



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2003

No. 055

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

*Washington, DC, April 7, 2003.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 273. An act to provide for the expeditious completion of the acquisition of land owned by the State of Wyoming within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 302. An act to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, to restore and extend the term of the advisory commission for the recreation area, and for other purposes.

S. 426. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit, James Division, South Dakota, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands and the Department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential lease-holders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 151) "An Act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the sexual exploitation of children," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr.

SESSIONS, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BIDEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 342) "An Act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements under that Act, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREGG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DODD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### 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 gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

### SALUTING SENATOR MOYNIHAN

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written recently about Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, scholar, politician, diplomat, public servant. We have been reminded again, in the wake of his passing, of his intellectual and political contributions dealing with the most sensitive and complex questions of our society. Ideas that were controversial when he first advanced them are now accepted as conventional wisdom.

I rise today to salute this giant and his greatest gift, which is to influence how America faces its challenges. He

was regarded appropriately as a tremendous architectural influence. No one over the last third of a century has done more to shape American communities. His influence can be seen from the steps of the Capitol with the creation of the Pennsylvania Avenue Redevelopment Corporation. He worked to restore once magnificent James Farley Post Office in New York back to life as a new Penn Station. He was the intellectual force behind the revolutionary 1991 ISTEA legislation, allowing communities to use transportation resources to shape their development rather than transportation choices shaping our communities. His legacy gave more power to citizens at all levels and made the money go farther to do more and better things.

As we begin the reauthorization this Congress of his landmark ISTEA legislation, we deal with many opportunities through wise infrastructure investment, a critical and underappreciated part of the Moynihan legacy. But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is an even more important part of his legacy for those of us who serve in this Chamber. At a time when our problems appear more complex and difficult and when our divisions appear deeper than ever before, Senator Moynihan gave us a blueprint for channeling the riches and power of America to greatness at home and abroad. At a time when the activities here somehow make the most monumental occasions appear smaller than life, we can look to this intellectual and political giant, himself larger than life, who had a gift to magnify the things he said and did. His advice for us would be to put aside the narrow and the partisan, not to rationalize what we know to be reckless or inappropriate in the name of the legislative process, and have the courage to

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2825

have the free exercise of ideas and debate, not to stifle discussion here on this floor.

Some of the Senator's more profound contributions initially appeared extraordinarily controversial. Only after they were entered into debate did their meaning take root and the controversial become the accepted. People here can honor the legacy of Senator Moynihan by doing the time-honored work of Congress, debating, listening, legislating, and working together in committee and in the House Chamber; and seize the tremendous opportunities to deal with world peace, the protection and economic security of our families and safeguarding the environment.

In honoring the memory of Senator Moynihan in practice, we will be honoring the trust that has been given to us by our constituents. We too can be larger than life rather than a side show while the real drama is worked out in some back room. We can reflect our own hearts and visions and the needs of our communities rather than being orchestrated by focus groups and special interests. Part of what characterized Senator Moynihan's genius was simply that he presented ideas regardless of the short-term public relations and political consequences. This meant that some people in Washington, D.C., were nervous working with him. It made it harder for some of the powers that be and the media pundits, but as the Senator proved time and time again, it made it easier to push America to do the right thing.

As someone raised in an often bipartisan or even nonpartisan Oregon political culture, this simple truth seems so obvious but somehow elusive in today's Washington, D.C. By doing our job as legislators, as independent, thoughtful representatives, we can make vital contributions during the most critical times since we were fighting Hitler and recovering from the Depression. I suspect the Senator himself would deem that to be a most fitting tribute to his legacy.

---

#### LET US DECLARE ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of news, of course, about the war in Iraq. Where are we going and how long is it going to take to win the military battle. I think it is important that we do not underestimate the length of time it is going to take for the transition after we win the military battle. Bradley Smith and now some former Iraqi officials have suggested at least 2 years, maybe 2 years of martial law to get a society and a people who for most of their adult lives have never lived under any rule except Saddam Hussein. The transition to a democracy is going to

take time. Brad also suggested that we should have a military base in Umm Qasr, down in the southeast corner of Iraq. How does all this play into probably the most extensive oil field potential for oil in the world in that country of Iraq?

This last weekend, some suggested that we are fighting in Iraq because of our dependence on foreign energy. While that is not true, the consequences of our dependence are certainly serious. This first became very clear to many of us during the Arab oil embargo during the early 1970s when at that time I was serving on the presidential oil policy commission. We need this foreign energy because it is a vital component for fostering economic growth, but considering the situation in Iraq, regardless of the consequences and the sluggishness of the economy, we need to reduce our energy dependence by serving and developing new sources of energy, and that need has probably never been greater in this country. This is why the energy bill passed out of our Committee on Science last week will be on the floor very shortly.

Oil and natural gas account for 39 and 23 percent of overall energy usage in our country. In the United States, domestic production of petroleum is nearly 8 million barrels a day, which includes 5.8 million barrels of crude oil and 2.2 million barrels of natural gas liquids; 8 million barrels a day in the United States. And while 11 countries have more petroleum reserves, we are currently the second largest producer in the world, behind only Saudi Arabia. Most of the new petroleum exploration taking place in the United States today is done by smaller companies. The bigger companies have decided they want to bypass the regulatory process, the environmental influence and the fact that we have already explored much in the United States for oil. So what we have left in the United States is mostly the smaller companies that are making this exploration.

Historically, conservation has been the primary method of reducing our dependence. It has been successful and we have seen American energy efficiency increase dramatically. Since 1970, GDP, our gross domestic product, has risen by 170 percent while energy consumption is up by only 42 percent. The energy bill will help us do even better with a focus on more efficient appliances, electricity generation and certainly automotive transmission. Because a growing economy would tend to increase use, the energy bill boosts our efforts to develop alternatives to petroleum. Today, America consumes about 19 million barrels of petroleum a day, about 44 percent of which is motor gasoline. That means a new motor fuel would have a dramatic impact on U.S. usage. The energy bill increases research into ethanol and biofuels made from agricultural crops. Science and research get substantial increases from language that we have added to the bill

in order to develop and perfect emerging technologies, including fusion energy and neutron source power, we have heard a lot about hydrogen cells for automobiles, and certainly improved clean coal technology.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, our dependence built up slowly over decades. Unfortunately it may also take decades to reduce that dependence, even under the best of circumstances. Shocks and problems will continue to cause many problems for our economy and our foreign policy. Still, if we act now, research can secure the energy that the American economy needs to grow and produce and it can result in more and better good-paying jobs, not only for our generation but for our kids and our grandkids.

---

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S VISIT TO BELFAST

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as you may know, President Bush is in Northern Ireland today to hold meetings with Prime Minister Blair to discuss and to strategize about the ongoing war in Iraq. While I understand that this important war summit will take up much of his time and energy, it is my hope that the President will take some time to discuss with Prime Minister Blair the current peace process in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, later this week, April 10 to be specific, will mark the fifth anniversary of the Good Friday Accords which set up the power-sharing government in Northern Ireland. Unfortunately, this power-sharing government has been suspended since October. Prime Minister Blair and his counterpart in Ireland, Bertie Ahern, have been negotiating for months with the representative parties to come up with an agreement that will allow for resumption of the Belfast Assembly.

As reported in today's New York Times, it seems the two prime ministers are planning to unveil an emergency formula that they hope will break the impasse and put the power-sharing government back on track. Mr. Speaker, while this is obviously good news, I worry that Prime Minister Blair will not go far enough to ensure that there is a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. Mr. Blair must take immediate steps in providing all residents of Northern Ireland the basic rights that they deserve. I hope that President Bush will use his influence with the Prime Minister to call on him to provide the people of Northern Ireland with a basic bill of rights. It is quite obvious to me that without a binding document that lays out the rights and liberties for all residents of Northern Ireland, the Belfast Assembly and the Good Friday Accords will not accomplish the goal of a permanent peace.

Citizens of Northern Ireland should be guaranteed, at a bare minimum, the right against unreasonable search and seizures, the right against being detained without charges filed and the right to openly practice one's religion.

Mr. Blair must also address the issue of policing and military presence in the north. For people to feel safe and secure, they must be assured that there is a police force that is representative of the local population. Mr. Blair should enact the Patten Commission's recommendation on police reform. The North must provide its citizens with a full, fair and just reform of their police service. The police service of Northern Ireland must be representative of all ethnic, religious and political groups in Northern Ireland.

The people of Northern Ireland must also have a basic sense that they are not under siege by a military force. The Good Friday Agreement sets out a framework for peace. If the people of Northern Ireland are to live together peacefully, they must not have a sense that they live in a police state.

Mr. Speaker, again I call on both President Bush and Prime Minister Blair to mark the fifth anniversary of the Good Friday Accords with an agreement that will have a lasting effect on Northern Ireland. I hope that Mr. Bush and Mr. Blair will use this opportunity in Northern Ireland to show the people of the North as well as the rest of the world that they are committed to making the agreement that was signed 5 years ago a true framework for a permanent peace.

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 45 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 Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

This faithless generation looks to You for a sign, Lord God. Your Word once came to Jeremiah with the question: "What do you see, Jeremiah?" The prophet replied: "I see a branch of the watching tree." Then, Lord, You said to him: "Well have you seen, for I am watching to fulfill my Word."

Lord, we keep watching on television a distant war, looking for signs of its ending. In our prayer we ponder Your Word, waiting for its fulfillment of peace.

Suddenly, the subtlety of Your language, Lord, reveals a hidden meaning.

The Hebrew name for the almond tree contains a play on words with "I am watching."

With us and in us You keep vigil for a springtime of promise, for the almond tree got its name as the watching tree because it is the first to blossom in the early rise of spring, as though it had never been sleeping.

Lord, You have been watching with us. You are with us, now and forever.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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.

#### HONORING DAVID BLOOM

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as we look at the tragic loss of life which has taken place through this war which, thank God, is being successful, there are obviously the families of those men and women in uniform, but there are also some familiar faces who tragically have been lost.

Michael Kelly, we got the word last Friday, was lost; and over the weekend, we heard the word that my good friend and a great reporter, David Bloom, tragically died.

I got to know David Bloom because he was a student at one of the Claremont Colleges I attended, and we became friends several years ago. While he did not cover Capitol Hill, I had the opportunity to travel with him, and we were, oh, so proud of his reporting.

A couple of weeks ago, I had dinner with a Marine Corps general who was talking about the great coverage that MSNBC was providing, and David Bloom was one of the great reporters. He had that "Bloom-Mobile," which traveled, as the chaplain just talked about, how we are all watching on television. We saw him move and provide fascinating reports.

He was praised by his colleagues over the past couple of days, and I just would like to say that my thoughts and prayers go to his wife, Melanie, and their lovely daughters.

#### COMMENDING OUR SOLDIERS

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I was about to come over, there was a young man in my office visiting one of my staffers, Lance Corporal Jason C. Smedley, and he was proudly displaying his Purple Heart. He had been wounded in an attack in An Nasiriya, Iraq, on March 26, 2003, and is now home to recuperate, and as we talked about what he would do next, he said, "I want to hurry up and get well so I can go back and rejoin my unit."

I was struck by that, struck by his seriousness, by his desire, and struck by the fact that he said that there is still much work to do, to try and rebuild what we are at this moment helping to tear down.

So I simply commend again to all of the soldiers who are giving of themselves in this time in honor of their country, looking for a better future and a better tomorrow.

#### HONORING NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, shortly we will honor someone who was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives for a number of years here, Congressman Norman D. Shumway, who served the 14th Congressional District for 12 years prior to his retirement at the end of the 101st Congress, ending in the first days of 1991. I was privileged to be his successor to Congress.

Mr. Shumway had a distinguished career here and served on what was then called, I think, the Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

He has been a long, long-time resident of San Joaquin County and served on the board of supervisors there; and he and his wife were very involved in the community, made great contributions, and soon I believe the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) will be bringing up a resolution to name a post office in his honor.

Norm Shumway epitomizes the type of person we would like to have representing the people of the United States, someone who believes in this country, in its values, someone who believes in faith and family and hard work, and someone who has a great appreciation for the blessings of freedom and who worked during his years here to promote the values that have made this country a great place to be.

I have not seen Norm for several years. Norm and Luana, but I consider them dear friends, and I am very, very pleased to join with my colleagues here shortly in honoring Norm for the service that he had here.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

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

RECORD votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

DR. ROSWELL N. BECK POST  
OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1055) 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".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1055

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

**SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.**

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1901 West Evans Street in Florence, South Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Dr. Roswell N. Beck Post Office Building".

**SEC. 2. REFERENCES.**

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Dr. Roswell N. Beck Post Office Building".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

H.R. 1055, introduced by my distinguished colleague from the State of South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), designates 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.

Mr. Speaker, the great State of South Carolina and indeed all of America lost a wonderful humanitarian when Dr. Roswell Nathaniel Beck, Sr., sadly passed away in January. Dr. Beck, who was not only a caring man, but in fact, a practicing physician, was

probably best known as an ambitious community organizer and political activist in the Florence area. I understand he was one of the most influential and beloved personalities in South Carolina's 6th District, which the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) represents. More importantly, Dr. Beck was a wonderful family man, as well as a friend to countless South Carolina residents, who looked up to him.

I assure Dr. Beck's family, especially his wife, Barbara and their children, Janice, Celeste, and Dr. Roswell Beck, Jr., and friends that the thoughts and prayers of all Members in this House are with them.

Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that this House recognize Dr. Roswell N. Beck by naming a post office building after him in his hometown of Florence, South Carolina. Therefore, I urge all Members to support the passage of H.R. 1055.

I thank my colleague from South Carolina for introducing this important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman, in consideration of H.R. 1055, legislation naming a postal facility after the late Dr. Roswell N. Beck, Sr.

H.R. 1055, introduced by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) on March 4, 2003, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire South Carolina congressional delegation.

Dr. Beck was born in South Carolina, attended Fisk University and received his medical degree at the prestigious Meharry College of Medicine in Nashville, Tennessee. After completing his residency in Baltimore, Maryland, and Mt. Sinai in New York, Dr. Beck served with great distinction in the Korean War as a medic in the Medical Corps. After winning a Bronze Star for service rendered in the war, Dr. Beck returned home to live and practice in Florence, South Carolina.

Described by the many dignitaries who attended his funeral on January 10, 2003, as a great humanitarian, physician, political power broker, accomplished musician and family man, Dr. Beck's life was dedicated to improving the quality of life for his fellow man. He organized the Florence Committee for Community Affairs, brought the first Head Start program to his town, served as chairman of the Voter Education Project, was an active member of the South Carolina Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse and the South Carolina Commission on Human Relations, and served as a trustee of the Medical University of South Carolina.

□ 1415

As chairman of the Voter Education Project, Dr. Beck was the driving force

in promoting the need for citizens to register and vote.

As an active member of his church and community, Dr. Beck was the recipient of numerous awards and citations. He is survived by his wife, Barbara Beck, and their three children, Janice Beck, Celeste Abdullah, and Dr. Roswell N. Beck, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), for seeking to honor Dr. Roswell N. Beck, Sr., in this manner. I urge swift passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) was trying to get here, and maybe he will come before we finish the next bill and will get an opportunity to speak to his bill naming the post office after Dr. Roswell N. Beck.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and while I have no further requests for time, I would like to ensure that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) has the opportunity to place his statement, when it comes in, at the appropriate point in the RECORD. It is he and his office that have called this bill to our attention, and we are very happy to move it very quickly to honor the memory of this very great South Carolinian.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the author of this legislation.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I especially thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill honors the life and accomplishments of a consummate country doctor, the memory of a decorated Korean War veteran, the heroism of a courageous American, and the fearlessness of an outstanding South Carolinian, Dr. Roswell Nathaniel Beck, Sr.

Dr. Beck was born in Georgetown, South Carolina. After completing high school, he left the safe confines of his home and matriculated at Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, where he received a bachelor of arts degree. After completing his course work at Fisk, Dr. Beck attended Meharry Medical College where he received his medical degree. After finishing his medical residency requirements in Baltimore, Maryland, Dr. Beck returned to South Carolina in 1948 and began practicing in Florence. He took great pride in addressing the medical needs of his community.

In 1951, Dr. Beck left South Carolina once again, but this time it was to answer the call of his country and serve in the Korean War. Dr. Beck performed valiantly in the medical corps and was awarded the Bronze Star for service in war.

Upon his return to South Carolina, Dr. Beck sought to not only confront the physical ailments of his community but set his sights on the social malignancies that afflicted so many of his patients. Dr. Beck was courageously and very fearlessly thrust into the vortex of the civil rights activities in South Carolina. He served as the chairman of the Voter Education Project for the sixth congressional district, where he tirelessly promoted the importance and the need for citizens to register and vote. He organized the Florence Committee for Community Affairs and was instrumental in bringing the first Head Start program to Florence, South Carolina.

In addition to his courageousness, Dr. Beck was fearlessly following his heart throughout his career. He also had a keen sense of history. Mr. Speaker, in 1972, when Shirley Chisholm made her courageous history-making run for the Presidency, the record will show that she received two delegate votes from South Carolina. Dr. Beck was one of them and I the other.

During his distinguished career, Dr. Beck also served on the boards of the South Carolina Commission on Human Relations and the South Carolina Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse. He also served on the Board of Trustees of the Medical University of South Carolina. He was awarded the Order of the Palmetto by Governor Richard W. Riley of South Carolina and named Medical Doctor of the Year by the intercounty Medical, Dental, and Pharmaceutical Association.

Dr. Beck holds an esteemed place in the hearts of many South Carolinians. I am particularly proud of and owe a great deal of debt of gratitude to him. His work as a physician, humanitarian, community activist, and family man has touched the lives of multitudes. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I would be standing here today were it not for the courageousness and fearlessness of this man, who so many of us consider a hero.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Beck has received many recognitions and awards; and I am honored that this august body is about to bestow upon his memory and his family yet another. Mr. Speaker, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1901 West Evans Street in Florence, South Carolina, as the Roswell N. Beck Post Office Building is not only fitting but proper.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply note that it seems to me that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) ran in good company.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for introducing this. It is an important recognition,

and I think he very lucidly laid out for the House his reasons for doing it.

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 Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1055.

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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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.

#### EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE ON FINANCIAL LITERACY FOR YOUTH MONTH

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 127) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a month should be designated as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### H. RES. 127

Whereas the informed use of credit and other financial products and services benefits individual consumers and promotes economic growth;

Whereas financial literacy encourages greater economic self-sufficiency, higher levels of homeownership, and enhanced retirement security, particularly among low- and moderate-income Americans;

Whereas the past decade has seen declining personal savings rates, increased bankruptcy filings, and rising percentages of family income devoted to servicing household debt;

Whereas millions of Americans, the "unbanked", have never established account relationships at mainstream, insured depository institutions;

Whereas 55 percent of college students acquire their first credit card during their first year in college, and 83 percent of college students have at least 1 credit card;

Whereas 45 percent of college students are in credit card debt, with the average debt being \$3,066;

Whereas only 26 percent of 13- to 21-year-olds reported that their parents actively taught them how to manage money;

Whereas a 2002 study by the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy found that high school seniors know even less about credit cards, retirement funds, insurance, and other personal finance basics than seniors did 5 years ago;

Whereas a 2002 survey by the National Council on Economic Education found that a decreasing number of States include personal finance in their educational standards for students in Kindergarten through 12th grade;

Whereas financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion of an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas personal financial management skills and long-lived habits develop during childhood;

Whereas personal financial education is essential to ensure that our youth are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens; and

Whereas the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy, its State affiliates, and its partner organizations have designated each April as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month", the goal of which is to educate the public about the need for increased financial literacy for youth in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of "Financial Literacy for Youth Month"; and

(2) requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe "Financial Literacy for Youth Month" with appropriate programs and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes of this debate.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration, House Resolution 127, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 127, introduced by my distinguished colleague, chairman of the Committee on Rules from the State of California (Mr. DREIER), recognizes and supports the goals and ideals of a Financial Literacy for Youth Month.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman for introducing this measure. Personal financial management is one of the most important skills for any American citizen to acquire, yet not enough emphasis seems to be put in our society on teaching these abilities to our Nation's young people. Establishing a personal budget, managing credit and debt, tracking purchases, and balancing checking, savings, and retirement accounts are tasks as difficult as they are essential. But the individual security that comes with being financially literate and responsible is invaluable for everyone. That is why it should be a goal of all Americans to work to teach our Nation's youth the basic financial literacy skills they will need to live a life of financial security.

That is why I am pleased that this House is considering this important

resolution at a time when economic confidence is such a relevant value. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 127, as amended; and again I congratulate my colleague from California for introducing this important measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Rules which encourages the JumpStart Coalition's efforts to designate April as Financial Literacy Month for Youth. As the resolution notes, 83 percent of college students have at least one credit card; and of those, 45 percent have an average credit card debt of over \$3,000. This is at a time when a decreasing number of States include personal finance in their education standards for kindergarten through 12th grade.

This resolution serves as a wake-up call for all of us, the administration, Congress, and the American taxpayer. The JumpStart Coalition's aim is to identify personal finance materials for educating our youth. To that end they have established 12 must-know personal finance principles for young people if they want to make a positive difference in their financial outlook.

At this time of budget and tax cuts and a floundering economy, all of us might benefit from hearing these 12 financial principles. It does not really matter whether you are young or old. They are:

Map your financial future. Do not expect something for nothing. High returns equal high risk. Know your take-home pay. Compare interest rates. Pay yourself first. Money doubles by the rule of 72, and that is to determine how long it will take your money to double, divide the interest into 72. Your credit past is your credit future. Start saving young. Stay insured. Budget your money. Do not borrow what you cannot repay. And let me add one more, especially since the 15th is not too far away. Pay all of your taxes.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this resolution designating April as Financial Literacy for Youth Month, and I urge all of us to strongly support it.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the State of California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished sponsor of this legislation.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my appreciation to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr.

DAVIS), the Davis twins here, who have moved this measure forward for us. They have outlined quite well exactly what it is that we are trying to do.

When I was a kid, Mr. Speaker, I got my first passbook savings account; and I was stunned when I put a little bit of my allowance into the account. It actually grew without my doing anything other than having it there in that account. I was told by my father I needed to establish some credit. It has not always been great, but he told me that I needed to establish credit, which was another very, very important lesson that I learned as a child.

I believe that the whole idea of individual initiative and responsibility for one's actions is very important. I had that instilled in me as a kid. But one of the things that we found, tragically, is that with the proliferation of credit cards, just mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and the issue of just trying to balance a checkbook, which my friend from Virginia raised, we have young people who do not have an understanding of the basics of what it takes to meet one's financial obligations. So that is why the JumpStart Coalition, and a wide range of other groups, have joined in providing strong support for focusing on April as Financial Literacy for Youth Month.

Mr. Speaker, I have been joined by my colleagues, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY), and others who have been cosponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services; the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT); the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD); the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS), as well as others.

One of the things we found over the past several years, Mr. Speaker, is that we have seen a tremendous increase in the number of bankruptcies, up to 1.6 million bankruptcies last year alone.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about my having a passbook savings account when I was a kid. We have noticed that the personal savings rate has dropped from 4.7 percent in 1998 to 2.3 percent in 2001. I believe that this legislation will help us focus some attention on this initiative.

Now, the National Council on Academic Education is an organization which has put together some of the tools for schools around this country to try and enhance financial literacy among our young people. I am very pleased in the district which I am privileged to represent, the Cucamonga Middle School, the Glendora High School, Monrovia High School, Ranch Cucamonga High School and San Dimas High School have all utilized the information that has come forward from the National Council on Economic Education.

We also have others around the country who are doing the same thing.

I want to say that the stellar leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) has led him to expeditiously move this legislation, which I believe is going to enjoy strong bipartisan support due to the strong and resonant statement from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). I urge my colleagues to join in supporting it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) has a great deal of interest in this legislation and hopes to be able to speak on the legislation.

I will simply close by stating that my mother used to say that a penny saved is a penny earned and my father used to say if one takes care of their nickels, the dimes will take care of themselves. It seems to me, that kind of logic is inherent in urging young people to pay attention at an early age to their financial concerns.

I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for its introduction, and urge all Members to support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 127, stating that a month should be designated for Financial Literacy for Youth. I believe that financial literacy is an empowering tool, and this is something that can benefit all individuals, regardless of their class or background. Designating a month for programs and activities designed to learn more about financial planning is a phenomenal idea, and I am a staunch supporter of the effort.

Gaining more knowledge of fiscal and budget management leads to wiser financial decisions in the future. Too often we have people who are not taught these skills in their childhood, and have a difficult time managing their money later in life. Higher financial literacy encourages greater economic self-sufficiency, higher letter of home ownership, as well as enhanced retirement security.

In my own district in Houston, Texas, I am an advocate of the WOW program, With Ownership, Wealth. Families that have invested in their houses are also investing in the community. When each person has an interest in keeping his or her communities safe, clean and properly taken care of, then the property value will raise. As owners of the homes, this will yield more prosperity on each account, for the community and for the individual.

Financial literacy should also be encouraged for our students entering college. A college freshman is inundated with credit card offers, promising more wealth and responsibilities than they have ever had before. Without proper financial skills, a credit card can lead to student debt, creating more burdens and hardships than necessary. Financial literacy month can reach out to these students, to understand the fiscal consequences of their action, and protect them from future debts that can be difficult to relieve, particularly at a time when building a sound credit history is so vital.

Financial literacy is also important for our elderly population. Since social security and pensions often do not cover all of the basic needs, proper financial planning is often needed to insure that people will be taken care of

post retirement. A Financial Literacy Month can provide outreach to the younger populations who often fail to think of securing their futures until it is too late.

I am proud to support this Financial Literacy for Youth Month, and thank my colleagues for bringing this idea to the house floor. If we can empower the youth in our nation to make smart, economical decisions, we all stand to benefit.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 127, to designate a "Financial Literacy for Youth Month."

To ensure the strength and resiliency of our nation's economy, it is vital that we instill in our next generation of consumers an understanding of today's increasingly complex financial world.

In a recent survey of our high school seniors' financial knowledge by the Jumpstart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy, over half received a failing grade, a percentage that has grown not only in the past five years, but in the five years before that as well. Yet the number of students using credit cards and ATM cards has gone up—45 percent of college students have credit card debt averaging \$3066. As this trend grows, we need to make sure they understand the implications and responsibility of credit.

Currently, fewer than 30 percent of young Americans are even given the opportunity to take money management or personal finance classes in high school. This needs to change.

There are as many as 10 federal departments and agencies that today offer a wide variety of educational programs and resources along with a growing number of states and private programs. Just last May, the Treasury established an Office of Financial Education. We need to ensure that schools nationwide are aware of these programs and encouraged to utilize them.

With America's youth spending about \$150 billion annually and more and more marketing campaigns targeting youth, it is important to give them the tools they need to make smart financial decisions.

In the 1990s, personal bankruptcies rose by 69 percent, and we need to combat this trend. Educating the next generation early and well will help to contribute to the nation's economic vitality.

They need to understand that there are serious consequences to mismanaging one's finances. They need to know that there are investing options other than putting your money in a savings account. They need to understand the importance of starting to prepare for retirement early.

They need to understand that the long-term pain of mismanaged personal debt is not worth the short-term gain. The need to understand that responsible use of today's financial tools can help them to maximize their purchasing power.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for recognizing this vital need and I urge my colleagues to support this important initiative.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support as a cosponsor of House Resolution 127, naming April the Financial Literacy for Youth Month, and I commend Congressman DAVID DREIER for introducing this important legislation.

I always say that education is the key to success, and providing financial literacy for

our youth is an integral part of that process. The resolution expresses the sense of the House that the President should issue a proclamation calling on the federal government, states, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

Designating April as the Financial Literacy for Youth Month should raise public awareness about the need for increased financial literacy in our schools and the serious problems that may be associated with a lack of understanding about personal finances. As Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan noted recently:

Today's financial world is highly complex when compared with that of a generation ago. An understanding of how to maintain a checking and savings account at a local financial institution may have been sufficient twenty-five years ago. Today's consumers, however, must be able to differentiate between a wide range of products, services, and providers of financial products to successfully manage their personal finances. Certainly, young adults have access to credit at a much earlier age than their parents did. Accordingly, they need a more comprehensive understanding of credit than was afforded to the previous generation—including the impact of compounding interest on debt balances and the implications of mismanaging credit accounts. In addition, as technological advances have contributed significantly to the dramatic changes within the financial services market, consumers more generally must be familiar with the role that computers play in the conduct of every traditional financial transaction, from withdrawing funds to gaining access to credit.

For these reasons and many more, it is imperative that we ensure our youth's financial literacy. Although several groups, including the Department of the Treasury's Office of Financial Education, have recommended that this be accomplished by incorporating financial literacy into math and English classes, I personally believe that we need to focus more on individual financial literacy curriculums. The Federal government should provide additional funds to accomplish this goal. Granted, the No Child Left Behind Act makes \$385 million available in Innovation State Grant funds for distribution to the states, but only some of that money will be used to fund financial education initiatives. We need to do more, and we need to use April, the Financial Literacy for Youth Month, to work towards these goals. On the state level, I would hope that the education boards would focus on financial literacy and work with their state legislatures to require at least two semesters of financial literacy as a requirement for graduation from high school. In my own state of Texas, the Independent Bankers Association of Texas has been working diligently towards such a change in curriculum. I hope that more take up this cause.

Some may ask why I am so interested in financial literacy. The reason is that I represent one of the poorest Districts in the nation where people still keep their money in their house and under their mattresses. I am speaking of the "unbanked." Those individuals who tend to be exploited by payday lenders, use expensive money grams for remittances and are subject to crime because they have not entered the mainstream banking system. It is for these people that I am interested in financial literacy and for these reasons that I cosponsored this bill.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 127, recognizing April as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month". I am pleased to join my friend and colleague from California, Mr. DREIER, in raising awareness of the need for our youth to learn financial management skills at an early age. If our schools don't teach the ABC's of financial literacy, it doesn't take an accountant to understand that our children are more likely to fall into debt and behind in life.

The financial world has dramatically changed over the last 20 years. The passage of complex laws, like Gramm-Leach-Bliley, has created a whole new world of integrated financial service products and possibilities. While we certainly don't expect children to understand the ins-and-outs of deregulation, some of the effects of this new and modern system are slowly starting to surface and will impact them later on in life.

Mr. Speaker, with all these new choices there is a new responsibility on our part to educate our youth. Why? Because teaching them about personal finance is the best way to prepare them for a financially rewarding adulthood as contributing members of society.

They need to know how to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens. It is through financial education that these young consumers will learn to capitalize on the choices and flexibility that this new world has created.

The most effective time to impact basic financial and economic knowledge is during students' formative years, through the K-12 education system. In passing H. Res. 127 it is my hope that public officials and educators will focus on this critical learning area. While the landmark "No Child Left Behind Act" focused on mathematics and reading education, policymakers and local educators can use this as an opportunity to integrate economics and personal finance into these and other subject matters.

A survey that will be released later this month by the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) illustrates accomplishments and challenges in the areas of economics and personal finance education. NCEE's "Survey of the States" found that 48 states in 2002 and the District of Columbia had economic education standards in place, up from 38 states in NCEE's first "Survey" in 1998. Testing for economics increased from 25 states in 1998 to 27 states in 2002.

However, in the area of personal finance, less progress has been evident. While 40 states had set standards for personal finance education in 2000, only 31 states renewed such standards in 2002. Of those 31 states, only 14 require the standards to be implemented.

Make no mistake—personal finance is the key to helping our youth avoid the pitfalls of foreclosure, predatory lending and credit counseling as adults.

Mr. Speaker, the President's sweeping education reform bill that we passed in the last Congress addresses many of the academic skills that our youth need to succeed. We cannot forget about the need to teach our youth more than purely academic skills. We mustn't forget life skills. We must help them learn to manage their personal finances.

It is our duty to help them succeed in today's increasingly sophisticated world of finance.

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

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has put it very eloquently. 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 Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 127, as amended.

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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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.

#### NORMAN SHUMWAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1368) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7554 Pacific Avenue in Stockton, California, as the "Norman Shumway Post Office Building," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1368

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

#### SECTION 1. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7554 Pacific Avenue in Stockton, California, shall be known and designated as the "Norman D. Shumway Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Norman D. Shumway Post Office Building.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO).

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1368 designates the postal facility at 7555 Pacific Avenue in Stockton, California, as the Norman D. Shumway Post Office Building. I wish to thank the entire California delegation for their support of this legislation, as well as the gen-

tleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for his committee's expeditious handling of the bill.

Former Congressman Shumway's leadership reflected three major goals: first, to restore government back to the people; second, to build the people's confidence in government; and third, to make government accessible and effective for his constituents.

Elected to Congress in 1978, Norm was overwhelmingly reelected to each succeeding congressional term until his retirement in January 1991.

Norm was a man of the people who always made time for personal meetings at his home and in D.C. He was keenly aware of and committed to the needs of all of his constituents, whether they were children or seniors, farmers or businessmen, military or civilian. As the representative of a large farming district, Norm worked hard to promote policies enabling farmers to meet the demands of the domestic marketplace. He was a strong proponent of senior citizens as he brought several aging committee hearings to the district to address the needs of older Americans.

Before and after his service in Congress, Norm worked diligently for the people of California on the San Joaquin Board of Supervisors, where he served as both chairman and vice chairman, and the Public Utilities Commission in California where he served as commissioner for 4 years.

Naming the Pacific Avenue Post Office after Norm is a small tribute to the Congressman for his contributions to California and our Nation.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) in consideration of H.R. 1368, a measure which names the Postal Service facility after former Representative Norm D. Shumway. H.R. 1368, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) of California on March 19, 2003, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire California congressional delegation.

Representative Norman D. Shumway served in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1978 until his retirement in January 1991. While in Congress, he served on a number of important committees, the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the House Select Committee on Aging.

A lifelong student of the customs and culture of the Japanese people, Representative Shumway was one of two Members of Congress who spoke fluent Japanese. As a result of his language skill and position on congressional committees, Norm participated in many seminars and conferences dealing with trade issues and U.S.-Japanese relationships.

Although retired for a number of years, Norm Shumway has remained active in his community, State and church. He is a lifelong member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and in that capacity, he has served as a missionary, seminary instructor, High Priest Group leader, Bishop, teacher and ward organist. He has served as a commissioner on the California Public Utilities Commission and parole board member of the California Narcotic Addiction Evaluation Authority.

Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the tradition of naming postal facilities after distinguished individuals, I thank our colleague for seeking to honor Norman D. Shumway in this manner, and urge swift passage of H.R. 1368.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have any additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chance to join in this salute to Norm Shumway as we prepare to name this post office in his honor.

In reviewing his biography, Norm has been a son of San Joaquin, and quite legitimately is. I do note in his biography he was actually born in Phoenix, Arizona, on July 28, 1934. In 1939 his family moved to California and was Norm was educated in the Stockton public school system and graduated from Stockton High School in 1952. He received his A.A. degree from Stockton which is now known as San Joaquin Delta Community College in 1954, and then as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned, Norm began his acquaintanceship with Japan when he served a church mission there from 1954 to 1958.

When he returned from the Orient, Mr. Shumway enrolled at the University of Utah from which institution he received a Bachelor of Science degree in political science in 1960, and then he commenced his legal education and graduated with a Juris Doctorate degree from the University of California's Hastings College of Law in San Francisco in 1963.

Mr. Shumway had been a partner in a Stockton law firm, and then in 1974 a vacancy occurred in the San Joaquin Board of Supervisors, and pursuant to State law at the time, the Governor, Ronald Reagan, appointed Norm to fill that vacancy and he was later elected to the same position and was reelected in 1976, and he served as chairman of the Board of Supervisors in 1978 prior to his election that same year to the United States House of Representatives.

Norm, I think it was mentioned, and his lovely wife Luana are the parents of six children and 30 grandchildren. As has been mentioned before, he has been a very faithful member of the Church Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and has served in numerous positions; after

leaving here and serving briefly, I think for several years, on the California Public Utilities Commission, he then served as a Mission President in Japan for 3 years. Then he and Luana returned, and I believe it was later on in the year of their return they were asked to go back to Japan again, where they served in the Public Information Office for one of the missions in the church over there; and I think they were there for perhaps another 3 years.

Norm and Luana now serve in Utah as Director of Church Hosting which involves educating distinguished visitors to Utah about the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, its mission and its organization.

Norm is an outstanding person and has a great deal left to contribute, and is actively doing so at this time as he and his wife Luana make their home in Bountiful, Utah, where they are serving the church on this mission. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to share these comments.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I guess I am the only Member in the Chamber who had the privilege of serving with Norm Shumway. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for moving this legislation.

I think probably the greatest testament to the success of Norm Shumway is the fact that it took both the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) to fill his shoes because both represent the area that Norm Shumway was first elected to.

My colleagues have gone through the litany of accomplishments in his great work on his church mission. It has been mentioned that he speaks fluent Japanese, and I believe that is a great talent which he utilized here. At one time, he was the only Member of Congress who spoke Japanese, and I do not know if anyone since he left speaks Japanese but he is very, very thoughtful and very aware of all of the issues as they relate to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of sitting with Mr. Shumway on the Committee on Banking, and he had an unwavering commitment to free market principles. I always knew that I could follow the lead of my senior colleague on the committee when it came to dealing with issues that related to financial services. He was a very, very principled Member, and I think it is a great tribute for us to name this post office for him.

I had the privilege of campaigning with Norm Shumway on behalf of the election of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), and he still won in spite of the fact that I was cam-

paigned for him. We were at the University of Pacific stadium, had a wonderful evening there, and Norm gave a great speech in support of the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) in that effort. Even after having left the Congress, he has maintained a strong commitment to this institution.

I would like to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations and best wishes to his wonderful wife, Luana, and their six children and 30 grandchildren whom we just heard about.

□ 1445

So I again thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman TOM DAVIS) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for moving this important legislation, and I congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for doing a reasonably good job at succeeding Norm Shumway.

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

I thank my colleague from California for adding to the legacy of Norm Shumway.

He was known for effectively representing the business community in the House where he rose as ranking member of the Committee on Banking Finance and Urban Affairs' Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization. He was a soft-spoken Member who often communicated to his constituents and the public by writing articles for selected journals, newspapers, and other publications.

He has continued, as has been noted, to altruistically work for public interests even leaving this body, serving on the Public Utilities Commission for the State of California as a commissioner for 4 years. Subsequently, the Governor appointed him to the Narcotic Addict Evaluation Authority where he worked for another year.

He now lives with his wife in Bountiful, Utah, where he valiantly tries to keep tabs on his 30 grandchildren. I know I speak for all Members when I say the House wishes him well.

We honor him today, and I urge all Members to honor him by supporting the passage of H.R. 1368. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) for introducing this important measure. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for being here and carrying on his legacy.

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 Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1368, as amended.

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. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. 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.

#### 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. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 48 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. CULBERSON) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1559. An act making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 10, 2003, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1559) "An Act making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BYRD, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. REID, Mr. KOHL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Ms. LANDRIEU to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### 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.R. 1055, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 127, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 1368, by the yeas and nays.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DR. ROSWELL N. BECK POST  
OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1055.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1055, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 383, nays 0, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—383

Abercrombie	Culberson	Hefley
Ackerman	Cummings	Hensarling
Aderholt	Cunningham	Herger
Akin	Davis (AL)	Hill
Alexander	Davis (CA)	Hobson
Allen	Davis (FL)	Hoekstra
Andrews	Davis (IL)	Holden
Baca	Davis (TN)	Holt
Baird	Davis, Jo Ann	Hooley (OR)
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hostettler
Baldwin	Deal (GA)	Houghton
Ballance	DeFazio	Hoyer
Ballenger	DeGette	Hunter
Barrett (SC)	Delahunt	Inslee
Bartlett (MD)	DeLauro	Isakson
Barton (TX)	DeLay	Israel
Bass	DeMint	Issa
Beauprez	Deutsch	Istook
Bell	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson (IL)
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson-Lee
Berkley	Dicks	(TX)
Berman	Dingell	Janklow
Berry	Doggett	John
Biggert	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (NY)	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (UT)	Dunn	Jones (NC)
Blackburn	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Blunt	Emanuel	Kaptur
Boehlert	Emerson	Keller
Boehner	Engel	Kelly
Bonilla	English	Kennedy (MN)
Bonner	Eshoo	Kennedy (RI)
Bono	Etheridge	Kildee
Boozman	Evans	Kilpatrick
Boswell	Farr	Kind
Boucher	Feeney	King (IA)
Bradley (NH)	Filner	King (NY)
Brady (PA)	Flake	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Foley	Kirk
Brown (OH)	Forbes	Klecza
Brown (SC)	Ford	Kline
Brown-Waite,	Fossella	Knollenberg
Ginny	Frank (MA)	Kolbe
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Kucinich
Burns	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Burr	Frost	Lampson
Burton (IN)	Garrett (NJ)	Langevin
Buyer	Gerlach	Lantos
Cannon	Gibbons	Larson (CT)
Cantor	Gilchrest	Latham
Capito	Gillmor	LaTourette
Capps	Gingrey	Leach
Capuano	Gonzalez	Lee
Cardin	Goode	Levin
Cardoza	Goodlatte	Lewis (GA)
Carson (IN)	Gordon	Lewis (KY)
Carson (OK)	Goss	Linder
Carter	Granger	LoBiondo
Case	Graves	Lofgren
Castle	Green (TX)	Lowe
Chabot	Green (WI)	Lucas (KY)
Chocola	Greenwood	Lynch
Clay	Grijalva	Majette
Clyburn	Gutknecht	Maloney
Coble	Hall	Manzullo
Cole	Harman	Markey
Collins	Harris	Marshall
Cramer	Hart	Matheson
Crane	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Crenshaw	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)
Crowley	Hayes	McColum
Cubin	Hayworth	McCotter

McCrery	Pickering	Smith (MI)
McDermott	Pitts	Smith (NJ)
McGovern	Platts	Smith (WA)
McHugh	Pombo	Snyder
McInnis	Pomeroy	Solis
McIntyre	Porter	Souder
McKeon	Price (NC)	Spratt
McNulty	Pryce (OH)	Stark
Meehan	Putnam	Stearns
Meek (FL)	Quinn	Stenholm
Meeks (NY)	Radanovich	Strickland
Menendez	Rahall	Sullivan
Mica	Ramstad	Tancredo
Michaud	Rangel	Tanner
Millender-	Regula	Tauscher
McDonald	Rehberg	Tauzin
Miller (FL)	Renzi	Taylor (MS)
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Terry
Miller (NC)	Reynolds	Thomas
Miller, Gary	Rodriguez	Thompson (CA)
Miller, George	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Mollohan	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Moore	Ross	Tiahrt
Moran (KS)	Rothman	Tiberi
Moran (VA)	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Murphy	Royce	Toomey
Musgrave	Ruppersberger	Turner (OH)
Myrick	Ryan (OH)	Turner (TX)
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Udall (CO)
Napolitano	Ryun (KS)	Udall (NM)
Nethercutt	Sabo	Upton
Ney	Sanchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Northup	T.	Velazquez
Norwood	Sanchez, Loretta	Visclosky
Nunes	Sanders	Walden (OR)
Nussle	Sandlin	Walsh
Oberstar	Saxton	Wamp
Obey	Schakowsky	Waters
Olver	Schiff	Watson
Ortiz	Schrock	Watt
Osborne	Scott (GA)	Waxman
Ose	Scott (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Otter	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Oxley	Serrano	Weller
Pallone	Shadegg	Wexler
Pascarell	Shaw	Whitfield
Pastor	Shays	Wicker
Paul	Sherman	Wilson (NM)
Pearce	Sherwood	Wilson (SC)
Pelosi	Shimkus	Wolf
Pence	Shuster	Woolsey
Peterson (MN)	Simmons	Wu
Peterson (PA)	Skelton	Wynn
Petri	Slaughter	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—51

Bachus	Gephardt	Owens
Becerra	Gutierrez	Payne
Boyd	Hinchey	Portman
Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Hoefel	Rohrabacher
Camp	Honda	Ros-Lehtinen
Combust	Hulshof	Rush
Conyers	Hyde	Sessions
Cooper	Jefferson	Simpson
Costello	Jenkins	Smith (TX)
Cox	Larsen (WA)	Stupak
Dooley (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Sweeney
Everett	Lipinski	Taylor (NC)
Fattah	Lucas (OK)	Towns
Ferguson	Vitter	McCarthy (MO)
Fletcher	Murtha	Weiner
Gallegly	Neal (MA)	Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes in which to record their vote.

□ 1851

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the next vote will be conducted as a 5-minute

vote, and the final vote will be a 15-minute vote.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE ON  
FINANCIAL LITERACY FOR  
YOUTH MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 127, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 127, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Clay	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Clyburn	Gordon
Aderholt	Coble	Goss
Akin	Cole	Granger
Alexander	Collins	Graves
Allen	Cramer	Green (TX)
Andrews	Crane	Green (WI)
Baca	Crenshaw	Greenwood
Baird	Crowley	Grijalva
Baker	Cubin	Gutknecht
Baldwin	Culberson	Hall
Ballance	Cummings	Harman
Ballenger	Cunningham	Harris
Barrett (SC)	Davis (AL)	Hart
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Barton (TX)	Davis (FL)	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Davis (IL)	Hayes
Beauprez	Davis (TN)	Hayworth
Bell	Davis, Jo Ann	Hefley
Bereuter	Davis, Tom	Hensarling
Berkley	Deal (GA)	Hill
Berman	DeFazio	Hobson
Berry	DeGette	Hoekstra
Biggert	Delahunt	Holden
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Holt
Bishop (GA)	DeLay	Hooley (OR)
Bishop (NY)	DeMint	Hostettler
Bishop (UT)	Deutsch	Houghton
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hoyer
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hunter
Blunt	Dicks	Inslee
Boehlert	Doggett	Isakson
Boehner	Doolittle	Israel
Bonilla	Doyle	Issa
Bonner	Dreier	Istook
Bono	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Boozman	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Boswell	Edwards	(TX)
Boucher	Ehlers	Janklow
Bradley (NH)	Emanuel	John
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Johnson (CT)
Brady (TX)	Engel	Johnson (IL)
Brown (OH)	English	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (SC)	Eshoo	Johnson, Sam
Brown-Waite,	Etheridge	Jones (NC)
Ginny	Evans	Jones (OH)
Burgess	Farr	Kanjorski
Burns	Feeney	Kaptur
Burr	Filner	Keller
Burton (IN)	Flake	Kelly
Buyer	Foley	Kennedy (MN)
Cannon	Forbes	Kennedy (RI)
Cantor	Ford	Kildee
Capito	Fossella	Kilpatrick
Capps	Franks (AZ)	Kind
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Cardin	Frost	King (NY)
Cardoza	Garrett (NJ)	Kingston
Carson (IN)	Gerlach	Kirk
Carson (OK)	Gibbons	Klecza
Carter	Gilchrest	Kline
Case	Gillmor	Knollenberg
Castle	Gingrey	Kolbe
Chabot	Gonzalez	Kucinich
Chocola	Goode	LaHood

Lampson	Obey	Shaw
Langevin	Oliver	Shays
Lantos	Ortiz	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Osborne	Sherwood
Latham	Ose	Shimkus
LaTourette	Otter	Shuster
Leach	Oxley	Simmons
Lee	Pallone	Skelton
Levin	Pascrell	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Putnam	Smith (MI)
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Pickering	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Pitts	Snyder
Lofgren	Platts	Solis
Lowey	Pombo	Souder
Lucas (KY)	Pomeroy	Spratt
Lynch	Porter	Stark
Majette	Portman	Stearns
Maloney	Price (NC)	Stenholm
Manzullo	Pryce (OH)	Strickland
Markey	Putnam	Sullivan
Marshall	Quinn	Tanner
Matheson	Radanovich	Tauscher
Matsui	Rahall	Tauzin
McCarthy (NY)	Ramstad	Taylor (MS)
McCullum	Rangel	Terry
McCotter	Regula	Thomas
McCrery	Rehberg	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Renzi	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Reyes	Thornberry
McHugh	Reynolds	Tiahrt
McInnis	Rodriguez	Tierney
McIntyre	Rogers (KY)	Toomey
McKeon	Rogers (MI)	Turner (OH)
McNulty	Ross	Turner (TX)
Meehan	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Meeks (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Menendez	Royce	Upton
Mica	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Michaud	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Millender-McDonald	Ryan (WI)	Vislosky
Miller (FL)	Ryun (KS)	Walden (OR)
Miller (MI)	Sabo	Walsh
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Linda T.	Wamp
Miller, Gary	T.	Waters
Miller, George	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Watson
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Watt
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Waxman
Moran (KS)	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Weldon (FL)
Moran (VA)	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Weldon (PA)
Murphy	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Weller
Musgrave	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wexler
Myrick	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Whitfield
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wicker
Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wilson (NM)
Nethercutt	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wilson (SC)
Ney	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wolf
Northup	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Woolsey
Norwood	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wu
Nunes	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Wynn
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta T.	Young (AK)
Oberstar	Sanchez, Loretta T.	

NAYS—1

Frank (MA)

NOT VOTING—53

Bachus	Gephardt	Neal (MA)
Becerra	Gutierrez	Owens
Boyd	Herger	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Hinchee	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Hinojosa	Rohrabacher
Camp	Hoeffel	Ros-Lehtinen
Combust	Honda	Rush
Conyers	Hulshof	Sessions
Cooper	Hyde	Simpson
Costello	Jefferson	Smith (TX)
Cox	Jenkins	Stupak
Dingell	Larsen (WA)	Sweeney
Dooley (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Everett	Lipinski	Towns
Fattah	Lucas (OK)	Vitter
Ferguson	McCarthy (MO)	Weiner
Fletcher	Meek (FL)	Young (FL)
Galleghy	Murtha	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes in which to record their vote.

□ 1858

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and

the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution recognizing and supporting the goals and ideals of 'Financial Literacy for Youth Month'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the next vote will be a 15-minute vote.

NORMAN SHUMWAY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1368, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1368, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 0, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Buyer	Doyle
Ackerman	Cannon	Dreier
Aderholt	Capito	Duncan
Alexander	Capps	Dunn
Allen	Capuano	Edwards
Andrews	Cardin	Ehlers
Baca	Cardoza	Emanuel
Baird	Carson (IN)	Emerson
Baker	Carson (OK)	Engel
Baldwin	Carter	English
Ballance	Case	Eshoo
Barrett (SC)	Castle	Etheridge
Bartlett (MD)	Chabot	Evans
Barton (TX)	Chocola	Farr
Bass	Clay	Fattah
Beauprez	Clyburn	Feeney
Bell	Coble	Filner
Bereuter	Cole	Flake
Berkley	Collins	Foley
Berman	Cramer	Forbes
Berry	Crane	Ford
Biggart	Crenshaw	Fossella
Bilirakis	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Bishop (GA)	Cubin	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Cummings	Frost
Blackburn	Cunningham	Garrett (NJ)
Blumenauer	Davis (AL)	Gerlach
Blunt	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Boehler	Davis (FL)	Gilchrest
Boehner	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Bonilla	Davis (TN)	Gingrey
Bonner	Davis, Jo Ann	Gonzalez
Bono	Davis, Tom	Goode
Boozman	Deal (GA)	Goodlatte
Boswell	DeFazio	Gordon
Boucher	DeGette	Goss
Bradley (NH)	Delahunt	Granger
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Graves
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Green (TX)
Brown (OH)	DeMint	Green (WI)
Brown (SC)	Deutsch	Greenwood
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, L.	Grijalva
Ginny	Diaz-Balart, M.	Gutknecht
Burgess	Dicks	Hall
Burns	Dingell	Harman
Burr	Doggett	Harris
Burton (IN)	Doolittle	Hart

Hastings (FL)	McHugh	Ryun (KS)
Hastings (WA)	McInnis	Sabo
Hayes	McIntyre	Sanchez, Linda T.
Hayworth	McKeon	Sanchez, Loretta T.
Hefley	McNulty	Sanders
Hensarling	Meehan	Sandlin
Herger	Meek (FL)	Saxton
Hill	Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky
Hoekstra	Menendez	Schiff
Holden	Mica	Schrock
Holt	Michaud	Scott (GA)
Hooley (OR)	Millender-McDonald	Scott (VA)
Hostettler	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner
Houghton	Miller (MI)	Serrano
Hoyer	Miller (NC)	Shadegg
Hunter	Miller, Gary	Shaw
Inlee	Miller, George	Shays
Isakson	Mollohan	Sherman
Israel	Moore	Sherwood
Issa	Moran (KS)	Shimkus
Istook	Moran (VA)	Shuster
Jackson (IL)	Murphy	Simmons
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Musgrave	Skelton
Janklow	Myrick	Slaughter
John	Nadler	Smith (MI)
Johnson (CT)	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (IL)	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Ney	Smith (WA)
Johnson, Sam	Northup	Snyder
Jones (NC)	Norwood	Solis
Jones (OH)	Nunes	Souder
Kanjorski	Nussle	Spratt
Kaptur	Oberstar	Stark
Keller	Obey	Stearns
Kelly	Oliver	Stenholm
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Strickland
Kennedy (RI)	Osborne	Sullivan
Kildee	Ose	Tancredo
Kilpatrick	Otter	Tanner
Kind	Oxley	Tauscher
King (IA)	Pallone	Tauzin
King (NY)	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Kingston	Pastor	Terry
Kirk	Paul	Thomas
Klecicka	Pearce	Thompson (CA)
Kline	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Knollenberg	Pence	Thornberry
Kolbe	Peterson (MN)	Tiahrt
Kucinich	Peterson (PA)	Tiberi
LaHood	Petri	Tierney
Lampson	Pickering	Toomey
Langevin	Pitts	Turner (OH)
Lantos	Platts	Turner (TX)
Larson (CT)	Pombo	Udall (CO)
Latham	Pomeroy	Udall (NM)
LaTourette	Porter	Upton
Leach	Portman	Van Hollen
Lee	Price (NC)	Velazquez
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Vislosky
Lewis (GA)	Putnam	Walden (OR)
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Walsh
Linder	Radanovich	Wamp
LoBiondo	Rahall	Waters
Lofgren	Ramstad	Watson
Lowey	Rangel	Watt
Lucas (KY)	Regula	Waxman
Lynch	Rehberg	Weldon (FL)
Majette	Renzi	Weldon (PA)
Maloney	Reyes	Weller
Manzullo	Reynolds	Wexler
Markey	Rodriguez	Whitfield
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Wicker
Matheson	Ross	Wilson (NM)
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Wilson (SC)
McCullum	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
McCotter	Royce	Woolsey
McCrery	Ruppersberger	Wu
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Wynn
McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—54

Akin	Ferguson	Lipinski
Bachus	Fletcher	Lucas (OK)
Ballenger	Galleghy	Matsui
Becerra	Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)
Boyd	Gutierrez	Murtha
Brown, Corrine	Hinchee	Neal (MA)
Calvert	Hinojosa	Owens
Camp	Hobson	Payne
Cantor	Hoeffel	Rogers (AL)
Combust	Honda	Rogers (MI)
Conyers	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Cooper	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Costello	Jefferson	Rush
Cox	Jenkins	Sessions
Dooley (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Simpson
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Stupak

Sweeney            Towns            Weiner  
Taylor (NC)        Vitter            Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) (during the vote). Members are reminded that there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1918

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7554 Pacific Avenue in Stockton, California, as the 'Norman D. Shumway Post Office Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform you I have been unavoidably detained, due to airline transportation delays, and will not be present for votes today, April 7, 2003.

However, if I had been present, I would have voted "Yea" on rollcall vote Nos. 109, 110, and 111.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 342, KEEPING CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SAFE ACT OF 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 342) to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements to and reauthorize programs under that Act, and for other purposes, with the House amendment thereto, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of the Senate bill and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BOEHNER, HOEKSTRA, PORTER, GREENWOOD, NORWOOD, GINGREY, BURNS, GEORGE MILLER of California, HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 660

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 660.

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 CONSIDERATION OF S. 380, POSTAL CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM FUNDING REFORM ACT OF 2003

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House S. 380; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except for (1) 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform; (2) the amendment numbered 1 to H.R. 735 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if offered by Representative WAXMAN of California or his designee, which shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment or a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommend with or without instructions; and that following passage of S. 380, H.R. 735 shall be laid upon the table.

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

There was no objection.

#### HONORING U.S. ARMY SPECIALIST JAMAAL ADDISON

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a very, very special occasion. The very first soldier to be killed in the war in Iraq from the Atlanta, Georgia, metropolitan area was from my district, the 13th district of Congress in Georgia. His name was United States Army Specialist Jamaal Addison. He died on March 23 during an ambush attack on his unit, the 507th Maintenance Company in central Iraq.

Oh, what courage, what bravery, and here we are in the United States so proud and so grateful for his service. He was just 22 years old, and he is survived by his wife and high school sweetheart, Takla, and their two children, 3-year-old daughter, Christian, and a 23-month-old son, Jamaal Addison, II.

Army Specialist Addison was laid to rest today at a funeral service held in my district at White's Chapel Methodist Church in Conyers, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, this was a great hero. Greatness, what a word, that comes to mind today.

When Aristotle, the great philosopher was asked, what is greatness, he said, in order to be great, you must first of all know yourself. Well, Jamaal Addison knew who he was and he knew whose he was. He was a child of God.

When that question was put to the great Roman General, Marcus

Aurelius, what is greatness, he said, in order to be great you must first of all discipline yourself. Well, this soldier, Jamaal Addison, disciplined himself on the battlefields of Iraq and paid the ultimate sacrifice.

But then the question was put to the Messiah, Jesus Christ, what makes a great person? And Jesus replied and said, You must first of all sacrifice yourself. Love the Lord your God with all your heart and strength. Love your neighbor as yourself. Jamaal Addison did that. Because he gave the greatest love of all, and that is this: he laid down his life for his friends, his friends and this Nation and around the world who want liberty and love peace.

God bless this great soldier, Jamaal Addison.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

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

#### TRIBUTE TO DAVID BLOOM, NBC NEWS CORRESPONDENT

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to David Bloom of NBC News. In the passing of David Bloom, we lost a thoughtful, passionate and courageous journalist. Yet he was more than a journalist, more than a face on NBC News. He was a husband, father, colleague, and a wonderful friend.

I met David Bloom for the first time several years ago. He was someone who was very special and very eager to learn more about the civil rights movement. David Bloom was born in 1963, the same year Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered his historic "I Have a Dream" speech at the March on Washington.

David was 2 years old when thousands of men, women, and children marched from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama, in 1965.

I will never forget the day that David called me. He said, Congressman LEWIS, this has nothing to do with business. This is personal.

He was driving from New York to Washington, listening to a tape of me giving an introduction to the speech Dr. King delivered at the end of the Selma-to-Montgomery march. He talked about how the speech touched him personally.

I want to say, Madam Speaker, David Bloom's true greatness was yet to come. He was truly a wonderful, talented, and just smart human being. He had energy and vigor. When he was reporting a story, he did more than talk. He used facial expressions and moved his arm and hands to tell its meaning.

David Bloom made an imprint on our hearts and minds. That will never, ever be forgotten. Our hearts and prayers go out to his wife, his three daughters, and the entire NBC News family. He will truly be missed.

**THE DWINDLING MANUFACTURING BASE AND HIGH-TECH INDUSTRY IN U.S.: WHAT IT MEANS FOR AMERICA**

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I want to relate to a problem that I see as real in this country, so I am going to talk for a couple of minutes about losing our manufacturing base. Now, it looks like we are losing our high-tech jobs in this country. Then, secondly, how serious a situation is it, and then maybe third, what are we going to do about it.

Over the last 30 years, we have lost our manufacturing base as we have made the transition towards a service economy. A lot of that service economy has been in the area of high technology. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Research of the Committee on Science, and one of the concerns is what is happening to outsourcing as more and more American companies are sending their engineering work overseas.

In the last 2 years, in the last 2 years, we have lost over 560,000 high-tech jobs. Why is that?

It is a situation where other countries are doing it cheaper. Companies have decided that they are going to outsource and put related factories and facilities in India, in the Pakistans, and any country where they can get these quality engineers to do the work cheaper; and of course, with our new technology and our ability to communicate so rapidly with the Internet, it does not make a great deal of difference whether one is down the hall or whether one is over in India or some other country.

In relation to repairing automobiles, it is now suggested that within a few years, because of the computerization of those automobiles, a lot of the mechanical work is going to be done by computers, again remotely; so it is not going to make any difference if the local repair shop plugs in their computer or if it is done by some shop overseas.

In the manufacturing industry, which I think we also have to be just as concerned with, we have, over the last 10 years, gone from almost 18 percent of our total working population in manufacturing to a situation today that is a little over 12 percent. If we care about the future of jobs and good-paying jobs for our kids and our grandkids, then it is a situation that we need to consider.

What are some of the possible ways that we can deal with this problem?

One, of course, I think is taxation, and we are going to be discussing that for the next several weeks. Our taxes now on business are approximately 17 percent higher than if that business were in another country.

□ 1930

One of the keys that I see is doing a much better job with matching math and science education. This has to be a priority as we are starting to limit the number of foreign students that can come in and do our research work. On research, what do we think, I ask my colleagues, is the percentage of our research done at universities in this country that is done by foreign students? Over 50 percent. So science and math have to be a priority.

We have had several hearings on science and math. The witnesses suggested that the learning in K through 12 is more a matter of excitement and enthusiasm and lighting a fire under people to be curious rather than filling a container with knowledge. I asked, when is this fire lit for science and math? And most of the witnesses said probably between 4 years old and 6 years old. So if we miss out on lighting the fire with parents that are interested, with communications that are going to stimulate the interest of those parents and those students and quality teachers, then it is going to be tough to light that fire in the future.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I just suggest that it has to be a real concern for our future economy and for future jobs; and for the relative wealth and influence this country has, that we need to pay attention to losing our manufacturing base and now losing our high-tech base. Part of that solution has to be fair taxes, and part has to be a better job with math and science education.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE DAWSON FAMILY COMMUNITY PROTECTION ACT OF 2003**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of brave families fighting to take back their neighborhoods from the clutches of drug abuse and the violence of the illicit drug trade.

Throughout the country, communities are losing this fight. The voices of families are being silenced, lost through the isolation and suppression that comes through the use of verbal threats, physical intimidation, and even murder.

April 16 marks 6 months since Angela and Carnell Dawson and their five young children were murdered in apparent retaliation for their local action in the fight against the open-air drug markets being operated on the streets before them in my district.

The Dawsons' house was firebombed at 2 a.m. in the morning in an attempt to silence their important and powerful voices, and the voices of other families committed to our troubled neighborhoods in this country.

We must not allow their voices to be stifled. We must support these brave families and protect their loved ones while ensuring that they can work freely with police and other law enforcement officials to push the drugs out of their communities. We must not fail to support them, for if we do, these neighborhoods and these neighborhood residents are doomed.

We need to strengthen the support for these brave families as they struggle to maintain their activism in their communities and on their blocks. Witness relocation programs are necessary and invaluable in protecting witnesses in individual criminal cases, Madam Speaker, but they are not sufficient to combat the problem of intimidation of entire neighborhoods patrolled by violent drug gangs actively involved in the interstate trafficking of illegal drugs.

In such communities, there are many dealers who will rush to fill the space of a single convicted dealer or enforcer. Courageous souls like the Dawsons are far less common and impossible to replace. Thus, it is vital that we support those families who insist on remaining in their neighborhoods and who are committed to working with police to repel drug trafficking in their neighborhoods.

That is why I am introducing today the Dawson Family Community Protection Act of 2003. The bill serves both to memorialize the Dawson family's commitment and activism, and to remind us all of what may result when families in an at-risk neighborhood do not receive adequate support.

Moreover, this bill would ensure that in the future, providing support for such communities is a Federal priority within the context of our National Drug Control Policy.

The Dawson Family Community Protection Act would require the director of the National Drug Control Policy to direct each year \$1 million in HIDTA funds to support HIDTA initiatives aimed at increasing safety and encouraging cooperation in neighborhoods like the Dawsons', neighborhoods that are not fighting one sole drug dealer, but a competitive open market of drug trafficking; neighborhoods where threats of reprisal for cooperation with police are commonplace, and where activist families working with law enforcement officials are in the most danger; neighborhoods that are doomed without increased support.

Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials understand the importance of ordinary families courageously taking a stand and cooperating with the police like the Dawson family did. The cooperation of such people is essential to the success of law enforcement efforts to disrupt violent drug

trafficking organizations and shut down markets that fund their illegal drug enterprises.

I am happy that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, with whom I serve as ranking member, supports me in this effort and is an original cosponsor of this legislation. I deeply appreciate his support for families like the Dawsons, and urge all of my colleagues to support the Dawson Family Community Protection Act, not only to protect families, but also to allow their voices to be heard.

Lastly, I especially thank Tony Haywood, our counsel to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his tireless work on this legislation; as well as Michael Christianson, Kimberly Ross, and Asi Ofosu on my staff for their assistance.

---

#### TRIBUTE TO NBC NEWS REPORTER DAVID BLOOM

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a son of Minnesota who died tragically this weekend while embedded with the 3rd Army Infantry Division in Iraq.

NBC news reporter David Bloom was a native of Edina, Minnesota, in the Third Congressional District which I am privileged to represent. David's parents, Harold and Laura Bloom, and his brother, John Bloom, are residents of Edina.

David distinguished himself at an early age as a champion debater and hockey player at Edina West High School. David was also an avid fan of his beloved Minnesota Vikings and Minnesota Twins, and he often touted his hometown teams on national television.

David Bloom's meteoric rise as a journalist was nothing short of spectacular. As his NBC colleague, Katie Couric, said, "David was always there for the story and not the glory. He was a reporter's reporter." Another NBC colleague, Matt Lauer, said, "David personified energy, passion, compassion, and balance."

With his engaging personality, sound intellect, high level of energy, and great sense of humor, David Bloom's 10-year career at NBC News always drew rave reviews. From his early years at the network in Chicago and Los Angeles to his years as White House correspondent and co-anchor of *Weekend Today*, David Bloom always got the story.

As NBC Washington Bureau Chief Tim Russert said, "David was first and foremost a competitor. He was very resourceful, stretching every deadline he ever met. One marvels at how much he did and how well he did it."

Mr. Russert and many other close friends and colleagues also have said

that David loved his wife, Melanie, and his three daughters more than anything. When Russert gave him the nickname "Bloomster", David readily told them it was his second favorite nickname. His favorite nickname was "Dad."

Madam Speaker, David Bloom was well-liked and respected by everyone who knew him. That was evidenced by the lofty praise that has filled the airwaves and the newspapers across America since his tragic and untimely death at age 39.

David Bloom was a great credit to his native Minnesota, his beloved family and friends, and his profession. As his co-anchor, Soledad O'Brien, put it, there was not a dry eye anywhere at NBC. I know my colleagues here in the House of Representatives feel the same profound sadness at the loss of David Bloom. Our thoughts and prayers go out to David Bloom's family, his wife, Melanie, and daughters Nicole, Christine, and Ava, as well as David's parents, Harold and Laura, and his brothers, John and Jim.

---

#### IMPACT OF THE LACK OF ENFORCEMENT OF IMMIGRATION REGULATIONS ON THE ADAMS FAMILY

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, it was a little over a year ago that I had the opportunity to visit with a gentleman who was, at that time, the head of a ministry in the Vicente Fox government in Mexico. His name was Juan Hernandez. Mr. Hernandez was head of a new agency that was called the Ministry for Mexicans Living in the United States. It was interesting that that would be the name of any new governmental entity that had just been created, but that was it, a new agency, the Ministry for Mexicans Living in the United States.

In the discussion we had, I found it interesting in that when I asked him specifically what was the purpose of such an agency, he said, well, it was to, first of all, increase the flow of Mexican nationals into the United States. I asked him for what purpose. He said essentially that in doing that the hope was, of the Mexican Government, that it would influence United States policy towards Mexico, because he wanted to have a large number of Mexican nationals living in the United States, but with political, economic, and cultural ties remaining to Mexico. So his job was split between encouraging the flow, on one hand, and then encouraging this connection on the other, a connection that would remain.

We talked a little longer. There were two other Members of the Congress there with me that evening. He said something that I thought we were all kind of amazed at. He said, Congressman, it is not two countries, it is just a region.

I know that he believed that, and many other people do. I think perhaps even people in this body may think of it that way: It is not really two countries, it is just a region where the border does not matter; it is inconsequential, and it is sometimes even problematic because it does restrict the free flow of people across that particular part of the country. There are folks who look at it in that way. Borders, they think, are anachronisms, not necessary, anymore; and after all, it was really just a region.

What has happened as a result of this shift in philosophy, this shift in government philosophy in Mexico in particular, the push for people to come north? In the past, Mexico had treated people coming across the border with some disdain, and there was actually a derogatory term applied to people who left Mexico.

But in the last 5 to 6 years, because of the importance of what Mr. Hernandez was described as trying to influence American foreign policy vis-a-vis Mexico, and also because of the importance that remittances play. Remittances is the amount of money made in the United States, or countries outside of Mexico, but sent back into Mexico to family members that now accounts for something over 30 percent of their gross domestic product. Therefore, of course, they are very interested in using America as a way of expanding that particular phenomenon. That is fine.

On our side, we have, of course, abandoned the borders. We have made sort of an unwritten agreement with Mexico that we would not really do anything to significantly impede the flow of those people into the United States for our own reasons, some of it dealing with cheap labor and our demand for it; others because of the political consequences that arise as a result of a massive flow of people across the border into the United States who will sometimes themselves vote, even illegally, but eventually become voters after a period of time, or their children will after they have been born here and are citizens of the United States.

But this has had an impact on certain folks. We do not hear anything about them. That is why I come just about every week with another individual, another person. Tonight I am going to talk a little bit about Frank Adams. Frank and his wife Barbara operate a small ranch of about 500 acres. It is about 3½ miles north of Douglas, Arizona.

Here is a picture of Frank. They have lived on this ranch for about a half a century. They are only 3½ miles north of the border. Their daughter lives on that ranch with them, and they have two grown sons living in Texas. Their experience is not an awful lot different from many of the other ranchers on that border area who I have brought to the attention of the body in the past.

Their lives have been completely turned upside down by this phenomenon, this elimination of the border, the fact that there is no longer a border, the "It is not really two countries, it is just a region" philosophy. Their lives have been turned upside down. Their ranches are being destroyed. They are being essentially driven out of their homes.

I just wanted to bring Mr. Adams to the attention of the body as a homeland hero.

□ 1945

#### AMERICA'S IMPORTANT WAR COLLEGES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend our troops on the battlefields in Iraq. Their continuing advance to victory is a product of that courage and ingenuity under changing conditions. It is also the results of extraordinarily detailed and adaptive planning. That itself was built on the knowledge and wisdom instilled by our war colleges.

These institutions in every service make great officers into outstanding war-time leaders. Military historians have noted that the allied victory in World War II is due in no small part to the fact that some of our top military leaders both attended and taught at the services war colleges. I believe the same will be said for Operation Iraqi Freedom. In all of the services, including the Army's exceptional war college at Carlisle, Pennsylvania, our officers are skilled in the art of strategy, operations, and tactics that are the foundation of an innovative and effective military campaign.

The instruction provided by our service intermediate- and senior-level war colleges came to fruition in the war plan developed by General Tommy Franks and his team. The plan outlined a truly joint effort that has kept American forces a constant 48 to 72 hours ahead of Iraqi responses. The strategy has hit hard at Iraqi leadership and Republican Guard targets, degrading command and control and isolating the bands of fighters unwise enough to take on our troops. Quite simply, the Iraqi military is already incapable of fighting in a coordinated way at division, brigade, and battalion levels. This is a stunning military achievement that would not have been possible without leaders educated in the art of war. And we as a Nation owe a debt to the professional military education system that provided that education to today's senior military leaders.

The current American infiltration of Baghdad demonstrates our disciplined ability to encircle the city and deal with the remnants of resistance, sector by sector. The strategy also shows a so-

phisticated approach to enhancing the psychological impact of each military action taken. By removing the will of the Iraqis to fight, our victory and the Iraqi people's liberation will come that much more quickly. I believe that military historians and strategists will long study the plans of this operation, the planning that was a product of the American war college system will become the lesson plan for future officers.

As British Air Marshal Brian Burridge said this morning, the U.S. advance into Bagdad has been unique. Historians and academics will pour over it for years, and this will be a required case study for students of war.

We should be proud of our troops and of the officers who lead them. But we should also feel deep pride for the system of institutions that has made this leadership as exceptional as it is.

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

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

#### AMERICA NEEDS A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I would like to open up by saying when the President sent us his budget this year the Office of Management and Budget, OMB, acknowledged that the surplus of the \$5.6 trillion which we all hailed 2 years ago is gone. It has vanished. In fact, OMB now says there never was such a surplus when they, the Office of Management and Budget, adjust the surplus to account for the economy as they see it now. The 10-year surplus is no longer \$5.6 trillion. It is \$2.4 trillion. And all of that \$2.4 trillion has been committed, or I should say overcommitted, by policy action to the tune of \$129 billion. That is what we would incur if we did not do anything else, mostly due to the tax cuts passed in June of 2001.

So any additional tax cuts and any additional spending beyond current services will go straight to the bottom line. There is no surplus anymore to mitigate or cushion or offset that deficit. It goes straight to the bottom line and adds dollar to dollar to the deficit. The arithmetic is simple.

Knowing that, the President of the United States nevertheless proposes \$2 trillion in additional policy actions, legislative actions here, mostly, once again, in new tax cuts that will add \$2 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years.

Now, when the Congress Budget Office sent us their analysis of the Presi-

dent's budget as they are required by law to do, they saw deficits out as far as they forecast. As a matter of fact, when you back out Social Security as I think you should because I do not think we should be spending Social Security, and everybody on this House floor who was here just a couple of years ago foreswore the practice of ever again spending the Social Security surpluses, so when you back it out and look at what CBO portrays and depicts the President's budget to produce, you will see that over the next 10 years they forecast deficits, without a Social Security surplus to offset them, deficits of \$400 billion at least every year for the next 10 years.

So when you remove the Social Security surplus from the equation, the accumulation of deficits is \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. As a consequence of this budget that the President sent up here, in a way both Houses repudiated the President's budget. Both Senate Republicans and House Republicans rejected what the President sent. When the House Republicans saw the President's budget, they warmly embraced his tax cuts. They were ready for another round of tax cuts, despite our experience with the last round; but they at least acknowledged the responsibility to go find some offsets, some spending offsets that would help mitigate, reduce, cushion the impact of these huge tax cuts. The President was seeking another \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts as much again this year as he did back in 2001.

They went back looking for some offsets; and they came up with \$470 billion in what we call, in budget parlance, reconciliation tax cuts. These are reconciliation spending cuts. These are directives to the committees of jurisdiction that write legislation that deal with Medicare and Medicaid and school lunches, a whole array of entitlement programs, to go change that permanent law so that they can save a certain sum of money by a certain date.

In this case, as I said, the total of all those reconciliation instructions came to \$470 billion. Our Republican colleagues wanted to cut Medicare over the next 10 years by \$262 billion, Medicaid by \$110 billion, veterans by \$15 billion on the mandatory side, the entitlement side and 15 more on the veterans health care side, education by \$9.4 billion on the mandatory side. That would have to come out of school lunches and student loans, government pensions \$40 billion, the railroad retirement program, a vested benefit if there ever was one, \$3.7 billion.

Well, those offsets had a short shelf life. They survived attack in the Committee on the Budget. They all voted for it on the Republican side of the committee; but during the markup, the chairmen of these different committees who were about to be the object of these reconciliation instructions came forth and they said, you have got to give us some relief. We cannot do it. So the number was cut from \$470 billion to \$265 billion.

Then when we got ready to go to conference, we came out here with a motion to instruct the conferees. And what we said is, even though you have cut this number from \$470 billion in Medicare and Medicaid and education and veterans cuts, even though you shaved this somewhat, you are still taking \$107 billion out of the Medicaid program in all likelihood. You could wipe out the children's health insurance program with the budget in the form you have got it right now.

So we said let us have a vote of the whole House on these and see if this really is the sentiment of the House. And guess what? By all of 300-and-some-odd votes, 22 nays, we said we do not want to cut Medicare and Medicaid and these other programs, education, veterans, by this amount. The Senate took a totally different tact, but they likewise repudiated the President's budget. The President in effect wants another \$1.4 trillion dollars in tax cuts this year even though they all go straight into the deficit and swell the deficit. So the Senate said, no, the first half of your tax cuts, Mr. President, which would make the tax cuts you did in June of 2001 permanent, right now they expire on December 31, 2010, rather than make that permanent now, we will put them on the back burner. We will come back to that one. That will take at least \$650 billion out of the tax package. And as for the rest, they said, let us cut it about in half. So they shaved it to \$350 billion.

So the House rejected the President's budget request by seeking to offset it and failed. The Senate rejected it by coming up with a much, much smaller tax cut; but we have still got tax cuts looming. You have still got the problem of sunset of the 2001 tax cuts. You have still got something call the alternative minimum tax which 30 million tax payers will confront over the next 10 years, and it will have to be adjusted. There is no question about it. These two actions alone, making permanent the 2001 tax cuts and adjusting the alternative minimum tax, could take another 1 trillion, \$1.3 trillion out of revenues over the next 10 years and make resolution of the deficit all but impossible.

So here we are talking tonight because this is a serious problem; and it has received very, very little attention. We want to call it to the attention of both Houses because, as we see it, we are positioned right now between two fatally flawed alternatives. The House and Senate resolutions, the one that passed the House and the one that passed the Senate, framed the conference such that there is no responsible way out. Both resolutions lead to large intractable deficits: \$2 trillion in additional deficits if you back out Social Security, \$4 trillion if you back out Social Security. And both lack any plan or process for wiping these deficits out.

This was not necessary, Madam Speaker. That is the first point to

make. All of this pain, all of this confusion, all of this deviation from the straight and narrow path of fiscal responsibility we were following just a couple of years ago could have been avoided if we simply recognized that we could have tax reduction, but not the massive tax reduction that was passed in 2001 or that the President would have us pass again. All of these cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and veterans and education would not be necessary but for these tax cuts. They are made necessary to make room for the tax cut. If you simply left the budget alone and let current services be provided at the current level and left the tax cut alone, by the year 2008 the budget would be in unified balance including Social Security. Instead, under the budget alternatives we have now, we have the equally unpalatable choices of a budget that we hope gets to balance in the year 2012, that is so far out hardly anybody can validate it, or maybe 2013. That is how bad a situation we find ourselves in because we have not faced reality.

And we offered an alternative here on the House floor. The Democratic resolution would have adequately provided for education, would have provided \$528 billion for Medicare prescription drug benefit, and would have provided some tax cuts. We wanted to put some money in the pockets of American consumers likely to spend it to give this economy a boost, a jump. We wanted to give some money to businesses to encourage them to invest, some tax cuts to businesses to encourage them to invest. We had tax cuts too, just not as massive as those included in the President's proposal. And we got to balance in the year 2010. We accumulated a trillion dollars less debt than the Republicans. We had a budget that was commendable. It was rejected. But we have not given up, and that is why we are here tonight.

To begin, we want to talk about veterans benefits, not the biggest item in the budget; but I would say one of the most important. If there is any promise we should keep, particularly in a time of war, it is the promises we made to our veterans. And those promises, under the two budget resolutions, one passed by the House, House Republicans, the other passed by the Senate, are in jeopardy.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for taking out this Special Order tonight to discuss the fiscal folly that this administration and the Republican leadership of this House are engaged in.

□ 2000

The President's budget and the budget passed by Republicans in the House really give us the worst of both worlds. The Republican budget takes us over the cliff fiscally, with \$2 trillion being

added to the publicly held debt over the next 5 years, by 2008. At the same time there are deep cuts in basic domestic obligations and priorities that we simply must meet. All this is to make room for the President's tax cut, mainly benefitting the upper bracket taxpayers.

I appreciate the gentleman giving us a chance tonight to hear from a number of Members who will talk about various aspects of this budget and the way that it will affect our constituents and the American people.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee that oversees veterans affairs, I am especially glad that we are bringing much-needed attention to the issue of veterans benefits. The budget adopted on a party line vote in the House on March 21 includes cuts of more than \$28 billion in veterans benefits over the next 10 years. That includes cuts in both entitlement funding and in discretionary funding, and these cuts, Mr. Speaker, come at a time when the VA health care system is already in a state of crisis.

Indeed, there are more than 200,000 veterans waiting 6 months or longer now for their first medical appointment with the VA.

The cuts are in both entitlements and discretionary spending.

The House Republican budget cuts appropriated programs for veterans below the level needed to maintain 2003 purchasing power over the next 10 years by a total of \$14.2 billion. This would necessitate major cuts in veterans health care, because health care makes up 96 percent of the discretionary spending that we do for veterans.

The Department of Veterans Affairs projection shows that there is going to be no decrease in the core population of eligible veterans over that time period, nothing that would reduce the demand for health care, and the population of noncore, that is, Priority 7 and 8 veterans, is projected to increase over that period.

So the funding reductions in veterans health care in the House Republican budget would reduce the number of veterans that the VA could treat; our estimate is a reduction of an average of 280,000 persons per year, or about 5.7 percent, over the next 10 years. That is a drastic cut. That is a slap in the face to people who have served this country honorably and well and whom we have promised would have their health care needs met.

Our Republican friends are also wanting to cut entitlement spending for veterans. The so-called reconciliation instructions in the Republican plan require \$14.6 billion in unspecified reductions in veterans benefits to root out the waste, fraud and abuse that House Republicans apparently believe can be found in veterans programs. This \$14.6 billion cut represents a cut of 3.8 percent in mandatory spending, far below the levels in current law.

The Republicans have claimed that this is a 1 percent reduction. The red line on this chart is what it would take to maintain the current purchasing power of these veterans entitlement programs. The blue line is the claimed 1 percent reduction, but the green line is what the Republican budget actually would do. Those are the cuts that we would see, the erosion in present purchasing power of programs for veterans.

What would we have to do to achieve these savings? Well, maybe one option would be to eliminate burial benefits for veterans, or maybe we could reduce the cost-of-living allowances or compensation payments for veterans with service-connected disabilities for the next 6 to 10 years. Our Republican friends do not say, but with numbers this drastic, cuts this drastic, there is no question that we would be seeing a serious erosion in benefits.

I would like to recognize the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs and a champion of veterans, and would invite her to comment on the situation that we are facing.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague for yielding to me.

I think this is a time when we are sending and have sent our young men and women into battle, and what better way to honor them than by honoring our current veterans, and it is important that we restore these cuts.

I mean, I look at our own VA hospital in Portland, Oregon, where we have cut 10 percent of our budget already before this budget. We have something like 6,000 veterans waiting to get an appointment. Even the veterans who have been disabled during war are taking 6 months to be seen, and now we are talking about cutting health care benefits.

This is a promise we made to people when they said they would serve, that we would provide health care to them, and we are still making that promise. I have a young gentleman working in my office who was a recruiter for the service, and he said, I was told when we recruit people to tell them that they would get health care benefits for the rest of their lives.

If we are making that kind of a promise, we need to keep that promise. We cannot keep that promise if we are cutting \$28 billion out of the budget; and why, I want to ask my colleague, why are we cutting \$28 billion out of the budget? Why is this necessary?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me just read what the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans says about that very subject. He says it better than I could.

"Has Congress no shame?" he said a couple of weeks ago when this Repub-

lican budget was before the House. "Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government that you choose to dishonor the sacrifice of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, health care and disability compensation, to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?" That is his diagnosis, and I think it is hard to argue with.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. These tax cuts are not for stimulating the economy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. On the contrary, I do not know of any economist who believes that the tax cuts this administration is proposing would have a stimulative effect on this economy. These are tax cuts that would exempt dividends from taxation and rate cuts that would affect mainly the top brackets, people who would not be spending the money and stimulating the economy.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a situation where they are cutting money out of health care benefits at a time when the population is increasing the need for health care benefits more and at a time that we already have huge waiting lists, at a time that we said we are sending our young men and women into battle and we said we would provide health care to all veterans for the rest of their life.

It is a promise we need to keep. If we can no longer keep that promise, then we need to tell the new people coming in that we cannot keep this promise and give them a different promise or different assumptions.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we had before our subcommittee a couple of weeks ago the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs, Secretary Principi, and so I had an opportunity to ask him what he thought of the House Republican budget and what they had done to his Department. I also asked what he thought of the accusation that there was that much waste, fraud and abuse in his Department. He hesitated a moment and he said to me, "Congressman, what we need at the Veterans Administration is an increase, not a decrease." He went on to cite the aging of the World War II veteran population and the kind of pressures that his Department is under to deliver quality health care.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. It is hard to cut waste, fraud and abuse when we are talking about compensation to disabled veterans and when we are talking about health care where there is not enough money and where they are already making cuts and the number of people on the waiting lists grows and grows and grows.

I know my colleague from Texas visited her veterans hospital this week.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Our colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), indeed does have a veterans hospital in her district. So she is well-acquainted with the good work that they do in these facilities and also what these cuts might mean.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join, maybe painfully delighted to join, my distinguished friend from North Carolina and the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon, because I could not agree with them more, and to express my great disappointment in real terms, if you will.

I visited my friends at the veterans hospital this morning. I wanted to go by and thank the professional staff for the work that they are doing under these very hard times, and I also wanted to acknowledge the veterans who were hospitalized there, the staff that was hospitalized, and what did I get but a real-life picture of what they were facing.

My hospital personnel leadership told me they had 3,400 on the waiting list, but with a little belt tightening and no money, they were to get that number down to about 1,000. But at the same time, since January, they have seen an 18 percent increase in demand for service, they painfully told me.

And I do not think most Americans may be aware of this, when we talk about de-enrolling of individuals, there is some crafting or characterization that these are high-income individuals that we are de-enrolling; that the reason why they cannot get the service is because they make a lot of money. They make \$30,000 a year. That is sort of a cutoff, as I understand it, and that is certainly not a lot of money.

As I said, my voice was raspy going through, but they were so important, and I went from bed to bed saying hello to veterans; and what they were telling me is, we are getting good care here, we would not have had anyplace else to go.

Just this last Friday I was with homeless veterans, Vietnam veterans in particular, and the shelter that they were in was referring them not only to the hospital because they needed hospital care, but also to the services of the Veterans Department.

So what shocks me is, I am seeing here that on April 1 virtually every Republican Member, as I understand it from the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), voted in favor of a Democratic motion to instruct conferees to reject that \$14.6 billion cut from veterans resources. Now I am confused because I believe we are coming to the floor again with our conference report, and we are still in the same predicament.

My colleagues made a very good point, and I just want to add to this and mention that we have 200,000 veterans who are currently waiting 6 months or longer for their medical appointment, but when I went to the hospital, the reason why I wanted to thank them was because I noticed, as our troops are bravely fighting in Iraq, these valiant young men and women,

some of whom will be needing these services, some of whom will become veterans almost immediately right now in the hospitals. Here in this region, the military hospitals, I have got constituents from Texas who, I understand, have lost limbs; the services that they will ultimately need will be at veterans hospitals.

How can we say no to them and the existing veterans? So I guess, when I ask the question, I am shocked at where we are.

And I want to throw into the RECORD, as well, a comment that I think is quite appropriate, again from the Disabled American Veterans. Let me read this. The quote is specifically:

"You are asking veterans to swallow a bitter pill, to remedy an illness of your own making. While we all like to see taxes reduced when prudent, cutting already underfunded veterans programs to offset the cost of a tax cut is indefensible and cowardly."

I guess I ask the question, and I visited with the Disabled American Veterans. We all have; they come to our offices. Are my colleagues telling me that after the motion was voted on unanimously, am I to understand that we may see a budget resolution coming out that does not restore these cuts? When any one of us as Members, it does not matter whether Republican or Democrat or an Independent, can go into our hospitals in a nonpartisan posture and ask them what they need, and they will tell us that they are turning away to-be patients or what-could-be patients because they have no money?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and I would like to address our ranking Budget Committee member. Is there any way that our Republican friends, who voted for this motion to instruct conferees, saying quite specifically, do not touch these programs, is there any way that they can now consistently vote for the Republican budget resolution?

Mr. SPRATT. There are deep cuts that have been made in veterans programs on both sides, mandatory entitlement programs and the veterans health care service, which is discretionary. We fund it every year in appropriations bills.

□ 2015

By the way, we are talking about just getting them just up to the level the President provided. We actually provided more in our budget resolution. We have up to the level of current services, so there would not be any loss in purchasing power.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. If the gentleman will yield, that is an important point. It was the Democratic budget that made the needed adjustments in veterans health care and other funding to meet the need. The President's budget fell far short of that. The veterans organizations made the case for much more adequate funding. And then our Republican friends in the House cut it even below the President's level.

Mr. SPRATT. That is exactly the point. They claim they were actually allowing the veterans budget to increase. And in nominal terms it does go up. But of course a dollar today will not buy the same thing as a dollar tomorrow, number one. Number two, in all events if you want some sort of benchmark to determine how much their cut was, we used the President's request. And what we were saying is that they were cutting the budget first \$30 billion below the President's request, and then they modified that a bit and reduced it to \$28.6 billion. But they left it in that position until we had our motion to instruct here on the House floor.

Now, we all know how much regard those motions to instruct get when there is a conference, particularly a conference like the one going on now. We do not go to those conference meetings. We had a big photo-op at the beginning, where everybody got to make a passionate statement and pound the table. But it is the last time we will see the budget conference report making these critical decisions until it comes here on the House floor to be voted upon.

That, of course, is a time when everybody can take assessment of it; and if it does not do right by veterans and education, then, by golly, if we are true to what we said in the motion to instruct, we should vote it down.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I just want to add that people need to understand that we have made cuts already. We already have these waiting lines for health care, and this will be on top of that. We sometimes forget that there are waiting lines. There are 6,000 people waiting at our hospital. The gentlewoman from Texas had how many?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. 3,400.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. 3,400 waiting at her hospital. I suspect everyone here who has a veteran hospital can talk about the number waiting already before the tax cut.

It seems to me when any soldier comes home, he or she should not have to worry about whether or not they are going to get health care. That is not something they should be worrying about right now.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield for a moment, I would like to build on what the gentlewoman said.

I think there needs to be what we call mutual sacrifice, and it does not seem to have penetrated for the administration and the Republican majority that we are at war. We are spending billions of dollars on the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we have made a promise to these young men and women who may be returning, along with their colleagues who have already served us in World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and other places, the fact that they have actually stepped up to the plate and said I am going to serve my country.

Let me just share with my colleagues this quote, and I think this answers the question. The Paralyzed Veterans of America said, "We do not consider payments to war-disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans, and GI bill benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan and maybe Iraq to be fraud, waste and abuse."

So I want to really thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on that motion, and my friends on the floor. The gentleman from South Carolina made it very clear. He pulled the door open and put the light on the process of the conference, where we should be engaging vigorously and fighting for our veterans. He is putting the light on it because he did his work, he provided us with a solid motion that could instruct these conferees. And lo and behold, in the dark of night, we are hearing there is a conference and they are all going past this idea of restoring these benefits.

I would only challenge my colleagues to go to one of their hospitals, there is probably one in a neighboring community, and look at those vets who are hospitalized, look at the staff. Some of the staff members that I met were nurses in the military service. Look at the waiting lines at clinics, and ask yourself is it better to give a tax cut to the 1 percent of the population or to give to those who are willing to step up to the plate and sacrifice their lives, their bodies, their health on behalf of the American people. I cannot imagine that they would do that.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments. We will be hearing in the remainder of this hour about many, many deficiencies and defects in this Republican budget, but I must say none of them match the sheer insensitivity and callousness of cutting veterans health care funding. It is just beyond belief that our Republican friends would attempt to do this, especially in a time of war.

They are driving the budget as a whole over the cliff while at the same time squeezing these vital programs. As we said, it is the worst of both worlds. I do appreciate the fine work of our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, and particularly his effectiveness tonight in highlighting the differences, and believe me there is no comparison, between the alternative he put forward on this floor and the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman, and I wish to yield now to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) to talk about Medicare and Medicaid, which if anything serve even more people than veterans programs and involve even deeper cuts.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget, and I want to thank my friends who spoke so

eloquently about the needs for veterans health care. Having worked in a Veterans Hospital, I know well the needs of these fine individuals, and I know their sacrifice to this country.

Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the war today, there is no question in my mind that the two most important priorities with the American people would be the economy and health care. Fifty percent of physicians in my home State of Washington have said that they will not take new Medicare patients. There were doctors in my office today saying, Congressman, we cannot afford to see Medicare patients because in Washington State, as in Iowa, as in Wisconsin, as in Oregon and many other States, the compensation rates for our doctors are lower than elsewhere. And doctors are leaving. These doctors cannot only not afford to see patients, but we cannot even attract doctors to Washington State.

Sadly, the Republican budget does nothing to remedy this. In the Committee on the Budget, the Democrats offered an amendment to correct the inequities in rural hospital payments to try to fix this. The Republicans voted this down universally.

We also face Medicaid problems. Not just Medicare, but Medicaid problems. What is the Republican solution? To propose a \$107 billion cut in Medicare spending. Now, admittedly, Medicaid spending will go up. But the problem is it will not go up sufficiently to keep pace with the demands of the people in need and with the demands caused by inflation. Washington State alone would stand to lose \$1.7 billion over the next 10 years.

Our State has been ravaged by budget cuts already. That \$1.7 billion is not just a number. It is children who cannot see a doctor, and it is working parents who have no health care for their families. That is fundamentally what is wrong with this budget.

Now, I could understand and support the need to control increased costs, and I have supported that all along; but not for the sake of passing some of the largest tax cuts in history that will go to the people least in need at the expense of those most in need. Someone who has worked so hard and so diligently on the health care issue is my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN); and if the gentleman will yield to her, I know she would like to make a few comments.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his comments, and I also want to express my appreciation for the distinguished ranking member for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget is the most irresponsible I have seen. Their proposal makes deep cuts in numerous important programs, such as veterans health, as we have heard ear-

lier this evening, and education programs to make way for a tax cut that was custom designed to benefit the very wealthy, a tax cut that would give almost 2 million Wisconsinites less than \$100 each.

This budget will also add more than \$800 billion to our national debt over the next decade. An average family of four would pay \$4,500 in taxes this year just to satisfy their portion of the interest on our rising debt. Do not tell my constituents in Fort Atkinson or Beloit, Wisconsin, that deficits do not matter. Deficits are a hidden tax that affects the bottom line of every household.

But to make matters worse, the Republican budget fails to address the health care crisis that plagues our cash-strapped States. While the Republican budget impacts a number of important health programs, perhaps one of the most negatively affected is Medicaid. Republicans have proposed cuts totaling nearly \$100 billion to Medicaid over the next decade. If enacted, these cuts will be nothing short of devastating to some of America's most vulnerable citizens.

Nearly 5 million of our poorest seniors currently rely on Medicaid for nursing home care, prescription drugs, assistance with Medicare out-of-pocket expenses, and other services. An increasing number of seniors will need Medicaid in the coming years as your baby boom generation retires. Republican cuts could leave millions of seniors with nowhere else to turn.

Medicaid is also the Nation's single largest payer of children's health care. Combined with the State Children's Health Insurance Program, or SCHIP, Medicaid is the Nation's foremost health care safety net for children. Today, in America, over 6.7 million children lack health insurance. To me, this is simply unacceptable. These children need immediate preventive care and regular medical care to set them on a path to become healthy adults. The proposed Republican cuts would put dangerous obstacles along this path.

With States facing record deficits of nearly \$80 billion this year alone, now is not the time to pare back the Federal government's commitment to helping States improve the health of their communities with these devastating cuts to Medicaid. Republicans recently buckled under intense pressure from their constituents and restored over \$200 billion in proposed cuts to Medicare just hours before the resolution was taken up before this House.

While the House-passed budget appears to back away from earlier calls for Medicare cuts, it still requires the Committee on Ways and Means to make undesignated cuts of \$62 billion and the Committee on Energy and Commerce to make undesignated cuts of \$107 billion over 10 years. And there is absolutely no language in the budget resolution that protects the Medicare program against these cuts within those committees.

The cuts to Medicaid and possibly to Medicare to pay for another large tax cut has been justified by Republicans who say it will stimulate the economy. Well, I have talked to small business owners and most have not mentioned dividend tax cuts at all. Instead, they have pleaded for Congress to do something about the high cost of providing health insurance to their employees. They have explained to me that they may not be able to afford coverage for much longer. And when I have talked to unemployed workers, they have not asked me to accelerate tax cuts. Instead, they have asked me how they can afford to maintain health coverage for themselves and their families and how Congress plans to help them put the rest of America back to work.

It is my hope that conferees emerge this week with a budget that is better for all Americans, one that makes progress on the difficult challenges that face our Nation, problems like the rising cost of health care, problems like the loss of quality jobs, rather than providing a tax cut that few are asking for and far too few would ever receive.

Mr. Speaker, I once again would like to thank my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD), who is a champion of health care for all.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from South Carolina would continue to yield, I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin, who has been so eloquent in her comments about why we need to provide health care and the damage that can be done by the Republican budget.

I mentioned earlier the challenge we face in our State and so many States finding and retaining qualified physicians to treat the patients. Someone who has been a champion of another critical issue dealing with the nursing shortage that is harming our health care system throughout the country is the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs); and if the gentleman from South Carolina would be willing to yield to her, I know she can add to this colloquy.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPs).

□ 2030

Mrs. CAPPs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concerns with the Republican budget. It is critically important that we raise these issues and we raise them now, because the conference on the budget is meeting right now to determine the shape of the budget for the Federal Government for the coming year.

Despite the adoption of our Democratic motion to instruct last week, which called on ignoring the cuts in the Republican bill, I am not particularly heartened by the progress we have seen so far. For example, much is being made of the Senate's action to cut back the President's tax cut to a

mere \$350 billion. That is certainly a better result than what we got in the House, but it is far from fiscally responsible or appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the House that the Federal budget is on record deficits. Every nonpartisan look at the budget numbers comes up with the same result, budget deficits of \$300-400 billion for as far as the eye can see.

We must not forget that in this budget process, we are a country at war. As I speak today, men and women in uniform are risking their very lives on the front lines in Iraq. This war has already cost us young lives, and we can only hope and pray it will not cost us more. We know that our commitment in Iraq will not end soon, and we know that without a doubt the war in Iraq and its aftermath will continue to cost our Treasury. Just last week we passed legislation to provide nearly \$70 billion in emergency funding, which was not part of the budget, and that will grow this year and the next.

My point is that we have enormous commitments facing our country and we cannot ignore them. These tax cuts are crowding our ability to deal with issues on the table.

The Republican budget resolution embraces the administration's irresponsible tax cut package at the expense of our Nation's health care needs. Our health care security is part of our national security. Despite the protests of many Members of this Chamber, the majority's resolution still requires Medicaid, Medicare, and veterans programs to be cut. Medicaid is to be cut by \$93 billion, the appropriate committees are charged to either cut Medicare by \$200 billion or to shortchange an already weak prescription drug coverage benefit.

The Committee on Veterans Affairs is supposed to cut \$15 billion from their programs, the vast majority of these are health- and benefit-related. These types of cuts would endanger health care for the most vulnerable millions of Americans, those who have worn the uniform, those who have been willing to make the ultimate sacrifice. It is unconscionable, and it does not reflect American values.

And I think of the sidewalk office hours I held in Santa Maria, California this past Saturday. Veterans came to me and implored me not to cut their benefits. Senior citizens came showing me their prescription medication costs, and telling me they are on fixed incomes and they cannot pay for these. But this is inevitable if we follow the Republican plan for huge tax cuts. Cuts to these vital programs are inevitable even if the tax cut is set at the Senate number.

I hope as the conference moves forward this week, some sanity will reign. The choice seems very obvious: tax cuts or prescription drug coverage; tax cuts or health care for the low income; tax cuts or veterans benefits. It does not seem to be much of a choice.

We cannot afford these cuts, \$700 billion or \$350 billion; they will endanger

our ability to meet our commitments to seniors and veterans.

We should honor these commitments and keep our promises.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPES) for her comments and her leadership on dealing with the nursing shortage.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, captured the White House and held the majority in this body and retook the Senate based in part on a slogan of compassionate conservatism. Based on what we have heard tonight on cuts to Medicaid, Medicare and cuts to veterans benefits, I am not sure I see the compassion; and based on earlier comments about their budget having a \$4 trillion deficit, I am not sure where I see the conservatism.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the work he has done on this year's budget and in attempting to speak about the facts, not the political rhetoric, but about the facts.

Tonight, as we speak, we both know that the Committee on the Budget of both the House and the Senate are attempting to work out the budget resolution, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is here on the floor, and Democrats are being completely excluded once again from making any of the decisions.

I have been here for 24 years, and for most of those 24 years I have been labeled here and at home as a tax-and-spend Democrat. I have looked forward to the day, really I did not look, I looked forward to shirking that title, and we have done that. We have done that. But now we have borrow-and-spend Republicans, and my grandchildren do not differentiate between either one.

What we have attempted to do now, over the last several years is, and we were successful up until last year when once again we began to experiment with the idea that there is no such thing as a bad tax cut as far as the economy and jobs are concerned. We experimented in 1981 and we borrowed \$4 trillion, and it took us until 1997 to get us to a balanced budget. I was proud to stand on the floor in 1995 when we passed the balanced budget constitutional amendment which would have required this body to balance its budget every year except when we are at war.

Let me make this point right now. Tonight we are at war; we are at war in Iraq. We are losing some of our youngest and finest. The House last week voted to borrow the money necessary to fight that war, and we will borrow whatever is necessary to fight that war because every dime that is required for tax cuts or for fighting the war will be borrowed money.

But tonight I want to focus in this brief period of time on where we are regarding debt and debt limits and to express my strong opposition and complete disappointment in this House going back and trying to hide increasing the debt ceiling. Instead of doing what we were accused of doing for years, and we Democrats did it, we hid the debt ceiling increases in a budget resolution, and we were chastised for doing that, and I was not for us doing it, and I am not for us doing it today. And the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was not either.

But now we are faced with a vote in which we are going to vote to increase our debt ceiling. If we take the budget that passed here last week, we are going to increase the debt ceiling to \$11 trillion in the next 10 years. That is obscene. In the next 5 years, we are going to increase it by almost \$3 trillion.

What are we here tonight talking about? What I am here tonight saying is, we are at war and we are behind the troops, and it was almost a unanimous vote of the House supporting our troops and our commander in chief, almost unanimous.

This is the first war in the history of our country that we are arguing about how big a tax cut we are going to give to the American people, not all of the American people, in order to fight the war. That does not make sense to the people I represent. I have yet to find the first person at home, and I am sure I might find one now, that says, you bet, borrow that money. Borrow that money for a \$700 billion tax cut, borrow that money to fight the war so those men and women doing their best for America today, when they come home and they go back to work, they will get to pay the interest on the debt.

Friends on both sides of the aisle say this is not the time to be arguing how big a tax cut and whether we are going to make it permanent. This is a time to hunker down and say, How can we in fact manage our fiscal affairs in wartime and do it in a way that does not do damage to our veterans, that does not do damage to Medicare and Medicaid recipients. We had an opportunity to vote on that, but we did not vote for it. We voted for the economic game plan that was put in place 2 years ago that folks apparently still believe is working even though by their own plan, their own budget shows that if everything works exactly like they have it planned, exactly like the dynamic scorers believe it will work, we will end up owing \$11.564 trillion in 2013.

Things changed on September 11, 2001. I do not understand why the other side of the aisle cannot admit that things changed on September 11, 2001, in a lot of other areas other than in our necessity to fight a war. It caused a change in our economy. It caused a change big time in our economy. That, to me, requires another look at the economic game plan; and the budget that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) put on the floor, that

the Blue Dogs put on the floor, would have recognized that change, but we lost.

Now let me say again, I hope that the wisdom of this House is not that we will attempt to hide increasing the debt ceiling in a budget resolution. If Members really believe the economic game plan is what they say it is, have the courage to come out with a clean bill; as Secretary Snow has asked us to do, on April 4, have a clean bill to say to the American people, we believe you ought to borrow the money in order to give us the tax cuts, all of them that we are talking about. There are good tax cuts, marriage tax penalty relief, child tax credit, estate tax relief, things that we can agree on, and we have agreed on in a bipartisan way, that can be paid for.

But I am getting a little bit tired of hearing everybody talk about these tax cuts we are now talking about and compare it back to what John F. Kennedy did in 1960. Sure, when you cut the marginal rate from 90 percent to 50 percent, we change economic behavior.

But I challenge Members, and we are unable to find a reputable economist who says cutting the marginal tax rate on today's corporate CEOs from 38 to 37 percent is going to change economic behavior and is going to create jobs and economic activity in the United States. And that is what we are arguing about. I do not understand it.

But if Members do believe it, let us have an honest debate, no more canned speeches from political campaigns. Let us talk about how we are going to borrow \$3 trillion in the next 5 years and we are going to owe \$11 trillion at the end of 10 years, following the economic game plan that some believe cannot be changed in this House. We are not doing a service to our grandchildren when we make that argument. We are darned sure not doing a favor to those who are out defending the freedom tonight as we speak. We are not doing them a favor when we are saying we must borrow money for an economic game plan that has already shown it cannot possibly work in the economic climate we are in.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me. A great political philosopher once said, if you do not change directions, you might end up where you are headed.

Let us look at where we were headed; as we look at the budget deficits over the course of the years, we see the Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, and Bush deficits. When President Clinton came in, we passed a budget in 1993 without any Republican support in the House or Senate. The Republicans took over the House and Senate after the 1994 election, but remember, when they passed massive tax cuts similar to the ones that they passed in 2001, President Clinton vetoed those bills.

They threatened to close down the government if he did not sign them. He

vetoed them again. They closed down the government. He vetoed them again, and it was essentially the Clinton plan that ran us up into surplus.

Within 1 year of the Bush administration, we are back down into deficits, and everything that we are spending on the war, since there is no way to pay for it, adds on to the bottom line, so this chart really might go off the chart.

What is the plan? In 2000, we had a surplus. By 2001, we have spent all of the Medicare surplus. September 11 is 3 weeks before the end of the fiscal year. The fiscal year ends September 30, so this was done before September 11, 2002, we are spending all of Medicare, all of Social Security, and \$160 billion in more debt. If we keep going at the rate we are going, it is going to be all of Medicare, all of Social Security, \$300 billion in additional debt as far as the eye can see.

Now this has consequences. We have heard of the debt tax. A family of four's proportion of interest on the national debt, when you run up all that debt, \$4,400. It was going to be down to zero if we had kept going in the direction we were going; but instead, since we were piling on new debt, by 2013, a family of four, over \$8,400.

□ 2045

We were told we had to run up all this debt and ruin the budget to create jobs. This is the number of jobs in millions for each administration: Carter, 9 million; Reagan, second administration, 9 million; Clinton, 10 million. We are losing more jobs than we are creating after that budget was created.

With no money, you have an effect on education. About a year and a half ago, the administration ran all over the country with a bipartisan group of leaders in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions because we had passed No Child Left Behind. We have a two-step process in Washington about spending money. The authorization, No Child Left Behind, and then the appropriation. Here is the authorization. In 2003 we spent \$23.8 billion; and this year's budget, we are going to spend less, about \$10 billion less than we promised in No Child Left Behind. At the same time, we are eliminating education programs like comprehensive school reform, dropout prevention, elementary school counseling, eliminating those programs, eliminating arts programs for disabled students. We are funding at less than inflation after-school programs, safe and drug-free school programs, bilingual education. Those are the kinds of cuts that are necessary because we do not have the money.

We are also cutting education generally. Over the last few years, we have been increasing education 12.3 percent. This budget that we are looking at now cuts education 2.7 percent, and what gets cut? Head Start, 28,000 if Head

Start takes its proportional share of the hit; 28,000 students will not get the ability to get a head start. That program has been proven to give those not born to privilege a fair chance in life, and now because we are giving tax breaks, they will not have that opportunity.

If the money comes out of school lunches proportional to the way the budget is cut, 500,000 students will not get school lunches. That is what happens when we cut the budget. We have to cut something. School lunches is what gets cut.

We are also cutting access to college. We know that college tuition, particularly State college, is going up. States are having fiscal problems, every State. I know my State is increasing student tuition. Of the last count, over 400,000 students every year qualify for college, take the right courses, take the college entrance exams, have good enough grades to get in, but cannot afford to go because they cannot afford it. And here we are in this budget cutting student loans, cutting Pell grants so that the maximum amount is less than it is this year. To add insult to injury, we are also cutting programs that encourage low-income and minority students to attend college, and we know that college is one's ticket to success in this country.

Also in special education, several decades ago we promised to spend 40 percent of the cost of educating students under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. At the rate we are going in this budget, we will never get to 40 percent.

This budget cuts important programs. We have heard about health care. We have heard about veterans. We have heard how deep in debt this budget goes, and we just have to wonder how bad it has to get before it is time to change directions again and go in a better direction.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership in responsible budgeting.

Mr. SPRATT. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. SPRATT). Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Committee on Rules may meet this week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment, one written copy of a brief explanation of the amendment and one electronic copy of the same to the Committee on Rules in Room H-312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 9. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as introduced on April 7.

Members are advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of the committees of jurisdiction and of the Committee on Rules by Monday, April 7, which I guess is today.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to talk with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

#### AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). 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, good evening to my colleagues. I appreciate the opportunity to address our group this evening.

There are a number of different issues I want to talk about, but the issues I am going to talk about are going to focus on one thing, and that is America.

I come back from a weekend in Colorado, spending time with my constituents out there, constituents of all different types of backgrounds. I can tell my colleagues that the morale in America, the patriotism in America I do not think could be stronger. These people that are against this war, I have some appreciation of some of their thoughts; but I want the Members to know that the people that are making all these anti-U.S. statements within the borders of this country I am absolutely convinced are a very small part of our population.

I am very impressed, very impressed, with the amount of support, overwhelming support, for the troops of the United States of America. Thank God we are Americans. I feel so good about that. I want to tell my colleagues, on the back of my pickup I have a bumper sticker. My colleagues have all seen it before. A lot of my colleagues may have it on the back of their pick up or their car. It is pretty simple. It says: "America, love it or leave it." That is not a bumper sticker that defies anybody's right for their freedom of speech under the first amendment.

In fact, we know here on this House floor we have lots of debate on this House floor. We are very intense debate. It is one of the checks and balances in the government that we have of this country, but it at some point in time even on this House floor no matter how intense the debate is, with very few exceptions, at that point people on this floor I can say almost unanimously, almost unanimously, love this country, and I see no reason to be apologetic, no reason to be apologetic for saying to people if they do not love America, leave it. There are lots of choices in this world, but one does

not have to go very far from American borders to understand that this is the one Nation of the few nations in the world that do not have a problem with people leaving. Our big problem is so many people want to come into this country because they understand the fundamental principles that have made this country so great, that have made this country stand out in world history as the leading country for democracy, as the country greater than any other country in recorded history, the country that has done more for its neighbors, as one of the few countries in history, after it goes to war or moves into other people's territory, as Colin Powell, our Secretary of State, so justifiably said the other day, the only time that the United States of America has kept territory in a foreign country was under a request for someplace to bury our soldiers.

This country has got a lot to be proud of, and I carry that bumper stick with a great deal of pride, "America, love it or leave it." And I can tell my colleagues there are a lot of people in this country, by far the overwhelming majority, they love this country, and they love what this country stands for, and they support the troops of the United States of America.

I know we have got some people out there, and I am going to address some of their issues, some protesters out there that are not only not supporting the troops of the United States of America, but in California and in other places in this Nation, they are actually carrying signs that say: "We support our troops as long as they shoot their officers." "We support our troops as long as they shoot our officers." It is an absolute disgrace.

We have other people who, for self-interest, frankly, on the Democratic side, very limited but on that side who are seeking the office of President itself who stand out there and say we need a regime change in this country.

Let me tell my colleagues about the administration that we have, in my opinion, running this country. George W. Bush, I think he is doing an outstanding job. What President in history has had two wars, has had a September 11, has lost the Space Shuttle, was handed a bad economy and it is still going south? The strength of our President is second to none. The strength of our President is what will lead this country through this fog, and I can tell my colleagues that when the storm came in, when the conditions got nasty, we did not see our President anchor the boat at the dock where it was the safest. We saw our President turn that boat into the storm to guide people through the storm.

In my opinion and I want to tell my colleagues in the opinion of Democrat and Republican, in my travels, in my calls, in my contacts throughout this country, Democrat and Republican admire the President that we have. They think this President is up to the job. They think this President is leading

the country in the right direction. They think this President is doing the right thing in taking out of power the worst mass murderer in the history of the world and, by the way, the worst mass murderer of Muslims. Saddam Hussein has killed more Muslims than any other man known in recorded world history, and that effort to take him out is being led by our President.

By the way, I do not want to downplay the assistance we are getting from our allies. I have time after time after time read in newspapers or heard people say this is the United States picking a fight. As Worley says in his song "Have you Forgotten?" which is the number one song on the country hits, after September 11 maybe we are out there looking to resolve this situation, but the fact is it is not the United States standing alone. In fact, if we take a look at the coalition that our President and his cabinet has put together, it is very impressive. Our long-time solid allies, Tony Blair and the British, and Tony Blair, if my colleagues want to take a look at an example of a profile in courage, we have got it right there. The British, the United Kingdom, a country that has long understood freedom, a country that has very judiciously, very judiciously, used their military might for good and just causes.

And then we can go on to the European continent, and I hear people say this is a split between the United States and Europe. It is not a split between the United States and Europe. It is a split between the United States and the French, the United States and the German leadership, the United States and Belgium; but it is not a split between Europe. Jacques Chirac would like us to think that France is Europe. Jacques Chirac would tell the other countries in Europe that France is the ruling country of Europe and that when France speaks, it is as if it is the voice for Europe, and it is not. In fact, we have more countries in Europe that support the United States of America and our position than support the position of the French.

Take a look at it. We can start with the British. We can go to the Italians. We can go to the Spanish. We can go to the Polish. We can go to the Netherlands. We can go to Australia. Throughout the world nations throughout this world and their leadership recognize that the mission undertaken by the United States and that willing coalition is the mission that is correct. It is the mission for the right cause, and it is the right time to undertake that mission.

We have strong support, strong support amongst our allies. This is not the United States acting alone, although I will tell my colleagues that our country must always be prepared, must always be prepared because of our strength, because of our leadership, because of our history of democracy, we must always be prepared to act for the interests of humanity even if it means

acting alone that we will find in our history. To the best of my knowledge, I do not remember anytime in our history that the United States has ever had to act alone. Why? Why does the United States not have to act alone including in the current war that we are involved? It is really pretty simple. It is because the causes that this country acts on, it is on the right side. It acts for the right reasons. It goes forward with the right intentions; and when we are right, when we have got the right cause, when we are headed in the right direction, it is easy for other countries to support us because other countries too, being right is not exclusive to the United States of America and being strong and having the might to help your friends and to help people that are under the wicked hands of somebody like Saddam Hussein, in my opinion it is a pretty easy decision to make. The French walked away from it. The Germans walked away from it. The Belgians walked away from it. But the countries that stood tall, that came out of that foxhole to take the fire to get rid of the evil empire over there, those countries are right too.

This is a coalition of the willing, and I will tell my colleagues thank goodness we have got a President who is willing to stand up and take the heat, take the protest, take the derogatory remarks, take the editorials, take all the political correctness that they try to aim against him, and yet he has stayed steady as she goes. He is on course. He knows in his own mind what needs to be done to protect not only the United States of America but to protect the world.

Right here on this House floor from this very seat, and I was sitting right out here and many of my colleagues were sitting right out here, the President said freedom is not a gift to the United States or exclusive to the United States; it is a gift to humanity, a gift given to the United States to carry out for humanity. That is paraphrased a little, but that is exactly on point.

Take a look at what else we have with the President. Take a look at our team. Condoleezza Rice, recognized as one of the experts in the entire world on international affairs, and, by the way, I boast with some pride a Colorado product, she went to school in Denver, Colorado. Take a look at our vice President, Dick Cheney, very methodical, very experienced in these types of areas. I think one of the most well thought-out Vice Presidents this country has ever had. Take a look at Colin Powell, clearly, clearly recognized as one of the most respected men in the world. Dick Rumsfeld, the youngest Secretary of Defense we have ever had, the oldest Secretary of Defense we have ever had, somebody who fits the part in the Department of Defense perfectly, in my opinion.

□ 2100

We have got the dream team out there. We have got the team that has led this.

Remember how in Afghanistan, Afghanistan now, not Iraq, but remember how with Afghanistan we were hardly into our mission, hardly into our mission, before some of the national publications, the national press, some of it, came out and said, oh, my gosh, the United States is going to face stunning defeat. The United States underestimated the power of the Taliban, that brought down the Russian empire when they came in and tried to take over, chased them out of Afghanistan, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. They have done the same thing with Iraq.

A week and a half ago, take a look at what the headlines were saying. They were talking about retreat, some of them. They were talking about how the United States greatly misjudged this, the United States has slowed down so much, the United States has been stopped. They really clearly underestimated the strength of Saddam Hussein and the dedication to his tyranny in the country.

How interesting a week changes these newspapers. Now, all of a sudden, they are out there saying this is one of the greatest military triumphs we have seen.

The battle is not over, but the United States and our troops over there, and our troops in the United States, by the way, have done a tremendous job. And what is different about this than Vietnam? I can tell you, in this war and in, I hope, all conflicts in the future, when our military people come home, or when we see military people on the street, they will be recognized as heroes. I cannot wait to put my arms around some of these young soldiers when they come home, back home to Colorado or Mississippi or Texas or whatever State. We are so, so darn proud of them. That is why I do not have any reluctance at all, as a U.S. Congressman, I have no reluctance at all when I drive around to have a bumper sticker on the back of my pickup that says "America: Love it or leave it."

I do not often get tears in my eyes. I do not know why it is, because I do have emotion, I have deep emotion. I have love, I have belief in a God, I have deep emotion, but I do not often tear up. But I have to tell you this weekend I teared up.

What a wonderful thing our military did, not only what they did, but what it is representative of. I am talking about the rescue of our prisoner of war, Jessica Lynch. And what made me tear up when I read the words. Here she is: She has had her bones broken, she has been shot, I would assume she probably saw the execution of her fellow soldiers. What a traumatic event. Now she is a prisoner of war.

All of a sudden, our soldier, our Jessica Lynch, and Jessica Lynch could be any soldier from any State, laying in

that hospital bed, hears a racket, hears noise in the hospital. As the reports say, she puts her head under the sheet, and all of a sudden she hears a voice. "We are United States soldiers. We are here to protect you and we are here to take you home."

Imagine that. Your name, Jessica Lynch. That is what first happened. "Jessica Lynch. We are United States soldiers. We are here to protect you. We are here to take you home."

Bless her heart. She sticks her head out of the sheet and she says, "I am an American soldier too. Do not let anybody leave me."

Jessica Lynch is a face, as I said earlier, you could put on any military uniform in our country. What is so neat about this story is not only the rescue, but the fact that an American soldier never leaves an American soldier behind. We always go back and get our people, and we will continue to go back and get our people.

But what is really significant about this is what it says, what America will do for another human being. And it is not just restricted to the soldiers. I can tell you that there are a lot of citizens of the country of Iraq that, once they know we are really there and that Saddam Hussein is really gone, they will feel the same comfort of freedom and the same comfort of security that Pfc. Lynch felt when her fellow soldiers came to take her home.

What a neat story. And what a neat story about what the American fighting man and woman has done for a country many, many miles away from the border of our own.

Sure we have a lot of self-interest in this. We do not want a mass murderer like Saddam Hussein with weapons of mass destruction. We do not want the worst killer in the history of the world, that has been the worst killer of Muslims, one of the worst mass murderers ever known, we do not want him to have those weapons. We know this individual has gassed his own people, 60,000 people in one incident; and, thank goodness, yesterday we drove a stake through the heart of his lead officer in charge of those kinds of programs, those programs of ricin, of nerve gas, of mustard gas. He died yesterday. We drove a stake through his heart, and Saddam Hussein is not far behind.

So, sure, we have self-interest. We know what would happen in Iraq. If we did not handle Iraq today, it would be North Korea tomorrow. We realized in this generation, through the leadership of our President, and, frankly, through the leadership of most of us on this House floor, we recognized the time to stand up, the time to fight, had arrived.

We were not like the French, that said negotiate, negotiate, negotiate. We were not like the Germans, that, for political purposes, for self-serving political purposes for the office of the president, ran and hid.

The United States stood up, and our men and women stood up; and we stood

up, as I said, not just for our own self-interest and the interests of the world to rid them of this person, but we stood up for the values of freedom, the values of democracy, the values of just fundamental, basic human rights for the people of Iraq. We stood up for the people of Iraq.

It is the American soldier, the British soldier, even the Polish soldier and the Australian soldiers, that got out of that foxhole and have come into Iraq to give the people of Iraq the basic and fundamental principles of human rights, of human decency, of freedom, freedom of some expression.

We have got an awful lot to be proud of. And this rescue over the last few days, man, am I proud of those people. Look at these soldiers here. They went to work. And look at the success, the successes that we have had.

Sure, we are going to take more casualties. This thing is far from over.

And we will rebuild this country. Not under the guidelines of the French, not under the guidelines of the Germans, not under the guidelines of the Russians or the United Nations, but under the guidelines of the United States, of the British, for a short period of time, and then under the guidelines of the people of Iraq.

This Nation and our willing coalition will allow the people of Iraq, for the first time in many, many, many moons, for the first time in many, many, many years, to allow the people of Iraq to have a real government that represents them, a government of the people, by the people and for the people. And that would not have happened, that would not have happened if nations throughout this world had not been willing to stand up at the sacrifice of losing their own people. That would not have happened had we and that willing coalition not stood up.

Imagine where we would be, imagine where the people of Iraq would be, 5 years from now had this willing coalition not stood up. Imagine where we would be, just like Chamberlain should have imagined where we would be in 1938 with Hitler. Imagine where we would be 5 years from now if we followed the French philosophy or the German philosophy in dealing with the country of Iraq and dealing with other problems throughout the world where we have tyrants that have in their hands weapons of mass destruction. And they have used them time and time and time again, and they have continued to defy international law and they have continued to defy the international community.

We are on the right track. We are fighting for the right cause. We have not only the finest military in the world, we have the finest military in the history of the world, and every member of our military, whether you are stationed domestically, whether you are sitting out there on a ship, whether you are in transit, whether you are in South Korea, whether you are in the Philippines or Kuwait or

Iraq, every member of the armed services of the United States of America can wear that uniform proudly. And I want every one of you to know that my colleagues, all of us here, we are so, so deeply indebted to and so proud of you.

The symbol of what you will carry to the next generation is that this Nation is willing to stand up for what is right and stand against what is wrong. There is a lot to be said in that message. And that rescue this weekend, it made all of us feel good.

But take a look at what it meant on a broader basis. That is what we are doing for the Iraqi people. We are freeing the Iraqi people. We are going to bring stability to that country. We are going to bring economic bliss. These people are going to get to enjoy material things we take for granted in this country. And it is in large part due to the leadership of our President, and in large part due to the dedication and sacrifice of our military forces, and in large part, in large part due to the patriotism of America to the average Joe and the average Jane on the street that say, America will stand for what it believes, America will help its allies, America will help its friends, America is a country that will go into history, into the future as well as our past, as the finest country in the history of the world.

And I am proud of it, and I am proud to have that bumper sticker on the back of my pickup, "America: Love it or leave it."

I want to mention a couple of other things. I am not trying to trivialize or treat lightly the difficulties that we have had with the French. I know that lately there have been efforts to change the word from "French toast" to "freedom toast," or figure out some other name on the menu, and not to do this or that with the French, and I understand that. There is a lot of anger back here.

There is a lot of anger with the American citizens about a country like France. It is kind of a luxury society. They get the benefits. They get the benefits of a lot of security that is provided by their neighbors. They get the benefits of a capitalist economic society. But they get the luxury of never having to come out of the foxhole.

But I have got to tell you, last week I did become aggressive in one area dealing with French products. I found out, and for the sake of open disclosure, my district is in the mountains of Colorado. We have a community in Colorado named Marble, Colorado, for obvious reasons, there is a marble quarry up there in that community. That quarry has provided marble for many things, including some of the steps here at the Capitol, many of the monuments, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. It is a very fine marble.

In discussing a call instituted by them, in discussions with some of the people in this company, which, by the way, is owned by the Swiss, and the other marble company in this country,

there is one owned by the Italians, they said, "Geez, do you know who supplies the tombstone for the Department of Defense to put over the graves of our fallen soldiers?" Of course we did not. The French.

When I heard that, I took it personally. I think it is wrong. I think it is inappropriate, considering what the French Government has done to this country, how they have kicked sand in the face of their friend; how in a time of adversity, they put their ship safe in the harbor and threatened our ship out there and our willing coalition.

We can handle it without them, but they left us. They left us when it was the most important time for them to be with us, that is when they left us.

Now I find out that our Department of Defense is purchasing the tombstones that we place over the graves of our fallen soldiers from a French company.

I have asked the Department of Defense, as the contract comes up for renewal in July, at least the Swiss were neutral, and the Italians are part of the willing coalition. The Italians have been a great country. They understood the evil we are dealing with. These are the kinds of countries that should be rewarded, not the French.

It is the same thing when we go and rebuild Iraq. The French should not be rewarded for their belligerent attitude, for the fact they hid as far down in the foxhole as they could get from the tough fight taking place outside the foxhole.

So I wanted to explain to some of my colleagues, this is not just trying to take a cheap shot or for some other reason to bring out this issue. The fact is, American soldiers should not be buried under tombstones purchased from a French company.

I want to visit for just a few moments, and then probably the most exciting part of my comments tonight are some of the letters that I want to read to you from some of our soldiers, some of the thoughts about this conflict, this war we are engaged in.

□ 2115

First of all, I think the protests in this country, the anti-American troop attitude, the expressions by Presidential aspirants that we need a regime change, and some of our colleagues on this House floor way over on the left side, objecting to what is happening here, that is not representative of the majority of the people of America. I do not take away, to an extent, I do not take away the right for debate. I think it is so fundamentally important for the checks and balances of our country. I do not take away, even if I disagree, I do not take away the right, if somebody disagrees with me, to debate on this floor or to walk in a protest. But as my colleagues know, there comes a point in time where we as a team must act together. There is a saying around here: politics ends at our country's borders. In other words, in

Congress, we have always said, look, when we go to battle outside, like a family, like a family dispute, when we step outside the family home, when we step outside the borders of this Nation, we must act as a Nation. We must act as a family. We must speak as a family. Let the politics and the debate stay within our borders.

Unfortunately, a small number of people, especially when we consider it in proportion to the population of this Nation, or if we consider even a more accurate number, if we consider the number of protests in proportion to the percentage of this country that supports our forces and supports the difference between right and wrong and the just cause of which we are engaged, it is minuscule. These protestors are really not representative of the majority of America.

I want to tell my colleagues, where they cross, in my opinion, where they cross the line of patriotic and unpatriotic. I do not think that one can say somebody is unpatriotic, for gosh sakes, because they protest. I do not think that is unpatriotic. As I have said earlier, there is freedom of speech. But there is at some point where one carries that protest to that line or one crosses that line where it does cross the line between being patriotic and unpatriotic. And let me come back to my remarks that I made at the beginning, and that is those protesters, disgraceful, what they have done. Those protesters, and I have pictures of it right here, those protesters that carry signs out there that say, we support our troops, we support our troops, as long as they shoot their officers. Those are the kinds of people that my bumper sticker applies to. If you do not love America, get out of it. Leave America.

And I am not ashamed, I am not concerned about standing up here and saying to my colleagues, in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of many people of this country, it is unpatriotic for one to stand out there when our forces, when our young men and women throughout this country and overseas, overseas actually taking bullets or being scared to death or being asked to carry out a mission so that we have the freedom to protest, that one would dare have the audacity, the unpatriotism to carry a sign that says, "I support our troops as long as they shoot their officers." Those people, in my opinion, have no place in our society. They do not, thank goodness, carry behind them much support. It is very limited. But it is so disgraceful in its public display, so disgraceful in its public display that I come to the House floor this evening to condemn as unpatriotic that particular sign and those people who do not support the troops of America.

In fact, every protester out there, many people, by the way, who I would describe as luxury, the life of luxury. They are not taking bullets. They are not worried about their security. We all go to sleep tonight not worried

about our security. We all go to the grocery store tomorrow not worried about whether there is food there. We have less worry about medical conditions than other people in the world because we have such a fine medical establishment. We do not worry about whether our kids have a school to go to in the morning. We really have a life of luxury. But that life of luxury in large part is given to us by the dedication of the American forces, by the dedication of the American forces that are willing to risk everything they have, including their own lives, so that we have that life of luxury.

It is my humble opinion that when those forces hit the field in combat, that the signs of protest ought to go down and those signs that ought to go up is "God bless the American forces." God bless our men and women who are willing to go out there, not for their own self interests, but for the interests of the country that they love, for the interests of America. For the interests of America's interests. For the interests of America's allies. For the humanity, for the interests of humanity; in the interest of freedom, of freedom and the export of freedom. They are willing to go out there and put their lives on the line.

We know, we know, many lives, many lives have now been lost in the last couple of weeks as a result of carrying that torch, the torch of America's gift to its people, and the gift of its people to America, and that is freedom and democracy. Yet we have people, people in our own circle, people in our own camp that not only do not help gather firewood for the fire, but have the audacity to carry a sign, carry lots of signs that say, we support our troops when they shoot our officers. That is going too far. That is going over the line.

I know when I get back to my office this evening I am going to have lots of phone calls, primarily from these kinds of people, yelling at me that I am an unpatriotic American. How dare they, as if I have no freedom of speech, but how dare I question their motives when they carry a sign that says "We support our troops as long as they shoot our officers." Well, I say to them, save your time. It is a waste of a phone call. Instead, think of that bumper sticker that I have on the back of my pickup: "America, love it or leave it." The intensity that I feel is not just with me. We see that throughout this country. People are so proud today to be Americans and our military people are so proud of their Nation and so proud of being in uniform for this country.

I was at a high school not too long ago and at the high school one of the students asked me, he said, are they going to bring back the draft? I said, the draft, now that we have a little time out of the draft, we now realize it was probably the worst mistake we ever made in this country. Why? Because in the draft, keep in mind, we did not offer any choice. We would go to

young men and women who had just gotten out of high school, maybe had started a career, say, being a mechanic, something that they really wanted to be, or going to college or doing something they really wanted to do, and all of a sudden their government was knocking on their door saying, whether you want to or not, you are being drafted, you have to leave your home, we are going to send you out in the military forces and we may have you painting ships or doing something they despise. Do you think our military is happy? Do you think morale in the military is good when we have a draft? It is not.

What we have today is a different concept; and if you go back and look at the history in the articles about getting rid of the draft and so on, nobody estimated just what a tremendous success it would be, getting rid of the draft and having an all-volunteer force, men and women who want to serve this country, men and women who want to put that uniform on. Men and women who wanted to be where they were going to be sent by our Commander in Chief.

I think we are going to see that reflected by any number of letters that I have right here, and I want to take a few minutes to read some of them. Our military, the morale in our military is as high as it has ever been, in part because of their deep, deep dedication to this country that has been so good to them and so good to all of us, in part because of the leadership of our Commander in Chief, and in smaller part because of the leadership of the United States Congress and elected officials and leaders throughout this country. We have come together as a family. We have spoken with a very strong voice, a voice that is recognized wherever those Stars and Stripes fly.

Now, granted, we should not be distracted for very long by a few small groups of protesters that have, in an unpatriotic way, in a belligerent fashion, carried signs that say, "We support our troops, as long as they shoot their officers."

I have really been moved by some of the letters that we have seen. I wanted to read a couple of them. I think they are so neat. As I have said before, I do not like to read from written text, but these are not my letters. These are letters that I am passing on to my colleagues. Let me start:

"We are the proud parents of two United States Marines."

By the way, at one of my events this weekend, I met the mother of two proud, I am not sure if they were Marines or Army officers or a mixture. Boy, was that mother proud. She stood up in front of this group, and she said, please, the best message I can take back to my sons, a son and a daughter, the best message I can take back to my children is that we in this country understand why they are fighting, that we in this country support what they are doing for us. She said, that is all

that is necessary. You do not need to send a care package. She did say prayers, but she said prayer, and let them know that we understand why they are there and that we too have the deep faith in them and the love for this country that they have. It is pretty moving.

"We are the proud parents of two U.S. Marines. We will not bother discussing our political views, one party versus another. What we will say is we do not want our sons nor any of our sons and daughters, husbands, wives and grandchildren in our extended military family to die in vain. Like most, we pray for peace, but we are sick, literally sick. Why? Because we lived through the Vietnam era and saw firsthand how our vets were treated. We are so afraid it is beginning to happen again, and we are not alone. Nor are we the only ones who believe with all of our heart that the key to winning any war on terrorism will depend on how we here at home emotionally support our troops, regardless of politics. Vietnam proved how we defeated ourselves by the way we divided our own Nation and treated our troops. We never lost the battle in Vietnam, we lost the battle on the political front. We are beginning to lose again and the bullets have yet to fly."

Now, I should note that this letter was written prior to the engagement of the conflict, about 3 weeks ago. I would also note that the mother who wrote this letter is today, I am sure, so, so proud of the overwhelming patriotism and support that is being shown by the American people for her two proud Marines and all of those who have chosen to serve in our military.

"Our sons did not choose to become a United States Marine to kill people. They had dreams of a career, of travel, and of protecting us from the terror of things like 9-11 so that it would never happen again. Both our sons are the best sons a parent could pray for. The thought of having someone throwing animal feces on our military when they finally return home, hearing nothing but negative media about how Americans hate them and the war, and the thought of what we would do to the servicemen and women's spirit scares military families to the point of sleepless nights. The media, stronger than the White House itself, can help change that fear, can help it from becoming a reality. Everyone is quick to show the protesters out marching. What has been done to show those who support our troops? We are not marching on the streets, we are not screaming clever chants, we are not holding up signs or throwing blame or calling names. No, we military families, we are at home. We are boxing care packages to our service people. We put yellow ribbons on our doors, on our trees, on our car antennas, Blue Star flags in our windows. We pray 100 times a day and light a candle. We are sending birthday cards, thank you notes of cheer to the members of the service whom we have

never met, nor may ever, because they are our extended family in that military force.

"They need to know amidst some of this bad publicity, there are those of us who are grateful for their choice and sacrifice for us to live in the land of the free, and it is because of the brave that we have the land of the free. You may never read that in the headlines. So what can be done?"

And she goes on to talk about how we can come together in our communities in their prayer and in their showing of support for our soldiers. And keep in mind, it is not just the soldiers that are on the front. Think of all of the supplies, all of the logistics that have to happen from people across this Nation, soldiers and citizens, civilian military employees, the prayer from us.

□ 2130

Look at all the supplies that have to be put together. Look at all our medical personnel. In Washington, D.C., we have servicemen, and when I say that, servicemen and servicewomen, we have service people who are now recuperating in our hospitals here in Washington, D.C., at our military hospitals. There are a lot of heroes out there.

I get the deep sense in this country that this country has responded totally opposite of the response that we saw in the Vietnam-era war. This country has come to its feet. This country will recognize and has recognized, and will greet with great cheer and great love and great pride our American soldiers when they come home.

This lady's concern about the Vietnam era and the way those service people were treated should be of no more concern. We have a few pockets of poorly educated, unpatriotic people who carry signs that the best way to support troops is to shoot their officers, but such a small fraction. We have a massive, massive amount of people that will stand in respect to these military people for the job that they have done and for the job that they will do not only today, but in the future.

Let me move on to another letter. This one is from Petty Officer Lance Herdon of Brandon, Mississippi. I am just taking out a part of the letter. Frankly, some of the letters have some pretty emotional, private stuff for the family, but with this, I do not think they have objection to it being read.

From the petty officer: "As far as questions about the protesters, yes, I am angered about the protesters. But, that is why we are here. We are the very ones that give them the rights to speak freely. I still don't understand how the very people who speak so badly about us and what we are out here trying to preserve are the ones who use it the most.

"To answer your previous questions, I did watch the President's speech. There was about 20 of us glued to the

television screen on the bridge. I don't understand what is left to show people. What I mean by that is the fact they have mass weapons of destruction and they refuse to destroy them. So that means that they could inflict serious harm on surrounding countries. Why should we not help the surrounding countries? I completely believe in liberating the people of Iraq. Give them one thing that we most often take for granted . . . freedom."

This 19-year-old petty officer says, "Give them the one thing that we most often take for granted . . . freedom." It is something that is overlooked, a major right we hold as Americans.

"For everyone in Mississippi—keep on keeping on. Everyone's support has been monumental so far. There are a lot of people that think that this is not necessary, but I think of it as a responsibility to mankind."

This is coming from a 19-year-old petty officer. "I think of it as a responsibility to mankind." The key word is freedom.

"I think that it is ironic that Abraham Lincoln was famous for freeing the slaves 200 years ago. I am on the USS *Abraham Lincoln* trying to free the people of Iraq. I am surprised no one else has said anything to that effect." It has been said, petty officer. "I don't see how anyone cannot want to free the people of Iraq."

Another one here from a desert battlefield far from home, a U.S. military officer sent his wife a love letter describing how his wedding ring has soothed him. It reminded him of her, although they are many miles apart.

"Every day I find myself fidgeting with my ring. The smoothness of its surface calms me," Captain Scott Smith wrote to his wife, Kelly. "I can't fully describe what I'm feeling. I'm no poet, but its lightness, its beauty remind me of you. Its hardness is a sign of your strength. Love, you are my rock. You are what I live for."

Think of the sacrifice, not only of these military men, but the military families, these young wives or husbands whose spouse is out there fighting for us. Think of the emotions.

Do Members remember the songs from World War II? "I'll see you in all the old familiar places," or "Kiss me once and kiss me twice," that kind of stuff, it is all there. The love for these troops is so deep and so intense, as reflected by letters like this.

Here is another letter: "Army Pfc. Favio Melendez, Jr., with the Patriot unit from the 108th in Fort Bliss, Texas.

He wrote to his wife: "Dear Babe, my journey back home is about to begin. The war would've been halfway over by the time you get this letter. I love you and miss you. If anything happens to me, remember I'll always love you. I'll always be with you. Tell everybody back home thank you for the letters and for the prayers. I'll see them soon.

"Tell my parents they have raised a proud American son. Tell my sister to

achieve her goals, for I have fought for them. Pray for those soldiers who have lost their lives for our freedom and pray for those who continue to fight to make the world a better place.

"I made a promise to you before I left, that I shall return . . . it's rough and tough out here, but I'll keep that promise.

"Take care of our son, and let him know who his daddy is. I'll see you soon. P.F.C. Melendez."

Here is another one, Brian Waninger to his wife Melena. "Today has been eventful, as you can imagine. We are all fine. Have a prayer chain started. I know that it works. Pray for the President. He is a brave man to have made these decisions and I am sure that he will face adversity. He will need a lot of support to stay strong. I say, get the wives together and protest the protesters. The men of Charlie Company are in good spirits and proud to be here. Pass it on. I love you and you are on my mind constantly. Love, Brian."

I want to mention another one. This is an obituary. There is one line in the obituary that really stuck out. "George A. Fernandez, 36, a member of the Army's Special Operation Command, died Wednesday after being shot in northern Iraq, the Defense Department said."

Think of this statement. This statement comes from his family. Think of the strength of a family to stand up and say something like this. They said he was the third generation of his family to serve as a senior noncommissioned officer.

"He served not only out of a sense of family obligation, but out of a sense of patriotic duty. He loved America and he was proud to be part of the Special Operations community." Fernandez was a native of El Paso, and he gave his life for the greatest country in the history of the world.

I want to mention another group of people out there, and then start to conclude this. There is another group of people out there that are not even American citizens. They are called foreign nationals. Now, I know that it is real easy to bash illegal immigrants, and lately there has been a lot of that. A lot of it is deserved. I understand the debate. I am not trying to take sides in a debate, here.

But I am saying that there are people who are not even citizens of this country who believe so strongly, who believe so strongly in the American dream that they have enlisted in our forces. Now, somewhere around the range of 10 have given their lives, have been killed in the line of duty fighting for the United States of America, even though not citizens of the United States of America, because they believe in the principles and the values and the freedom and the fairness and the justice for all. They believe in what our great country has done for its people, and more importantly, more importantly, these people believe in what our country has done for the world and has done for others, our neighbors.

A Guatemala native put off college to join the Marines. Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez, 22 years old, rifleman with the Marines, born in Guatemala, held permanent U.S. resident status which he obtained in 1991.

Those people, those foreign nationals who signed up to serve in our military, those foreign nationals who have made the ultimate sacrifice, we need to know that the respect of this country goes well beyond our borders; that there are people throughout this world that would do anything to become American citizens, to help further the dream that our forefathers had when they first put this country together. Lance Corporal Jose Gutierrez was one of those. By the way, I should tell the Members that the United States now, in recognition of his sacrifice, made him in citizen of the United States.

I want to put up one other poster. This is called "Freedom". I want Members to know I did not author this, but Fred Thompson, a U.S. Senator, former United States Senator, has a TV commercial, or has put this on the TV. I am not sure who the author is, but I did not do it. I think the words are so explicit and say so much.

In conclusion of my remarks, I wanted to read a letter, but I wanted to go through this. Just go through with me.

"Freedom

"It is the soldier, not the campus organizer, who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.

"It is the soldier, not the reporter, who has given us the freedom of press.

"It is the soldier, not the poet, who has given us the freedom of speech.

"It is the soldier who serves under the flag who defends the protester's right to burn the flag.

"Isn't it time now to demonstrate that we support our troops? Were it not for the brave, there will be no land of the free."

Finally, I want to conclude with a letter. This letter was written to "Mom". The young man is from the State of Nevada. This letter was actually published in a newspaper.

"Dear Mom, it's really your decision to march if you want to or not. You are the one who has to decide if what we are doing out here is right or wrong. My opinion is not yours.

"I do, however, have things I would like for you and Grandma and everyone else at home to know.

"I am a United States soldier. I was sworn to defend my country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. People may not agree with the things we are ordered to do. I would like to address those people by telling them that terrorism is not a threat to us as Americans but to many other innocent people in the world.

"What type of country would we be if we didn't defend the rights and freedoms of others, not because they're Americans, but how about just because they're human?

"We live in a country where people feel secure with their daily lives. They

do business like usual and don't worry about the thought of terrorism actually happening to them.

"The people of 9/11 thought the same thing. We now know that it can happen to anyone at any time.

"Yet as Americans we're afraid of losing our soldiers to defend our security. I can only speak for myself when I say that my life is an easy expense to ensure that my family and my friends can live in peace.

"I strongly believe in what we are doing and wish you were here to see for yourselves the honor and privilege that American soldiers aboard this ship are feeling, knowing that we are going to be a part of something so strong and so meaningful to the safety of our loved ones. Then you would know what this potential war is about.

"We will stand tall in front of terrorism and defeat it. We as soldiers are not afraid of what may happen. We are only afraid of Americans not being able to understand why we are here.

"I ask for your courage as Americans to be strong for us; I ask for your understanding in what we believe is right. I ask for your support in what we are sworn to do: defend our country and the life of all.

"We will succeed in our task and we will end the threat of terrorism in our backyard. We will also end the threat of terrorism in our neighbors'.

"We have to remind ourselves of what this country stands for: life, liberty, and justice for all. In order to maintain those rights, we have to stop this threat. I am proud to be here. I will be coming home, but not until I know that it is safe for all Americans and for everyone that I love.

"My family is first. My country is where they live. I will defend it." This is a 20-year-old Navy corpsman, 20 years old and writes like that.

It is with a great deal of pride that I have that bumper sticker on the back of my pickup, "This is America: Love it or leave it." I want all of my colleagues, when they go back, to know that the belief and support of the American people is behind the military forces of America; that by far the greatest majority of Americans feel good to be Americans. They feel proud of this Nation, and they not only feel honored by our troops, they feel that our troops are acting for a noble purpose.

□ 2145

And they see these troops as real heroes, not sports celebrities, not famous people, not Hollywood actresses but as real true heroes. And there frankly are a lot of people who have put down their signs in protest and have picked up signs supporting our force. Those people who are carrying the disgraceful sign that they support our troops as long as they shoot their officers are a disgraceful bunch. I guess you get some bad apples in every bushel. But the fact is we live in the greatest country in the history of the world. And I, for my

own small part, feel very, very privileged, very privileged to have been born or to be a citizen or to have as fellow citizens people who have come into this country in the United States of America. Just take a look at the last words we have got: "Were it not for the brave, there would be no land of the free."

#### HISPANIC HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURGESS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing the opportunity to be here tonight.

This month is health care month and I wanted to take the opportunity to come up here tonight to talk a little bit about health care. And as chairman of the National Hispanic Congressional Caucus, I wanted to specifically emphasize Hispanic health care. I want to thank also my colleagues who are both on the Hispanic Caucus who have been working extremely hard in the area of health care, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) and others.

Hispanics are now the fastest-growing population in the United States and comprise 13 percent of the total population. Yet they continue to suffer disproportionately from health disparities and face many barriers in access to quality health care. Over 33 percent of the Hispanics are uninsured. That is one out of every three find themselves without access to insurance, compared to 10 percent of the non-Hispanic whites. Let me just add that the uninsured population continues to grow, continues to become even worse as with the economy as well as with the fact that we have not been supportive of some of those programs.

And I would also add that those people who are uninsured are the ones that are out there. They are working Americans trying to make ends meet but find themselves working in small companies, find themselves working in rural America, find themselves not working for a major corporation or governments, so they find themselves without access to insurance. Yet, they are working. They do not qualify for Medicaid because they are not poor enough because they are making money, but then they do not qualify for Medicare either because they are not senior enough. So here they are in between, working Americans, yet find themselves unable to afford health care. Yet in a country that has the best health care system in the world, it is not affordable; and it is not accessible to working Americans.

When it comes to children, the numbers are equally sad. Hispanic children have the highest uninsured rate in the United States, with the child population one out of every four, 24.1 per-

cent. So we have a situation that not only hits the uninsured but it also hits the most vulnerable, our children. Over 35 percent of all Hispanic children depend on State Children's Health Insurance, or what we have call the SCHIP program, for health care needs.

We know that the uninsured have limited access to care. And we also know that the uninsured suffer disproportionately from diseases that can be prevented, treated and even cured. And that is what is so sad, some of these diseases can be prevented; some of these diseases can be treated and some can be cured. And then I look at the numbers where I see the statistics that show that in 1 year an estimated 2 million Hispanics were diagnosed with diabetes and another 1 million were estimated to have undiagnosed diabetes. And so here now we have the data to be able to diagnose diabetes at a very early age. We have the information. We have the potential of making a difference. We have the capability of being able to provide the data that is needed.

And I want to let you know that in the area of diabetes, I have been well educated in that area. When I served in the Texas House, I was in the public health committee, and I recall very distinctly finding out the data. When we looked at the disease, diabetes, at the number of people that go blind, the number of amputees usually as a result of diabetes, a large percentage of them, and, ironically, enough, in those areas it is an area that can be prevented, especially now that we can diagnose it at an early age, where we can work with those youngsters, work with those families so they do not have to suffer later on where they might lose a limb or go blind.

We also have when we see statistics that show 20 percent of persons living with AIDS are Hispanics, we know we have a serious problem if we do not start to address the state of Hispanic health with targeted prevention programs, treatment programs. With the strains that the health care system is currently experiencing, then we will have even more dramatic problems.

In the area of AIDS, we have made some significant strides. In fact, the data show that the numbers overall have been going down, and that is good and the statistics have shown it. But when it comes to minorities, especially African American and Hispanics, we find within ourselves it is growing disproportionately. And so AIDS has not gone away. It is still there. It is still a killer, and it is still one of the areas that we need to concentrate on. And it is also an area where we identify it as one of those infectious diseases such as tuberculosis that we really need to concentrate on, no matter whether it exists in this country or anywhere else. So eventually we will have to deal with it. So it becomes important that we zero in on AIDS and see what we can do.

One of things I wanted to mention about AIDS is that in our Hispanic

community throughout this country one of the difficulties is that a lot of communities have what we call community-based organizations, and we have a few but our programs were not initially, we do not have as many as other community groups do. And so you find in the Hispanic community a lack of community-based organizations that are not funded. You have some groups, but they do not have sufficient resources. And so when they try to compete for the Federal dollars, for the State dollars, they find themselves a disadvantage because they were not there from the very beginning; they were not there when these other organizations were given these seeds monies to be able to start those programs to be able to make a difference.

I also wanted to take this opportunity also to talk a little bit about the Hispanic Health Improvement Act. Through the caucus, we organized, the Hispanic Congressional Caucus, has organized based on task forces. We have a task force that is headed by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), but we have worked on that task force to come up with our own Hispanic Health Improvement Act; and we have been working on this for some time now. It is a comprehensive bill aimed at improving Hispanic health in the United States. The legislation offers a variety of strategies for expanding health care coverage, for improving access and affordability, which is key, for also reducing health disparities as well as strengthening our Nation's health care workforce.

Let me just add that this particular piece of legislation is a piece of legislation that I have personally been working on for a little bit since I came up here almost 6 years ago; and it has evolved into a piece of legislation that is pretty comprehensive over all and touches on a lot of areas that the Hispanic community has been encountering and the difficulties in the disparities. One of the things that we did about a year ago was we did a conference where we asked every Member, both Republican and Democrat, that had any significant number of Hispanics in their districts, we invited them to a conference, and we had the conference in San Antonio. We had great participation, not only from the legislature, but also from each of the Members' staff. We invited one or two members from each of the staffs. And there we were able to come up with additional recommendations that were extremely helpful in beginning to finalize our piece of legislation and begin to address the responses that we needed in order to make that happen.

This legislation provides for the expansion of the successful State Children's Health Insurance Program, which is known as SCHIP, to cover the uninsured low-income pregnant women and parents. Right now the SCHIP as we well know does not cover women that are pregnant, that are uninsured; and we also know the importance of

covering them is key. It also provides the flexibility to States that want to enroll legal permanent resident children and pregnant women. And once again, these are legal permanent resident children and pregnant women. We do not have that in the present legislation, and it is important. It is important that that also occurs. There must also be flexible incentive for States to increase enrollment in times of economic recession and as the population increases.

It is important, the proposal, that the administration has right now is to basically take the SCHIP program, the Medicaid program and what we call the disproportional share and put it into one lump sum, which is most of the needy programs in this country, and then send it to the States but then it caps it. Our program allows for the flexible incentive that if the numbers increase, you are able to put additional resources. Especially in those areas where the population is growing, it is important that we provide access to that capability. And we know that population fluctuates every 10 years or so because we draw our lines based on that for political representation. So we also know that the numbers of the ones that are in need also grow.

The legislation also addresses the future needs of our health care system and provides increased funding for health resources services, administration health professions, diversity programs; and we must ensure that our health care system can provide both linguistically and culturally appropriate health care. You might say, well, what does that mean? I just want to give one example. I recall a couple of years ago, it has been about 3 years ago when we had a hearing and I remember some testimony that was provided by one of the doctors who said that she had a client, and during that hearing she indicated that the client had been informed that she had been positive for AIDS. But in Spanish it was translated AIDS is positivo. If you just tell someone they are positive without explaining in Spanish as to what it means in terms of what it means to be positive, in Espanol you say "esta positivo," that means everything is okay.

So when you just get it in writing, she assumed that everything was okay. Well, that particular patient had a child and contracted AIDS. And so we have got to be able to communicate. We have got to be able to reach out. And a lot of times our health professionals might not be both linguistically or culturally appropriate in terms of being able to communicate, and sometimes our education assumes a great deal on the part of the patient, and that needs to be considered.

These programs also promote diversity and support training professionals in the fields that are currently experiencing shortages. The bill also targets approaches that will help improve the health care of Hispanic communities in

those areas and to make sure we address some of those needs.

Let me take this opportunity to talk a little bit more about our piece of legislation because when we talk about the importance of shortages in our Nation's health care, the bill begins to look at addressing the needs of what exists. And we know that right now there are thousands and thousands of nurses that are needed. We need nurses. And we need to make sure that we have the resources to make that happen. So this bill calls for beginning to look at providing those resources to make that happen. We have got to begin to educate our health care professionals. We have got to produce our own health care professionals. We need doctors.

Let me give an example, and I think I have shared this before, but I have got to keep saying it because we still do not do anything about it.

□ 2200

We always complain about immigration. We always indicate that there are too many people coming from abroad, and prior to 9/11, we had a little less than 300,000 people come from abroad. This is the professional category, 300,000.

In that category, Mr. Speaker, we have approximately 5,000 doctors. If we look at the data, Mr. Speaker, we graduate 12- to 13,000 each year; yet, we bring in 5,000 doctors each year. We are a brain drain on the rest of the world.

At the same time, we tell people, young people who want to go into medical school, to qualify, we tell two of them, sorry, we do not have any room for them. So at some point we have to produce our own. We have got to produce more doctors, more health care professionals. We need more dentists and pharmacists. We need more nurses, and so we need to begin to provide those opportunities for some of our people in this country to be able to provide that access that is needed.

In addition to that, the bill also calls for improving access and affordability to medically underserved areas. The border area is one of the most underserved areas in the Nation, and it is an area that requires a great deal of help. It is an area that requires a great deal of assistance, and we need the resources to provide access to health care.

I represent San Antonio down to the Mexican border where I have La Salle, Zapata, Starr and Hidalgo, and in those counties there was a recent study that has just been done. In fact, I am going to have a chance to meet the author and discuss it. It is a good friend of mine, and we will discuss the findings; but Dr. Ortiz was telling me that on the survey that he had done of individuals in Hidalgo County, as I recall, and there might be some from Starr County also, that is also on the border, that when they were asked, where did they get access to their health care, 50 percent of them, they were Americans who were asked, where do they get their access to health care, it was in Mexico.

We complained about people coming from Mexico, accessing our services, and yes, they do come over and access our service, but a large percentage of them also go to Mexico to access service, both for prescription drugs, for dental services and for just general health care.

So it is important to note that we still in this country have not been able to meet the needs in those underserved areas. Our rural America is having a great deal of difficulty getting access to good quality care. With the advent of the HMOs and the health care systems, those systems are unwilling to go into rural America because they do not see the profits there. They do not see the way they are going to be able to make a profit, and most of them find themselves in urban areas. So rural areas, the options are very limited to some of the constituencies in our rural communities throughout this country.

There is a real need, and this particular bill provides some resources to begin to look at those underserved areas and begin to provide access to be able to get those resources.

Also, thirdly, the bill increases resources that are needed to combat Hispanic health disparities. I want to take this opportunity to talk about a couple of those disparities.

One of them is the area of diabetes, and I know I mentioned to my colleagues earlier that diabetes is a very important issue that confronts Latinos and others, but I wanted to just mention some of the statistics in the area of diabetes.

In 2000, an estimated 2 million Hispanics had been diagnosed with diabetes, and another 1 million are estimated to have undiagnosed diabetes. Approximately 10 percent of all Hispanics have diabetes; that is one out of 10. That is a pretty significant number when we see one out of 10 Hispanics that suffer from diabetes. For those that are 50 or older, the data goes up to 30 percent that have diabetes. So as they reach the age of 50, it is 30 percent. That is almost three out of 10. So it increases dramatically.

Hispanics, on the average, are almost two times more likely to have diabetes than non-Hispanic whites. So diabetes is definitely an area that we really need to look at, an area that we really need to concentrate on, and I am hoping that we are able to get the resources that we are asking under the Hispanic Health Improvement Act to be able to respond to those needs.

Remember that this is an issue and this is an illness and a disease that causes people to lose their limbs. It causes people to go blind, and their quality of life is hampered. It is an area that in a lot of cases can be prevented, and there are some beautiful programs out there. Dr. Trevino's program in San Antonio that works with kids in the San Antonio ISD school district and others, these are good programs, viable programs.

I have been blessed that in my district, in Starr County was where some

of the first studies that were done in the area of diabetes, where they are able to now identify those youngsters in elementary school that have the signs or the possibility of diabetes; and so we need to make sure that we go forward in that area.

The other area that I have mentioned to my colleagues that is also a disparity that I would like to just kind of address a little more, and that is the area of both HIV and AIDS. Twenty percent of persons living with AIDS are Hispanic, 20 percent, despite the fact that we only represent 13 percent of the population. So we see the disparity, and that 20 percent is significant.

The AIDS incidence rate per 100,000 population, the number of new cases of diseases that occurred during a specific time period among Hispanics in 2000 was 22.5, more than three times the rate for whites. So in the area of AIDS, we are disproportionately hit, and according to projections made by the Harvard School of Public Health, by the year 2050, the number of new AIDS cases among Hispanics will surpass that of whites. When it comes to AIDS and HIV, we have an area that we really need to begin to look at how we are going to concentrate, how we are going to be looking at meeting some of those needs of those individuals.

Once again, there is need for basic grants to start up those community-based organizations that do not exist in our communities. They exist in some of the other communities, but in ours, we still do not have the community-based organizations.

The other areas of disparity are the issues regarding cancer, the issues of asthma, substance abuse and mental health. Let me briefly, in the area of mental health a number of studies suggest that the mental health of Hispanics decreases as Hispanics adapt to the U.S. way of life. That is kind of interesting, that as they become more Americanized, the mental health problems supposedly decrease. Hispanic youth experience, proportionately, more anxiety-related though, and delinquency problem behaviors with both depression and drug use than do non-Hispanic white youth. In fact, many refugees from Central America experience kind of trauma-related traumas in the homelands where they come from with the civil wars, and so a lot of them are suffering from post-traumatic stress disorders.

It is one of the areas that we know especially with our veterans that it is something that needs to be worked on. It is something that needs to be treated, and it is similar to, for example, what happened in New York after 9/11. There is no doubt that we ought to be working with a lot of New Yorkers there and the families because of the issue of post-traumatic stress disorder, and it is something that stays with someone.

If anyone has gone through any experience such as that, it is something that changes their life. It is something

that dramatically causes a person to change, and in some ways, they are even unconsciously doing certain things without realizing why they are doing it and why they think in certain ways because of the impact of that traumatic experience.

So it applies not only to veterans in the war, but it also applies to things that we witness, things that we have experienced. So post-traumatic stress disorders among young Latinos also has increased, along with the issue of depression.

Among Hispanics with mental disorders, fewer than one in 11 contact mental health specialists. So a lot of Hispanics who do suffer from mental health difficulties do not contact for assistance, are not in our mental health programs throughout this country, are not getting the service that they need, while fewer than one in five contact general health care providers, but one in 11 failed to contact.

Among Hispanic immigrants with mental disorders, fewer than one in 20 use the services. So the numbers go even lower as they first come into this country. They tend not to utilize the services.

Let me talk a little bit on mental health. Mental health is one of the areas that for some reason in this country, just like in health care, but more so in mental health, it is an area that we have been reluctant to fund. It is an area that we have been reluctant to provide assistance to, an area where a lot of our youngsters suffer from depression, where a lot of our women suffer from depression, where we have forgotten quickly what happened at Columbine, and so those things are still there. Those problems still exist, and there is a need for us to reach out to our young people. There is a need for us to work with our communities and our schools to see how we can help, and there is really a need for us to reach out.

There is data to show that Latinos, Hispanics, a large number of them, in fact, the number of suicides among Latinos is growing. So it is an area that we need to really kind of look at real close. So I wanted to make sure that I emphasize that our program also talks about the mentally ill as well as substance abuse.

Let me also briefly talk about another disease which is heart disease. Heart disease claims the lives of 30 percent of, more than 107,000, Hispanic Americans who die each year, 107,000, 30 percent are Hispanics. Among Mexican American adults, about 29 percent of men and 27 percent of women have cardiovascular diseases. Among those with high blood pressure, Mexican Americans are much less likely than non-Hispanic whites and non-Hispanic blacks to be aware of it and be treated. So not only do they have high blood pressure, but a large number of them are not even aware of the problem, and they feel okay or think they feel okay and they continue to act in the way

they do, and so they are unable to get it treated.

It becomes real important that we provide the preventive care that is needed, to provide the access to those services that are important.

So I wanted to emphasize those specific programs that we have and indicate the importance of that.

Let me also take this opportunity to also talk briefly about the prescription drug coverage. For access to health care, we know at one time, when both Medicaid and Medicare were established, we could have argued, well, prescriptions were maybe not that important at that time. Although for our indigent, we have provided access to prescription drug coverage, but we have not done that for Medicare, and I know that the President has come up with a proposal on Medicare for prescription drugs, but we also know that that proposal is inadequate, and everyone knows it and everyone recognizes that.

It is a proposal that is just out there that is a facade, that does not really address the needs of our seniors that are suffering from Medicare.

For Hispanics, most of our Hispanic Americans that find themselves in their twilight years, the majority only have Social Security and nothing else and find themselves only with Medicare and no Medicare-Plus or any other, and so it becomes real important that we start to begin to look at a prescription drug plan that helps to address the needs of our seniors and our seniors are in need.

Our seniors are having a great deal of difficulty, and every time I go to a senior citizen center, every time I am at church, people will approach me about the importance of prescription drugs and the importance of making it accessible to our seniors.

The ironical thing about it is, once again, here we have a country that has come up with some beautiful health care programs, some beautiful responses to some of our diseases; yet our people do not have access to them and they are not affordable.

So I would ask what good does it do to have all the information, all the good prescriptions that are out there to address the needs of some of our problems when people do not have access to them, and they are not affordable?

□ 2215

So there is a real need for us to reach out to those seniors and make that accessible.

The importance of the prescription drugs to our seniors is key. We know that that is one of the main ways of addressing the needs of our seniors. We know that that is one of the few ways that they can deal with their problems. So it becomes important that we come up with a program that addresses the need of prescription drug coverage for our seniors, and we know that the President's proposal is not adequate.

The Bush budget basically sacrifices the health of our Nation to provide tax

cuts for the wealthiest 1 percent. The Bush budget fails to adequately address the problems of the 41 million Americans that find themselves uninsured. Nearly 25 percent of all uninsured are children. Even 25 percent of the moderate-income families cannot afford health insurance. And eight out of 10 uninsured Americans are working individuals. We have to keep that in mind. These are people that are trying to make ends meet. These are people trying to work to go after that American dream, yet finding themselves without health insurance, unable to provide the resources when they do find themselves in need of medications.

I wanted to stress one more time that in the area of health care for our seniors we find ourselves in the Congress and in the administration with an unwillingness to respond to a program that addresses their needs. We ought to recognize that the private sector has even indicated that they cannot make a profit from our seniors, Mr. Speaker. We know that they spend a little bit over \$1,000 on prescriptions, and we know that the private sector has a rough time. The only ones they can make a profit on are those healthy seniors that find themselves in a situation where they are not that sick. But as soon as they do get sick, they are not good for our insurance companies because they cannot make a profit.

And that is fine, Mr. Speaker. Insurance companies are there as a for-profit operation. They are there to make a profit. So we should not expect them to provide access to our seniors. But it is the responsibility of the government to provide for its most vulnerable. These individuals have been there for us in the past. These individuals have worked all their lives. Now it is our obligation and our responsibility to provide for access to that health care.

In the same dialogue, when we talk about health care, I wanted to take this opportunity to also talk about our veterans at a time when our veterans are growing in numbers. With a lot of the World War II veterans, the Korean veterans, as well as the Vietnam veterans reaching that age, the demographics show there are a large number of veterans; and that number is increasing. So it is important for us to step up to the plate.

Yes, we have provided some minimal increases throughout the years, but it is not sufficient. So I wanted to take this opportunity, because of the fact that we do have our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan and Colombia, but more so in Iraq, to just express that our thoughts and our prayers go out to all our soldiers that are out there, and we wish for their quick and safe return. We know that we are going to be victorious. We know we are going to be able to make that happen. We want that to occur as quickly as possible, and we are going to try to provide them with whatever resources they need. But we must also honor our veterans services. We honor them by en-

suring that they have access to quality benefits and services once they come home, and that is important.

With our troops in the field, and, sadly, with many Americans already experiencing the war's devastating effect, it is shameful that this House passed a budget resolution cutting \$15 billion from veterans disability compensation programs and \$9.7 billion from veterans health care at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that our soldiers began Operation Iraqi Freedom. It is clear that this proposal will have a devastating effect on the VA health care and benefits program, and it would serve as a further insult to millions of veterans already facing reductions in their health care, in their compensation, in their pensions and education benefits.

The administration's budget was already inadequate to meet the health care needs of our veterans, and now the House Republicans have gone further and cut \$844 million above the President's request for veterans health care next year. Not only was the President's budget inadequate, but the House chose to go beyond that and cut even further. The proposal, which was approximately \$1.3 billion above the 2003 appropriations, would not even cover the inflationary impact and anticipated salary increases for the VA health care workers.

Mr. Speaker, the budget relies on unrealistic management efficiencies and increased copayments. Despite the fact that there are arguments that there was money added, it is based on certain management efficiencies that they are going to be able to achieve. So it is not even real dollars. It is based on increasing copayments for our veterans and a new annual enrollment tax on certain veterans using the VA health care system and other inefficiencies, such as eliminating 5,000 VA nursing home vets. Mr. Speaker, that is the bill that we voted out, one that would cut and eliminate 5,000 nursing home beds.

The budget resolution also calls for cutting \$15 billion over 10 years. That is \$463 million just in 2004 alone in the VA mandatory spending under the guise of eliminating fraud, waste and abuse. Well, 90 percent of the spending for the VA health entitlements is paid out of monthly payments to disabled veterans and their survivors. I personally do not consider payments to war disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans, and the GI bill benefits for the soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be fraud, waste or abuse.

I recently joined my colleagues on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, led by our Republican colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), in a bipartisan recommendation to the Committee on the Budget, which would have added \$3 billion. So I want to thank Chairman SMITH for his sincere effort at trying to do that, just to add for next year, for veterans discretionary programs, including med-

ical care and research, construction, and programs that fund the administrative cost of other important benefits such as compensation, pension and education programs.

I urge all my colleagues to do the right thing as we move forward and to look at this veterans budget and be able to do the right thing.

In conclusion, as I talk about the veterans program, we also had a study that was done by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Secretary Principi, who I hold in great esteem; and this particular study was called the "Report of the Preparedness Review Working Group to the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs." This report basically talks about some of the problems that we are encountering and the need to look at how we begin to prepare ourselves in case of a major problem.

Since the 9-11 attacks, the Department of Veterans Affairs has been forced to address issues that it never received funding to undertake. The VA continues to serve as a backup provider for the Department of Defense in times of war, and it is also part of the National Disaster Medical System. It is responsible for several roles within the Federal response plan, including providing assistance with procurement, assisting in the management of the national stockpile of anecdotes, which is key and important, and other pharmaceutical and information management technologies that support emergency medical care to veterans as well as active duty military and civilians.

In order to fund such activities, Mr. Speaker, funds are currently being diverted from the VA patient care system. I had an opportunity to provide an amendment to the supplemental last Thursday, the supplemental for \$77 billion. Two billion dollars of that is going for health care for the Iraqis; and I asked that of those \$2 billion for the Iraqis that we look at \$90 million, of which \$70 million was going to be used to help pay for the cost that has already been incurred by the VA since 9-11. That was just \$70 million, but I was not able to do that. The other \$20 million was to begin to start off a piece of legislation that I helped author, that we passed but has not been funded, to establish four health centers throughout the country that will be able to respond for homeland defense in the area of health.

Right now, after the study, the emergency preparedness budget that was sent recommended \$248 million that they need now, and those dollars are not there. And in fact, we are taking \$122 million away from existing services to try to do this. That is taking away from our veterans that need the service now that are reaching that age where they need us the most. In order to fund such activities, funds are currently being diverted. And we have to

stop that. We have to be able to provide the resources for homeland defense, to be able to get the pharmaceutical stockpiles that are needed for a national emergency.

Our health care system, the VA, is one of the best in the country. It covers every region in the United States. And so there is a real need for us to provide them with the resources for the stockpile for pharmaceuticals that they need for antidotes and other things. They need not only the pharmaceuticals but they also need the training. Our personnel need the training. They need the resources to make that happen.

Every time we go code orange or whatever the code might be, there are certain levels where they need a police force to fortify. They need security personnel that go on overtime, not to mention the fact that because we have gone into war we find ourselves in a situation where a lot of our nurses and a lot of our doctors, a lot of our health professionals are not only working for the VA but are in the military. So we are finding a great deal of difficulty in filling those slots, and to the point that they are looking at contracting out some of the services. That is why those resources are needed.

In addition, in order to activate those four critically needed bioterrorist centers that would help us, we needed that \$20 million. The VA's many areas of expertise on such diverse topics as biomedical research, post-traumatic stress disorders, war-related illnesses, as well as environmental hazards, including both treatment of environmental exposures such as Agent Orange, ionizing radiation, as well as Gulf War illnesses, make it poised to make significant contributions to detect and diagnose and treat a lot of our soldiers as well as our constituency if we ever have to. But they need the resources in order to make that happen.

So I would appeal to the Members and to the Republicans to reassess the budget of the VA. Now, I know they will argue, and the average constituent out there will hear, no, we just added \$122 million. They do not mention that

the \$122 million came from existing services. They are coming from the services that are being provided for our veterans. And right now is when our veterans, the numbers and the demographics are growing. This is when we need them the most.

So I wanted to take this opportunity tonight to talk about health care, since this month is Health Care Month, and I wanted to take an opportunity to mention our veterans.

□ 2230

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that our prayers and thoughts are with our soldiers. We pray for their swift and quick return back to their loved ones.

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 reasons.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and April 8 on account of a funeral in the district.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal family matters.

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. HOOLEY of Oregon) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TANCREDO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, April 8.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 8.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 8, 9, 10, and 11.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 273. An act to provide for the expeditious completion of the acquisition of land owned by the State of Wyoming within the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 302. An act to revise the boundaries of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in the State of California, to restore and extend the term of the advisory commission for the recreation area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 426. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the initial stage of the Oahe Unit, James Division, South Dakota, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands and the department of Game, Fish, and Parks of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential lease-holders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 8, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first quarter of 2003, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 2002 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND, LUXEMBOURG, MALTA, ITALY, AND PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 1 AND DEC. 12, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Richard W. Pombo	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Rob Portman	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Richard Burr	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Vito Fosella	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Scott Palmer	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			
Sam Lancaster	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00			(3)			

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO POLAND, LUXEMBOURG, MALTA, ITALY, AND PORTUGAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 1 AND DEC. 12, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
John Feehery	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Bill Hughes	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Chris Walker	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Shanti Ochs	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Martha Morrison	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Steve Rusnak	12/2	12/4	Poland		372.00		(3)				
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Richard W. Pombo	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Rob Portman	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Ken Lucas	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Richard Burr	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Scott Palmer	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Sam Lancaster	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
John Feehery	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Bill Hughes	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Chris Walker	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Christy Surprenant	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Bill Livingood	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Shanti Ochs	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Martha Morrison	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Steve Rusnak	12/4	12/6	Luxembourg				(3)				
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard W. Pombo	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Rob Portman	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Ken Lucas	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard Burr	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	12/6	12/7	Malta	93.02	222.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Sam Lancaster	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
John Feehery	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Bill Hughes	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Chris Walker	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Shanti Ochs	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Martha Morrison	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Steve Rusnak	12/6	12/7	Malta	72.07	172.00		(3)				
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard W. Pombo	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Rob Portman	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard Burr	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Vito Fossella	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Sam Lancaster	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
John Feehery	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Bill Hughes	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Chris Walker	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Shanti Ochs	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Martha Morrison	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Steve Rusnak	12/7	12/10	Italy	1,249.25	1,248.00		(3)				
Hon. J. Dennis Hastert	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard W. Pombo	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Hon. Rob Portman <sup>4</sup>											
Hon. Frank D. Lucas	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Hon. Richard Burr	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00	1,706.34					
Hon. Vito Fossella	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Hon. Grace F. Napolitano	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Scott Palmer	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Sam Lancaster	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
John Feehery	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Bill Hughes	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Chris Walker	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Christy Surprenant	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Bill Livingood	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Shanti Ochs	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Martha Morrison	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Steve Rusnak	12/10	12/11	Portugal	421.40	430.00		(3)				
Committee total											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.  
<sup>4</sup> Departed from Rome.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Speaker of the House, Feb. 1, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MALAYSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 10 AND JAN. 17, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Amory Houghton, Jr	1/12	1/17	Malaysia	3,401.00	895.00		7,005.25				7,900.25
Hon. Darrel E. Issa	1/13	1/16	Malaysia	2,720.80	716.00		5,052.24				5,768.24
Robert W. Van Wicklin	1/12	1/17	Malaysia	3,401.00	895.00		7,350.75				8,245.75
Erica M. Ferri	1/12	1/17	Malaysia	3,401.00	895.00		7,350.75				8,245.75
Committee total					3,401.00		26,758.99				30,159.99

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Feb. 4, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO CHINA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 10 AND JAN. 20, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Donald Manzullo	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Judy Biggert	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Joseph Crowley	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Leonard Boswell	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Michael Capuano	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Ken Lucas	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Bill Pascrell, Jr	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Bernice Sanders	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Jan Schakowsky	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Hon. Charles Stenholm	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
J. Matthew Szymanski	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Ian Deason	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Katherine Kless	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Jennifer Osika	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Peter Yeo	1/12	1/19	China		1,773.00		3,273.00				2,046.00
Committee total					31,914.00		4,914.00				36,828.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

DONALD A. MANZULLO, Jan. 12, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 12 AND JAN. 16, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/14	1/16	Belgium		618.00		3,214.31				3,832.31
Carol Lawrence	1/13	1/16	Belgium		927.00		5,682.12				6,610.12
Committee total					1,545.00		8,897.43				10,442.43

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DOUG BEREUTER, Mar. 6, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO KYRGYSTAN, UZBEKISTAN, KUWAIT, AND GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 18, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Mac Collins	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Hon. Terry Everett	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Hon. William J. Pascrell	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Chester C. (Bo) Bryant	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Brant Bassett	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Marcell Lettre	2/13	2/14	Kyrgystan		233.00		(3)				
Hon. Mac Collins	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		(4)		(3)				
Hon. Terry Everett	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Hon. William J. Pascrell	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Chester C. (Bo) Bryant	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Brant Bassett	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Marcel Lettre	2/14	2/15	Uzbekistan		333.00		(3)				
Hon. Mac Collins	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Hon. Terry Everett	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Hon. William J. Pascrell	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Chester C. (Bo) Bryant	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Brant Bassett	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Marcell Lettre	2/15	2/16	Kuwait		385.00		(3)				
Hon. Mac Collins	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Hon. Terry Everett	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Hon. William J. Pascrell	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Hon. Michael Capuano	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Hon. Joe Wilson	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Chester C. (Bo) Bryant	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Brant Bassett	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Marcel Lettre	2/16	2/17	Germany		322.00		(3)				
Committee total											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

<sup>4</sup> Denied per diem.

MAC COLLINS, Mar. 18, 2003.



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO BELGIUM, FRANCE, TURKEY, SLOVAKIA, AND UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 15 AND FEB. 24, 2003—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Alicia O'Donnell	2/23	2/24	United Kingdom		304.00						304.00
	2/15	2/18	Belgium		966.00						966.00
	2/18	2/20	France		860.00						860.00
Jo Weber	2/20	2/23	Turkey		840.00						840.00
	2/23	2/24	United Kingdom		304.00						304.00
	2/15	2/18	Belgium		966.00						966.00
	2/18	2/20	France		860.00						860.00
	2/20	2/23	Turkey		840.00						840.00
	2/23	2/24	United Kingdom		304.00						304.00
Committee total					36,401.00		7,102.85				43,503.85

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.  
<sup>4</sup> Military air transportation +4,040.90.  
<sup>5</sup> Military air transportation +3,061.96.

DOUG BEREUTER, Mar. 12, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HON. FRANK R. WOLF, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 29, 2002 AND JAN. 4, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Frank R. Wolf	12/29	12/29	United States				6,981.81				6,981.81
	12/31	12/31	Eritrea		184.00						184.00
	12/31	1/3	Ethiopia		840.00		235.00				1,075.00
		1/4	United States								
Committee total					1,024.00		7,216.81				8,240.81

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FRANK R. WOLF, Feb. 3, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DANIEL SCANDLING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 29, 2002 AND JAN. 4, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Daniel Scandling	12/29	12/29	United States				6,981.81				6,981.81
	12/31	12/31	Eritrea		184.00						184.00
	12/31	1/3	Ethiopia		840.00		235.00				1,075.00
		1/4	United States								
Committee total					1,024.00		7,216.81				8,240.81

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SCANDLING, Feb. 3, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. KIRK D. BOYLE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 16 AND FEB. 24, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kirk D. Boyle	2/17	2/19	Austria		214.00				50.00		528.00
	2/19	2/21	Croatia		191.00				50.00		482.00
	2/21	2/24	Germany		272.00				50.00		916.00
Committee total											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KIRK D. BOYLE, Mar. 10, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 16 AND MAY 19, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jim Kolbe	5/16	5/19	Mexico		345.65						345.65
Hon. David Dreier	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72						252.72
Hon. Charles Stenholm	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Joe Barton	5/16	5/19	Mexico		168.48		888.02				1,056.50
Hon. Chris Cannon	5/16	5/19	Mexico		168.48						168.96
Hon. Tom Tancredo	5/16	5/19	Mexico		186.96						186.96
Hon. Howard Berman	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Calvin Dooley	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Ed Pastor	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Bob Filner	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72						252.72
Hon. Lucille Roybal-Allard	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44
Hon. Tom Udall	5/16	5/19	Mexico		280.44						280.44

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 16 AND MAY 19, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Fran McNaught	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Patrick Baugh	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Caleb McCarr	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Jim Farr	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Linda Solomon	4/16	4/20	Mexico		331.01		638.91		87.55		1,057.47
Linda Solomon	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Paul Ostburg Sanz	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Brad Smith	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Jean Carroll	5/16	5/19	Mexico		252.72		(3)				252.72
Delegation expenses:											
Representational									6,253.70		6,253.70
Interpreters									3,120.00		3,120.00
Miscellaneous									40.00		40.00
Payment to Treasury of accrued interest									1,602.86		1,602.86
Committee total					5,690.86		1,526.93		11,104.11		18,321.90

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

JIM KOLBE, Mar. 25, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 16 AND MAY 20, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Amo Houghton	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. John LaFalce	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Liberty Dunn	5/14	5/20	United States		1,554.00		295.00				1,849.00
Hon. Phil English	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Don Manzullo	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Dan Miller	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Frank Record	5/16	5/19	United States		1,036.00		110.50				1,146.00
Hon. Clay Shaw	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Mark Souder	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Cliff Stearns	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Bob Van Wicklin	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. Louise Slaughter	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Hon. William Lipinski	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Ms. Jessie Shepard	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Dr. John Eishold	5/16	5/20	United States		1,036.00		(3)				1,036.00
Delegation expenses:											
Miscellaneous									209.30		209.30
Representational									39,485.99		39,485.99
Payment of Interest Accrued									502.59		502.59
Committee total					17,094.00		405.50		40,197.88		57,697.38

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

AMO HOUGHTON, Mar. 3, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRANSATLANTIC LEGISLATORS' DIALOGUE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational									85,855.11		85,855.11
Miscellaneous									2,591.48		2,591.48
Translation									10,500.00		10,500.00
Travel									1,705.00		1,705.00
Lodging									28,968.60		28,968.60
Committee total									129,620.19		129,620.19

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HENRY J. HYDE.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/21	2/25	USA				641.00				641.00
Robin Evans	10/4	10/7	Belgium				5,682.15				5,682.15
Susan Olson	2/21	2/25	France				<sup>3</sup> 2,866.16				2,866.16
	5/23		USA				576.50				576.50
	10/4	10/7	Bulgaria				<sup>3</sup> 2,910.59				<sup>3</sup> 2,910.59
Hon. Ralph Regula		11/8	Belgium				5,682.15				5,682.15
Josephine Weber		2/22	Canada				<sup>3</sup> 605.25				605.25
	5/23		France				<sup>3</sup> 2,866.16				2,866.16
			Bulgaria				<sup>3</sup> 2,910.59				2,910.59

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2002—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total			
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>		
Lodging and Miscellaneous .....											2,008.84	2,008.84	
Delegation Expenses:												2,866.16	2,866.16
Representational functions .....												20,690.09	20,690.09
Miscellaneous .....												4,667.78	4,667.78
Committee total .....											24,740.55	27,366.71	52,107.27

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> One-way airline tickets.

DOUG BEREUTER, Mar. 12, 2003.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, BRITISH AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY GROUP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2002

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total			
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>		
Delegation Expense:													
Representational .....												14,812.11	14,812.11
Travel .....												12,916.50	12,916.50
Lodging .....												829.40	829.40
Miscellaneous .....												125.37	125.37
Payment to Treasury of accrued interest .....												2,615.68	2,615.68
Committee total .....												31,299.06	31,299.06

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

Mar. 12, 2003.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1674. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Funding and Fiscal Affairs, Loan Policies and Operations, and Funding Operations; Capital Adequacy—ABS and MBS Investments (RIN: 3052-AC14) received March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1675. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the intention to reallocate funds previously transferred from the Emergency Response Fund; (H. Doc. No. 108—61); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1676. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) for the quarter ending December 2002, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1677. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the effectiveness of voting assistance programs, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1566 Public Law 107—107, section 1602; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1678. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Disclosure of Financial and Other Information (RIN: 2550-AA25) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1679. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Radiation Exposure Reports: Labeling Personal Information (RIN: 3150-AH07) received March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1680. 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 Kuwait [Transmittal No. DTC 041-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1681. 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 Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 007-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1682. 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 the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 014-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1683. 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 France, United Kingdom, Germany, Switzerland, Sweden and Spain [Transmittal No. DTC 008-03], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1684. 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 Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 006-02], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1685. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 2002," pursuant to 22 U.S.C.

2151n(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

1686. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 3 of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

1687. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Seven Bexar County, Texas, Invertebrate Species (RIN: 1018-A147) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1688. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plan; Correction [Docket No. 030124019-3040-02; I.D. 010703B] (RIN: 0648-AQ67) received April 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1689. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher/processor Vessels Using Hook-and-line Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 021212307-3037-3037-02; I.D. 031303B] received March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1690. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Taunton River, MA [CGD01-03-011] received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1691. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security Zone: Protection of Tank Ships, Puget Sound, WA

[CGD13-02-018] (RIN: 1625-AA00 [Formerly 2115-AA97]) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1692. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Security and Safety Zone: Protection of Large Passenger Vessels, Puget Sound, WA [CGD13-03-003] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for the Handling of Discrimination Complaints under Section 519 of the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (RIN: 1218-AB99) received April 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1694. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program (RIN: 3067-AD21) received April 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1695. A letter from the Director, Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Board of Veterans' Appeals: Rules of Practice—Appeal Withdrawal (RIN: 2900-AK71) received March 31, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1696. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Workforce Security, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Treatment of Retirement Pay—Employee Contributions—received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1697. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of fringe benefits (Rev. Rul. 2002-25) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1698. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Diesel Fuel: Blended Taxable Fuel [TD 9051] (RIN: 1545-AX97) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1699. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claim for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2003-27) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1700. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Grants to individuals (Rev. Rul. 2003-32) received April 2, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1701. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's results of an audit conducted in response to a report entitled, "Annual Report on Transfers of Militarily Sensitive Technology to Countries and Entities of Concern"; jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select).

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1036. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others; with an amendment (Rept. 108-59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1298. A bill to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BOEHLETT, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 6. A bill to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Resources, Education and the Workforce, and 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. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 1644 A bill to enhance energy conservation and research and development, to provide for security and diversity in the energy supply for the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Resources, Education and the Workforce, and 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. BOEHLERT:

H.R. 1645 A bill to establish a research, development, and demonstration program in genetics, protein science, and computational biology of microbes and plants to support the energy and environmental mission of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Science.

By Ms. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1646 A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to modify the State exemption provisions for advancement of time; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

H.R. 1647 A bill to assist in the conservation of cranes by supporting and providing, through projects of persons and organizations with expertise in crane conservation, financial resources for the conservation programs of countries the activities of which directly or indirectly affect cranes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1648 A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain water distribution systems of the Cachuma Project, California, to the Carpinteria Valley Water District and the Montecito Water District; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 1649 A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security

Act to clarify rules for determining whether certain agent-drivers and commission-drivers are employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1650 A bill to ensure regulatory equity between and among all dairy farmers and handlers, including producers also acting as handlers, for sales of packaged fluid milk into certain non-federally regulated milk marketing areas from federally regulated areas and to apply minimum milk price requirements to certain handlers of Class I milk products in the Arizona-Las Vegas marketing area under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. DOOLEY of California):

H.R. 1651. A bill to provide for the exchange of land within the Sierra National Forest, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 1652. A bill to provide extended unemployment benefits to displaced workers, and to make other improvements in the unemployment insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. GOODE):

H.R. 1653. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to change the effective date for paid-up coverage under the military Survivor Benefit Plan from October 1, 2008, to October 1, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 1654. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to require congressional approval of proposed rules considered by the Congress to be significant rules; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STRICKLAND:

H.R. 1655. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; 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. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 1656. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide the National Labor Relations Board with expanded statutory authority with respect to employees and labor organizations engaged in or encouraging violent and other potentially injurious conduct; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MALONEY,

Mr. PAYNE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mrs. CAPPS):  
H.R. 1657. A bill to provide funding for programs at the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences regarding breast cancer in younger women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 138. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774-2005; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. NEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H. Con. Res. 139. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the brochures entitled "How Our Laws Are Made" and "Our American Government", the publication entitled "Our Flag", the document-sized, annotated version of the United States Constitution, and the pocket version of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H. Con. Res. 140. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the awareness of and treatment for kidney disease; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Res. 179. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the systematic human rights violations in Cuba committed by the Castro Regime, calling for the immediate release of all political prisoners, and supporting respect for basic human rights and free elections in Cuba; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 180. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week" and honoring the service of correctional officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. POMBO introduced a bill (H.R. 1658) to amend the Railroad Right-of-Way Conveyance Validation Act to validate additional conveyances of certain lands in the State of California that form part of the right-of-way granted by the United States to facilitate the construction of the transcontinental railway, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Resources.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. REYES, and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 34: Mr. TIERNEY and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 44: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 49: Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 97: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MICA, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 100: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 119: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 133: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 140: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 173: Mr. DOYLE and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 198: Mr. SMYTH of Michigan.

H.R. 199: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 205: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H.R. 218: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 235: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. COLE, and Mr. OTTER.

H.R. 284: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FORD, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 300: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 331: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 391: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 466: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 504: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 527: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 528: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 531: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 532: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 577: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 584: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 627: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 648: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 685: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 693: Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 781: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 791: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FROST, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. GERLACH.

H.R. 800: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 806: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 813: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 816: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 844: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 876: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 886: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 898: Mr. GILCHREST and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 953: Mr. PICKERING, Mr. REYES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 972: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 979: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 996: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 997: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 1038: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1040: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 1049: Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1052: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1072: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1084: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 1101: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 1105: Mr. WYNN, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1119: Mr. CARTER, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 1136: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1137: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1157: Mr. DOGGETT and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1221: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1225: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1231: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1309: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1321: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1322: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 1348: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1375: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. HART, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1409: Mr. BISHOP of Utah

H.R. 1415: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 1429: Mr. HOLT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SOLIS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1442: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HERGER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 1478: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 1519: Mr. BISHOP of New York.

H.R. 1577: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 1585: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1633: Mr. BECERRA.

H.J. Res. 4: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. KOLBE.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. FOLEY.

H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 103: Mr. CALVERT.

H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 119: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FROST, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. FROST, Mr. FARR, and Mr. POMEROY.

H. Res. 72: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 127: Mr. MCCOTTER.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 660: Mr. BACA.