''taxes that are paid by the people coming in.'' First of all, even if they were paying taxes, of course, we would recognize these are low-skilled, low-wage people.

At one of these pickup sites I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, that we were going through a couple of weeks ago on the border, we saw some paper, well, there was paper and stuff everywhere; and I happened to look down and there was a 1040, a Federal income tax form that someone had filed, and it was deposited in the rest of this trash heap in this pickup site. I picked it up and we were looking at it and it was a Mr. Delgado. And Mr. Delgado had filed taxes, a tax form for the previous year, in which he claimed, and I cannot remember now because I do not have it with me, but I think it was $8,000 or $9,000 in income that he had paid $1,100 or $1,200 in taxes. But of course he also claimed $2,400 in unearned income tax credit. So he got a refund, of course, of almost double what he paid.

And this is not unusual. It is costing us not just the money that every city and State and the Federal Government has to put out for all the services and the infrastructure, but it costs us in terms of the tax claims that are made by the people who come in here and work often illegally. And my colleagues know as well as I do how this happens. Tax ID numbers are assigned. The IRS could not care less whether a person is legal or illegal. They will assign a tax ID number, and that is really all one needs to then make a claim for an income tax credit.

So there is that one side of the immigration issue. There is this economic dilemma that we face and certainly an economic hardship that is placed on Americans to support massive immigration into this country. Then there is this other side, there is this thing we call the national security implications of massive immigration.

And before I go to that, Mr. Speaker, I do want to talk about something else that is occurring. We are about to perhaps embark upon some action in the Middle East, and we are looking for friends around the world. We are very interested in getting countries in the Middle East to help us out. We have heard a lot about Turkey and the fact that we had offered them, well estimates go from $12 billion to $30 billion in aid, essentially a bribe, to have them allow us to station troops there. Their parliament recently turned down that request from the United States to station troops there, so this has caused a lot of consternation.

But they are not the only government that is trying to hold the United States up in order for them to agree to allow us to do what we think we need to do for our national interest and for the interest of, in fact, the civilized world. Our friends to the south have been negotiating with the United States, because of course we need their vote on the Security Council in this resolution that is coming up. It is widely reported that some bargaining has been going on between the administration and Vincente Fox's government. The issue is, well, what is in it for us, is the way I think it has been put. What is in it for Mexico? What are we willing to give them to get their vote on the Security Council?

This is the same government, Mr. Speaker, the same country whose president came here and addressed a joint session and talked about the need for trust. He used that word over and over and over again, I remember. We have to trust each other. We have to trust Mexico especially, he said. Well, in that vein, then, he is suggesting that some quid pro quo is necessary for them to support our resolution, or the British resolution in the Security Council; and what they are asking for is another push for amnesty for all the people living here illegally, all the people from Mexico living here illegally.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what arrangements have been made to get their vote; but I would suggest that this is not the action of a friend, of a nation that we are supposed to be able to trust. And I also assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will certainly do everything in my power to stop any effort to provide amnesty for anyone here illegally, Mexicans or anyone else. It is the worst kind of public policy.

Just before I came on the floor, I was talking to someone who was telling me about the fact that he is engaged, and he is trying to get the person to whom he is engaged here in the United States. It is a lengthy and difficult process, and he is of course doing it the right way. It is going to cost money. It is certainly going to cost a lot of time, and it is a big inconvenience. And I wonder what we would tell him and anyone else who is actually trying to do it the right way if we were to in fact then grant amnesty to the, what, 10 to 13 million people here who have done it the wrong way. What message does that send to all of the law-abiding citizens of this country and/or law-abiding prospective citizens to this country? It tells them they were suckers; and that is it, that they should have simply snuck in.

Why would someone not just sneak in? Why would anyone go through the hassle? And by the way, when we go down to the border, the border patrol will say every time, please do not even mention amnesty. Because every time we say amnesty up here, this flood they are trying to deal with turns into a tidal wave. It is terrible public policy, Mr. Speaker, and I will do anything I can to try to stop it.

Again, I do not know what arrangements have been made. I know it has been widely reported that this is the kind of thing that is going on. The fact that the borders are porous is more than just an obstacle to those of us who want to adhere to the rule of law and encourage people to come into this country legally, to enhance the idea of national sovereignty. It is more than just a little obstacle along those lines. It is also a very severe and significant threat to the existence of the United States of America.

Across these borders come people, as I have said before, with ill intent, and they can come across at their will. And many people are coming from areas of the world that are certainly known to spawn the terrorists about whom we are so greatly concerned. In fact, on the border they also have a term for that. They always refer to these people coming across, this new phenomena, by saying there are so many OTMs. That simply means ''other than Mexicans,'' coming across the southern border.

But it is not unique to the southern border. I guarantee it is happening on our northern border also. Many people are being reported, hundreds, sometimes more, who are actually coming from countries in the Middle East. And what we are noticing recently is quite a number of people coming up through Brazil in what is something called the tri-border region in South America. This is an interesting phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. A very interesting phenomenon, because it is something we hear very little about.

In a paper, from which I am going to quote here, it is called ''Tres Fronteras,'' which means ''three borders,'' and that is why I say we refer to it now mostly as the tri-border area. It is Paraguay, Argentina, and Brazil in South America. It was submitted by Lawrence J. Martines, a member of the IACSP, the Association of Former Intelligence Officers, and a variety of other organizations. It is entitled ''The Nexus of Islamic Terrorism in Latin America.''

It starts off: ''Ciudad Del Este, Paraguay once held the title of the contraband capital of South America. A seedy border town surrounded by jungle, where the borders of Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay meet. Millions of dollars in drugs have passed through Ciudad Del Este down the Parana River to the Rio de la Plata and eventually reaching the Atlantic seaboard. Upriver came illegal booze, jewelry, and black-market cigarettes. The narcotrafficantes and all-purpose smugglers fueled the economy of the region. According to a U.S. State Department document, thanks to Ciudad Del Este, impoverished Paraguay had both a higher consumption of whiskey than Scotland and a record supply of foreign cigarettes and jewelry.

□ 2230

''In the mid-1980s, a demographic shift began in South America,'' and this is the part that is quite interesting and something hardly anyone talks about. ''Muslim immigrants from the Middle East and Southwest Asia began flooding into the region, including the Tres Fronteras. By 2001 the Muslim population south of the Panama Canal had skyrocketed to an estimated 6 million. Over a million currently live in Brazil, while Argentina plays host to 700,000. Much of the remainder live in Paraguay, Chile, Peru and Bolivia. In Ciudad Del Este, over 23,000 Muslims, mostly Lebanese, Syrians and Iranians, now control the economic and political life of the area which extends across the border to the city of Foz do Iguacu on the Brazilian side of Parana.

''Following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, and under major prodding from the CIA, police officers from the three adjoining nations swept into the area to scour for evidence that the tri-border region may have evolved into a haven for Islamic extremists. Paraguayan police rounded up numerous Arab immigrants and Paraguayan citizens who they claimed to have links to international terror groups. Among those arrested was Alejandro Weiss, the former Paraguayan consul to the United States of America. It was discovered that consul Weiss had sold over 300 passports, visas and cargo shipment authorizations at $8,000 a piece. These documents went to Lebanese, Syrian and Egyptian citizens suspected of terrorist connections. These individuals and their cargoes have since melted into the rapidly growing Arab community within the tri-border region.

Skipping to the end, On November 21, Otto Reich, the Assistant Secretary of State for the Western Hemisphere made the following statement. ''We have information that there are numerous people helping the Hizballah organization in the tri-border area. This includes financially helping terrorist groups in the Middle East.''

''Footnote: When taking a hard look at Islamic extremists in Latin America, one should not ignore Mexico. Within the last year, a former Mexican immigration official in Ciudad Juarez was imprisoned because of his involvement in smuggling hundreds of Iraqis and Palestinians into the United States of America since 1996. These Arabs apparently traveled up the land bridge from South America. Further, within the same time frame, Matamoros police arrested a migrant smuggler accused of sneaking numerous Pakistanis into the southwestern United States.

''One must conclude from all this Islamic extremist activity south of border that we must increase vigilance at our back door. The threat is clearly aimed at our homeland via the geography of our hemispheric neighbors. Continued sneaking of terrorists into America through our porous southern flank is a given, unless there is a major military or law enforcement presence implemented there in the very near future.''

While we were down there and in other briefings I have had from Border Patrol agents and from the INS, they will show you the number of people that they have arrested, and they identify them by country of origin. Over the last year and a half, it is fascinating to see what is happening, because there is the typical number from Mexico, and then they go through all of the other countries from which we are grabbing people that are coming into the country illegally.

In the last year and a half it was weird because Brazil just went off the charts. What is the idea there? What is happening is this. Brazil and the tri-border area is home to this group of Islamic extremists, they provide the transportation network that brings these people up through Mexico and into the United States. They come from all over the Middle East, they come through that tri-border area. They are culturated to a certain extent, and then moved into the United States. We have gotten all of these people with these Brazilian passports. It is a very odd thing.

But the point I am making is this: The folks that are coming into this country are not just looking for a job cutting your lawn or replacing your roof. Some of them, many of them, are coming to replace you, your very existence. They are coming across porous borders, and the only way that it can ever be dealt with is, I reiterate, to provide a major military or law enforcement presence on that border, northern and southern. It means the commitment of our military assets to a task that one would think would be the most logical task, the first task, to protect the homeland. Homeland defense.

There are 37,000 American troops on the border between North and South Korea. South Koreans tell us that they do not want them. There are demonstrations all of the time against American troops there. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly look long and hard at any proposal to bring those troops back home and put them on the border where I know they are wanted, and that is our border between Mexico and the United States and Mexico and Canada.

There are Muslim groups in Canada. When we were on the northern border, we were told about a Muslim group in Calgary, Canada. Odd as that might sound, that is what we were told by the Forest Service officials that were playing host to our group. And the reason they identified this group was this group was responsible, perhaps not all 25,000, but the Muslim population in Calgary that was responsible for the transportation of the narcotics of the drugs into the United States. They put them together here to make methamphetamines. And then the money that was garnered from this illegal trafficking in narcotics went back to this group in Calgary, Canada, and was then used to support terrorist organizations all over the world.

We were told that there is something like 100,000 Muslims in other major cities in Canada, including Vancouver. Again, an odd thing. Muslims in Canada and Brazil, yes, it is happening. It is documented. It is pretty peculiar, I agree, but it is a fact of life. It is not a fact that we want too much exposure on however because if most people in the United States understood this, knew this, there would be a call to do something about it, and their government would supposedly respond to that. I do not know that they would do it, but I know there would be a call to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a greater divide between what the people of this country want and what this government is willing to give them than in this area of immigration reform. The people want it. We are not willing to give it. Why? Because of the politics of the issue.

What do we do instead? We not only open the borders and keep them open, but we encourage even more people to come across. States are now providing various amenities, benefits to people to come here and live illegally. The Mexican consul in the United States is going around lobbying cities and States to get them to accept the matricular consular. It is a card handed out to Mexican nationals. They have every right to do that, but then the Mexican consul has gone out and asked cities and States to accept these cards as an ID for the provision of benefits and services, and many cities and States have agreed to do that.

That means that we are running a variety of immigration systems in this country. The Federal Government is saying here is what we give you. It is called a green card when you come into the United States legally, or a visa. And a city is saying I do not care about that, I will take this card given by the Mexican consul.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if an American consul official would go to a State official in Mexico or Canada and say would you please help me help people that are here illegally violate the Federal law, would you please help us. Well, there would be an international incident. The governments of Mexico and Canada would file a protest saying what are your consuls doing in my country trying to get people to break the law. That is exactly what is happening in America. Yet we have taken no action against it.

□ 2245

We have not even filed a protest. In fact, we do not want this to be known. It is happening in State after State. Colorado, my State, to its great credit, has passed through the House and through at least one committee in the Senate a bill to ban any acceptance of the matricular consular by the State and any local entity in Colorado. I hope States throughout the United States take this example and move forward quickly. I have introduced legislation to stop the Federal Government from doing this. Why would there even be opposition to this? Why would we be saying that we would accept for identification purposes anything but a U.S. or State government issued document? But we are doing it to accommodate illegal immigrants into this country because, Mr. Speaker, that is the only people that in fact need this card. The only people who need a card for identification purposes are people who are here illegally. Otherwise, you have something from our government. It is called, as I say, a green card or a visa. But if you are here illegally, you do not have that so you need this other card, and we are accommodating that. States and cities are doing it. Even the Federal Government is abetting it because we have not spoken out against it. We have not demanded that the Mexican consul stop this activity.

The State House in Washington last week, I think, passed a bill giving instate tuition. If Washington goes ahead, they will join several other States, Utah, Texas, California, I cannot remember, I think there is another State, that have done that. I wonder if they recognize, and, by the way, this is something I hope that they hear, Mr. Speaker, that in 1996 this Congress passed a law saying that if any State does that, if they give instate tuition to illegal residents in this country, then they have to give that same rate to everybody who applies, all outstate applicants have to be given the rate that they give to an illegal alien applying. So that will end outstate tuition for anybody wanting to go to Utah, California, Texas and Washington, anybody in the United States who chooses to leave their State and apply to any of these States for college; and if they are told that their costs are going to be much higher than the State resident, they could sue. I would certainly encourage them to do so because, of course, this is an activity that is designed to thwart the will of the Congress and the Nation.

How many immigration systems are we going to run in this country? And they are given driver's licenses and they are out lobbying for this. And everybody will say, But these people are just coming for jobs. Come on. It is good for the country. No, Mr. Speaker, there are major, negative implications to massive illegal immigration. Where are the ears to hear this? Why have we not as a body risen up and reflected the will of our constituents and demanded that these governments stop trying to infiltrate into the United States, stop trying to send their people in here illegally? There is a process to come into the United States legally. It is not the act of a friendly nation to encourage people to come across our borders illegally.

Michelle Malkin, I cannot say enough about her as an author and observer of the political scene, has written a book called ''Invasion'' to describe this phenomenon, and it is an invasion. It is the accurate word to describe what is happening to us. In order to stop it, we need to put our military on our borders to defend our Nation against this invasion. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, how we can look our constituents in the eye, any of us, when we go home if we have not done everything possible to defend the country. That includes using the military assets of this country for that purpose.

We do not have to place people arm in arm across the border. Technology now allows us to, in fact, monitor large tracts of land, be able to address the issue when it occurs, someone crossing a border; we have sensors that can identify a person as opposed to a deer or an animal coming across. We have drones, unmanned aerial vehicles we can use on our borders. I have seen it work. We tried it on the northern border for a 2-week stint, 100 Marines using three drones and two radar stations controlling 100 miles of border in some of the most rugged areas of the country. We can do it. It is not an issue of resources. People will say, it just costs too much. A Member of the other body indicated, and he is from Arizona, that we could not put troops on our borders because we are about to go to war. I would suggest that there is a problem there, because we are at war in a way, in his own State, I should say. Therefore, those troops could be, I think, appropriately used there.

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that I know is uncomfortable for many to deal with; but it is nonetheless a real issue, something that needs to be dealt with by this body and by the American people. I appreciate the time that has been given me this evening to bring it to the attention of this body.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). The Chair reminds the body that characterizations of Members of the other body in this Capitol should not be used in debate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANDREWS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOEFFEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FRANKS of Arizona) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, March 5.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, March 5.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEAUPREZ, for 5 minutes, March 5.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BERMAN, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,970.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 5, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

884. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, Case Number 00-02, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

885. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, Case Number 00-05, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

886. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, Case Number 97-08, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

887. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force, Case Number 97-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

888. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 01-07, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

889. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 01-05, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

890. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 00-04, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

891. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy, Case Number 99-09E, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

892. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

893. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: New Hampshire; Plan for Controlling Emmissions from Existing Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerators [NH-50-7174a; FRL-7447-6] received February 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

894. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Control of Emmissions from New Marine Compression-Ignition Engines at or above 30 Liters per Cylinder [AMS-FRL-7448-9] received February 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

895. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report on the status the Foreign Military Financing Account Direct Loans, the Foreign Military Loan Liquidating Account Direct Loans and the Military Debt Reduction Account Direct Loans as of 30 September 2002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2765(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

896. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report containing an analysis and description of services performed by full-time USG employees during Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2765(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

897. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 04-03 which informs you of our intent to sign Amendment Number One to the NATO Improved Link Eleven Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the United States, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

898. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Norway [Transmittal No. DTC 285-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

899. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 287-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

900. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Italy [Transmittal No. DTC 284-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)and 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 286-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

902. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the FREEDOM Support Act, pursuant to Public Law 103—160, section 1203(d) and Public Law 102—511, section 502; to the Committee on International Relations.

903. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Dayton, OH [Docket No. FAA-2002-14045; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-13] received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

904. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Indianapolis, IN; Correction [Docket No. FAA-2002-13817; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-09] received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

905. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Circleville, OH [Docket No. FAA-2002-14179; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-08] received January 27, 2003; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

906. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Columbus, OH [Docket No. FAA-2002-14005; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-14] received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

907. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class D Airspace; Sparta, WI; Modification of Class E Airspace; Sparta, WI [Docket No. FAA-2002-14046; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-15] received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

908. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-85-AD; Amendment 39-13003; AD 2002-26-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

909. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-10, DC-9-20, DC-9-30, DC-9-40, and DC-9-50 Series Airplanes; and Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), DC-9-83 (MD-83), DC-9-87 (MD-87), and MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-53-AD; Amendment 39-12996; AD 2002-26-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

910. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Aircraft Company Beech Models 36, A36, A36TC, B36TC, 58, and 58A Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-CE-07-AD; Amendment 39-13012; AD 2003-01-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

911. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and -400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2002-NM-46-AD; Amendment 39-13018; AD 2003-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

912. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81), DC-9-82 (MD-82), and DC-9-83 (MD-83) Airplanes, and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-13009; AD 2002-26-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

913. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Co. CF6-80A Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2002-NE-44-AD; Amendment 39-13016; AD 2003-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

914. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL-600-2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-250-AD; Amendment 39-13013; AD 2003-01-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

915. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 204B, 205A-1, 205B and 212 Helicopters [Docket No. 2002-SW-14-AD; Amendment 39-13015; AD 2003-01-04] received

January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

916. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-290-AD; Amendment 39-13004; AD 2002-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

917. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Class E Airspace; Point Hope, AK [Docket No. FAA-2002-14076; Airspace Docket No. 02-AAL-6] received January 17, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

918. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Flint, MI [Docket No. FAA-2002-13820; Airspace Docket No. 02-AGL-11] received January 8, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

919. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Annisquam River and Blynman Canal, MA [CGD01-03-006] received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

920. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Jamaica Bay and Connecting Waterways, NY [CGD01-02-143] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

921. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 14.5 to 16.0, Cairo, IL [COTP Paducah, KY 03-003] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

922. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Notification of Arrival in U.S. Ports [USCG-2002-11865] (RIN: 2115-AG35) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

923. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operating Regulations; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, New Orleans, LA [CGD08-03-004] (RIN: 2115-AE47] (RIN:2115-AE47) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. LEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. WU, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. HART, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1046. A bill to assess the extent of the backlog in DNA analysis of rape kit samples, and to improve investigation and prosecution of sexual assault cases with DNA evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 1048. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of assistance for certain disabled veterans for specially adapted housing and automobile and adaptive equipment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 1049. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to allow the arming of pilots of cargo aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age limit for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEREUTER:

H.R. 1051. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to update the feasibility and suitability studies of four national historic trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 1052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the transportation fringe benefit to bicycle commuters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 1053. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a 7-year recovery period for depreciation of potato storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 1054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage and accelerate the nationwide production, retail sale, and consumer use of new motor vehicles that are powered by fuel cell technology, hybrid technology, battery electric technology, alternative fuels, or other advanced motor vehicle technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina):

H.R. 1055. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1901 West Evans Street in Florence, South Carolina, as the ''Dr. Roswell N. Beck Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MORAN of Virginia,Mr. WOLF, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WYNN, and Ms. WATSON):

H.R. 1056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts paid on behalf of Federal employees under Federal student loan repayment programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. BEREUTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BURR, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FORD, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GORDON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KELLER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MICA, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. OTTER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi,

Mr. TERRY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 1057. A bill to repeal the sunset of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 with respect to the expansion of the adoption credit and adoption assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 1058. A bill to provide for an exchange of certain private property in Colorado and certain Federal property in Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FROST:

H.R. 1059. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide increased access to military commissary stores for members of the Ready Reserve, persons who would be eligible for military retired pay (but for the fact that they are under 60 years of age), and their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 1060. A bill to provide for an exchange of lands with the United Water Conservation District of California to eliminate private inholdings in the Los Padres National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. REHBERG):

H.R. 1061. A bill to remove a restriction on the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with any Federal agency to acquire goods and services directly related to improving or using the wildfire fighting capability of those agencies; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Government Reform, 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. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1062. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make reimbursement for certain damages incurred as a result of bonding regulations adopted by the Bureau of Land Management on February 28, 1997, and subsequently determined to be in violation of Federal law; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 1063. A bill to limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1064. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize Bureau of Prison personnel to carry firearms off duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 1065. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to allow the Commissioner of Social Security reasonable discretion in applying the 10-year marriage requirement for entitlement of divorced spouses to spousal benefits in cases in which the divorce is in whole or in part the result of severe spousal or child abuse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 1066. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to safeguard the rights and expectations of consumers who lawfully obtain digital entertainment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1067. A bill to provide for the establishment of a memorial at the site in Alaqua, Florida, of the accidental bombing of a home by an aircraft of the United States Army Air Corps on August 11, 1944, which killed Alfred Cosson, James Cosson, James Cosson, Jr., and Winnie Lee Cosson and wounded five other family members; to the Committee on Resources, 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. NETHERCUTT (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HART, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1068. A bill to increase the supply of pancreatic islet cells for research, to provide better coordination of Federal efforts and information on islet cell transplantation, to collect the data necessary to move islet cell transplantation from an experimental procedure to a standard therapy, and to provide for a demonstration project on Medicare coverage of pancreatic islet cell transplantation for beneficiaries with type 1 diabetes who have end-stage renal disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, 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. OLVER (for himself, Mr. BASS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1069. A bill to establish the Freedom's Way National Heritage Area in the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PETRI (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MICA, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BAKER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. BAIRD):

H.R. 1070. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to improving transportation and security of household goods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REYES (for himself, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1071. A bill to establish the Southwest Regional Border Authority; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. SAXTON:

H.R. 1072. A bill to prohibit post-conflict assistance for Iraq from being expended with any French firm; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 1073. A bill to repeal section 801 of the Revenue Act of 1916; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMMONS:

H.R. 1074. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a projectin Connecticut, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SWEENEY (for himself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon):

H.R. 1075. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to dietary supplements containing natural or synthetic ephedrine group alkaloids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 1076. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATT (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FORD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1077. A bill to reauthorize the HOPE VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WICKER:

H.R. 1078. A bill to establish academies for teachers and students of American history and civics and a national alliance of teachers of American history and civics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BUYER, Mr. COLE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. GIBBONS,Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HILL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KLINE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. TURNER of Ohio, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.J. Res. 27. A joint resolution recognizing and commending the continuing dedication, selfless service, and commitment of members of the Armed Forces and their families during the Global War on Terrorism and in defense of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KUCINICH,Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr.

ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. FATTAH):

H.J. Res. 29. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of all citizens of the United States to a public education of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 30. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of citizens of the United States to health care of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to equality of rights and reproductive rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a clean, safe, and sustainable environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 34. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing the people of the United States progressively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to full employment and balanced growth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BEREUTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 60th anniversary of the historic rescue of 50,000 Bulgarian Jews from the Holocaust and commending the Bulgarian people for preserving and continuing their tradition of ethnic and religious tolerance; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H. Res. 120. A resolution to commend the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association on its proactive commitment to the security of general aviation; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Res. 121. A resolution endorsing increased efforts to preserve and protect Lake St. Clair as a vital part of the Great Lakes system; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. REGULA (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HOBSON, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. TURNER of Ohio):

H. Res. 122. A resolution recognizing the bicentennial of the admission of Ohio into the Union and the contributions of Ohio residents to the economic, social, and cultural development of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 21: Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 39: Mr. POMBO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SIMPSON, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HALL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. OTTER, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JOHN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 57: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 65: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 109: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 111: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 119: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 121: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 135: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 140: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 151: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 168: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 192: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MATHESON.

H.R. 196: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OWENS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 198: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 199: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. DEMINT.

H.R. 217: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 218: Mrs. BONO, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. FLETCHER.

H.R. 260: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 284: Mr. FARR, Mr. JOHN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. WATT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. WELLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 294: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 302: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 303: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MOORE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 308: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 315: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 318: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 331: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 391: Mr. CANNON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 412: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 436: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 442: Mr. HOLT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 459: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 466: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 478: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 490: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WELLER, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 496: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 501: Mr. CLYBURN and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 518: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CASE.

H.R. 522: Mr. EMANUEL and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 572: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 573: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 574: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 588: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 589: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Ms. HART, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 593: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 594: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FARR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BELL, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 626: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 648: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 655: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 661: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 687: Mr. GOODLATTE, MR. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 713: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 714: Mr. RENZI.

H.R. 721: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 722: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WELLER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. WATSON, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 725: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 735: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SCHROCK, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 737: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 738: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 740: Mr. OWENS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 741: Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 742: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 743: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 759: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 760: Mr. MICA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 771: Mr. KLINE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 784: Mr. MENENDEZ and Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 785: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 786: Mr. FROST, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H.R. 794: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 801: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 813: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 815: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 817: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 838: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 839: Mr. CANTOR, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 857: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 859: Mr. PAUL and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 870: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 871: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 872: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 876: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 878: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 894: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 896: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 919: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 953: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 973: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 983: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 1013: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1029: Ms. WATSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1043: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ENGLISH, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. TERRY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. BACA.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. STEARNS.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. CASE.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. VITTER.

H. Con. Res. 26: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. ROYCE.

H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. SHAW and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Con. Res. 39: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SANDERS.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. BACA, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Con. Res. 57: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. STARK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CASE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Res. 27: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 59: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H. Res. 72: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H. Res. 76: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 106: Mr. HILL, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H. Res. 109: Mr. HYDE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. FLAKE.

H. Res. 111: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FILNER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FARR, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. ENGEL.