United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2003 No. 127

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN 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 a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House of requested:

S.J. Res. 17. Joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–170, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance, announces the appointment of Andrew J. Imperato, of Maryland, to serve as a member of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel, vice Christine M. Griffin, of Massachusetts.

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 Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

FUTURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in 5 minutes I am going to give a short tutorial on the bleak future of Social Security. A proposal that I just introduced, H.R. 3055 tries to make sure that we keep Social Security solvent. Social Security is one of the most successful programs in assuring that retirees continue to have some real social security.

After the Great Depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said what we should have is a program of forced savings during one's working years, to set aside to make sure that people have some money in retirement.

Well, as it turned out, the law that was passed provided that nothing was set aside in an individual's name. Existing workers paid in the Social Security tax and that was immediately sent out to current retirees. It was sort of a pay-as-you-go program.

It is, if you will, Mr. Speaker, like a chain letter. Uncle Sam says, look, here is a list of names; put your name at the bottom of the list and send a check to all those people above you. And when your name gets to the top when you retire, all of the people below you at that time will send you a check.

The problem is there will be fewer people to send you a check. There are two colliding forces, not only in the United States but across the world where the age of death is higher. We are living longer. And at the same time, the birth rate is going down.

In Europe, France now has a payroll tax of 51 percent. You make a dollar and have to give 51 percent to the government to take care of the seniors in that country. That is because a pay-as-you-go program with such a large senior population and a reducing birth rate means fewer number of workers to pay in, which means each individual workers has to pay out more in taxes.

Let us not let the United States come to that predicament because it will mean one of two things: a company either charges, more for this products to pay for the extra cost of that tax or you pay workers less. Either way, it is bad for the future of our economy and our ability to compete with other countries.

Mr. Speaker, let me describe H.R. 3055: The trust fund continues in our bill. The Retirement Security Act would allow workers to create on a voluntary basis accounts funded from their payroll taxes. The accounts would start at 2.5 percent of income and would reach 8 percent by 2075, a slow process as you shift away from the pay-as-you-go. Workers would own the money in their accounts. Investments would be limited and widely diversified, and investment proceeds would be subject to government oversight.

The government would supplement the accounts of low-income workers making less than $35,000 a year to ensure they build up a significant savings. What is important in those early years is the magic of compound interest, starting with a small amount of dollars and letting it grow. Again, it is an optional program.

People choosing to participate in the voluntary account program would continue to receive benefits directly from the government, and those benefits would be offset based on the amount of money going in. But they would be guaranteed so that the person that opts in to a personal retirement savings account would be guaranteed that they would be at least as well off as those that did not take that option.

Printed on recycled paper.

Worker accounts: all worker accounts would be owned by the worker and invested through pools supervised by the government. Regulations would be instituted to prevent people from taking undue risk. Until an account balance reaches $2,500, a worker would be limited on the kind of index investments they could make; and after the balance reaches $2,500, they would have more flexibility but only investing in safe accounts as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The fairness to women's provision that we put in this bill: for married couples, account contributions would be pooled and then divided equally between the husband and wife. So whatever the husband and wife would be eligible to invest would be added together and divided by two so each spouse would have the same in their individual account. Second, it would increase surviving spouse benefits to 110 percent of the higher-earning spouse's benefits. Third, stay-at-home mothers with kids under 5 would receive retirement credit. In other words, we are saying for a spouse that stays home with those young kids, they can have those years credited at the average for the other years.

In conclusion, Social Security solvency, the Retirement Security Act has been scored by the Social Security Administration actuaries to keep the program solvent. There would be no increases in the retirement age, changes in benefits for seniors or near-seniors, or changes in the Social Security COLA.

Mr. Speaker, there are only 24 Members in the House and Senate that have ever signed onto a bill. We need to move ahead and save this program.

AMERICA DESERVES STRAIGHT TALK ON THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this administration is well known for spinning the truth, a very polite term for a lamentable practice. For example, over two-thirds of the American public think that Saddam Hussein and the Iraqis have some linkage to the attack of September 11, when, 2 years after the fact, there remains no evidence, despite the efforts of the administration to rhetorically connect these events.

The administration's habit of using misleading language is at its worst with the environment. Their Clear Skies Initiative will actually permit dirtier air. Relaxation of the New Source Review rules will inhibit the intent of the Clean Air Act, which 30 years ago gave a reprieve to the dirtiest coal fired plants, a reasonable time to come into compliance. The New Source Review rules were designed so that when plants modernize, new anti pollution technology must be put in place. Instead, the agencies have kept these aging dinosaurs in use because, simply, they make more money.

Rather than enforcing the Clean Air Act as previous administrations have done to encourage the industry, President Bush now proposes that these old plants continue to be grandfathered permanently. Changes to the New Source Rules announced last month will allow plants to make a 20 percent investment each year without triggering the New Source Rule. There is no reason for them to ever come into full compliance.

Because of the prevailing winds, the pollution is not just in the vicinity of the plant or in that State that allows it to operate. The effects are concentrated, particularly in the New England States. And attorneys general in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, as well as some midwest States like Wisconsin and Illinois are lining up to challenge this rule in court.

Yesterday, the President was in Michigan to promote his Clear Skies Initiative; but he had the audacity to appear at one of the Nation's dirtiest power plants in Monroe, which is responsible, we are told, for approximately 300 premature deaths each year.

The Detroit Free Press points out that the mercury emissions at that plant have gone up over the course of the last 2 years, and this Clear Skies Initiative will allow more mercury emissions than simply enforcing the current law.

The President attempted to paint to this as a jobs-creation issue; but local labor leaders pointed out that when the Monroe plant owner, Detroit Edison, found out that the New Source Review rules were going to be relaxed, they promptly stop their efforts to install pollution controls required by law and fired 800 union workers who had been installing them. Lost jobs, dirtier air, health problems for thousands.

The pending energy bill should be an opportunity to rectify these problems with cleaner air, reducing the dependence on foreign oil and maybe even protecting the power grid recently proven vulnerable. Instead, we currently have a grab bag of incentives for special interests that shortchanges efficiency, continues reliance on expensive imported foreign oil, and delays the day of reckoning for electrical power to clean the air and a more fuel-efficient auto industry.

It is not too late for the administration and the Congress to deal meaningfully with two or three of these items that would actually help the American public. It is not just protecting the environment and the health of our citizens; it is a matter of long-term economic stability and security at a time when we have almost 140,000 American troops in and around Iraq in no small measure to secure Middle East oil.

The Bush administration should be straight with the American public about the economic, environmental, and security consequences. Rather than a misleading photo-op, we should work for the meaningful environmental progress that America deserves.

VICTORY'S PRICE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, a generation from now Iraq will either be a thriving democratic ally of the United States, or an enemy of unimaginable hatred, ruled by a violent government of, for, and by international terrorists.

A generation from now the battle of Iraq, now the central component of the war on terror, will have succeeded or have failed. America will have won or lost; and our brave heroes who gave their lives there will have sacrificed for virtue or died in vain.

The toppling of Saddam Hussein's status in Firdos Square will have been the dawn of an age of Middle East freedom and stability, or it will have been the cruel joke that ushered in an era of unspeakable terror in the region.

There is no middle ground. Freedom and terrorism cannot co-exist. This struggle between good and evil will be decided by victory or surrender, in security or in shame.

And the terrorists understand the stakes. That is why they swarmed like scorpions into Iraq. They know that their true enemy is not our weapons, but our own will. And thankfully, so does President George W. Bush. That is why he spoke to the Nation last week and announced his request for additional funds to prosecute the war.

The question now before us is whether we realize, as the terrorists do, that the separate stand they are making in Iraq is the last best hope for their evil ideology.

Mr. Speaker, our mission in Iraq is not related to the war on terror. It is the war on terror. The enemy has chosen to make his stand right there. And if victory is our aim, we must not yield until the last terrorist in Iraq is in a cell or in a cemetery. Whether it costs $87 billion or $187 billion, our absolute victory in the war and the peace is worth any price, because without victory, there will be no survival.

□ 1245

If we are to take the war on terror seriously, we must spend what it takes to win. Critics and candidates may measure wars by the dollars that they cost, but the American people will measure this war, as we did in World War II and the Cold War, by the lives it saves, the evil it destroys and the freedom it preserves.

ADMINISTRATION PLAYING FAST AND LOOSE WITH THE FACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

MCGOVERN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly and disturbingly clear that the Bush administration is not being truthful with the American people. From the economy to the environment to the war in Iraq, too often members of the administration play fast and loose with the facts.

They said their massive tax cuts for the wealthy would produce thousands of new jobs. In fact, we have lost not thousands but millions of jobs.

They pledged that no child would be left behind, when, in fact, their education budget fails to live up to its promises and many children are being left behind.

They say there is no real evidence of global warming when, in fact, the vast majority of the scientific evidence disagrees, and it is absolutely stunning to see how hostile this administration is to our precious environment.

On foreign policy it is even worse. For example, in a television interview over the weekend, Vice President CHENEY rejected suggestions from Democrats, Republicans and people around the world that perhaps a different approach is needed in Iraq. The Vice President insisted that the administration's Iraq policy is a rousing success, but after hundreds of American casualties, billions of American taxpayer dollars, zero weapons of mass destruction and facing a long-term occupation of Iraq, that does not seem like the definition of a rousing success.

Before the war, the administration said it would cost between $50 and $100 billion. Mr. Speaker, we now know that the cost of the war in Iraq is at $166 billion and counting.

According to the Washington Post, the Vice President pointed to Iraq's prewar possession of 500 tons of uranium as evidence of their reconstituted, to use his word, nuclear program. The reality is the material was low-grade uranium that could not be used for weapons without sophisticated processing that Iraq could not do.

Perhaps most disturbingly, the Vice President and other members of this administration continue to cloud the issue regarding the link between Iraq and the terrible tragedy of September 11.

The Vice President on Sunday insisted that the relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda ''involved training, for example, on biological and chemical weapons, that al Qaeda sent personnel to Baghdad to get trained on the systems.''

According to a report in today's Boston Globe, however, those claims are based on the hearsay of a terrorist, have never been verified, cannot be proven, and are questionable at best, and Mr. Speaker, I would put the full story of the Boston Globe in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Boston Globe]

CHENEY LINK OF IRAQ, 9/11 CHALLENGED

(By Anne E. Kornblut and Bryan Bender, Sept. 16, 2003)

WASHINGTON.—Vice President Dick Cheney, anxious to defend the White House foreign policy amid ongoing violence in Iraq, stunned intelligence analysts and even members of his own administration this week by failing to dismiss a widely discredited claim: that Saddam Hussein might have played a role in the Sept. 11 attacks.

Evidence of a connection, if any exists, has never been made public. Details that Cheney cited to make the case that the Iraqi dictator had ties to Al Qaeda have been dismissed by the CIA as having no basis, according to analysts and officials. Even before the war in Iraq, most Bush officials did not explicitly state and Iraq had a part in the attack on the United States two years ago.

But Cheney left that possibility wide open in a nationally televised interview two days ago, claiming that the administration is learning ''more and more'' about connections between Al Qaeda and Iraq before the Sept. 11 attacks. The statement surprised some analysts and officials who have reviewed intelligence reports from Iraq.

Democrats sharply attacked him for exaggerating the threat Iraq posed before the war.

''There is no credible evidence that Saddam Hussein had anything to do with 9/11,'' Senator Bob Graham, a Democrat running for president, said in an interview last night. ''There was no such relationship.''

A senior foreign policy adviser to Howard Dean, the Democratic front-runner, said it is ''totally inappropriate for the vice president to continue making these allegations without bringing forward'' any proof.

Cheney and his representatives declined to comment on the vice president's statements. But the comments also surprised some in the intelligence community who are already simmering over the way the administration utilized intelligence reports to strengthen the case for the war last winter.

Vincent Cannistraro, a former CIA counterterrorism specialist, said that Cheney's ''willingness to use speculation and conjecture as facts in public presentations is appalling. It's astounding.''

In particular, current intelligence officials reiterated yesterday that a reported Prague visit in April 2001 between Sept. 11 hijacker Mohamed Atta and an Iraqi agent had been discounted by the CIA, which sent former agency Director James R. Woolsey to investigate the claim. Woolsey did not find any evidence to confirm the report, officials said, and President Bush did not include it in the case for war in his State of the Union address last January.

But Cheney, on NBC's ''Meet the Press,'' cited the report of the meeting as possible evidence of an Iraq-Al Qaeda link and said it was neither confirmed nor discredited, saying.

''We've never been able to develop any more of that yet, either in terms of confirming it or discrediting it. We just don't know.''

Multiple intelligence officials said that the Prague meeting, purported to be between Atta and senior Iraqi intelligence officer Ahmed Khalil Ibrahim Samir al-Ani, was dismissed almost immediately after it was reported by Czech officials in the aftermath of Sept. 11 and has since been discredited further.

The CIA reported to Congress last year that it could not substantiate the claim, while American records indicate Atta was in Virginia Beach, Va., at the time, the officials said yesterday. Indeed, two intelligence officials said yesterday that Ani himself, now in U.S. custody, has also refuted the report. The Czech government has also distanced itself from its original claim.

A senior defense official with access to high-level intelligence reports expressed confusion yesterday over the vice president's decision to reair charges that have been dropped by almost everyone else. ''There isn't any new intelligence that would precipitate anything like this,'' the official said, speaking on condition he not be named.

Nonetheless, 60 percent of Americans believe that Hussein probably had a part in attacking the United States, according to a recent Washington Post poll. And Democratic senators have charged that the White House is fanning the misperception by mentioning Hussein and the Sept. 11 attacks in ways that suggest a link.

Bush administration officials insisted yesterday that they are learning more about various Iraqi connections with Al Qaeda. They said there is evidence suggesting a meeting took place between the head of Iraqi intelligence and Osama bin Laden in Sudan in the mid-1990s; another purported meeting was said to take place in Afghanistan, and during it Iraqi officials offered to provide chemical and biological weapons training, according to officials who have read transcripts of interrogations with Al Qaeda detainees.

But there is no evidence proving the Iraqi regime knew about or took part in the Sept. 11 attacks, the Bush officials said.

Former senator Max Cleland, who is a member of the national commission investigating the attacks, said yesterday that classified documents he has reviewed on the subject weaken, rather than strengthen, administration assertions that Hussein's regime may have been allied with Al Qaeda.

''The vice president trying to justify some connection is ludicrous,'' he said.

Nonetheless, Cheney, in the ''Meet the Press'' interview Sunday, insisted that the United States is learning more about the links between Al Qaeda and Hussein.

''We learn more and more that there was a relationship between Iraq and Al Qaeda that stretched back through most of the decade of the '90s,'' Cheney said, ''that it involved training, for example, on [biological and chemical weapons], that Al Qaeda sent personnel to Baghdad to get trained on the systems.''

The claims are based on a prewar allegation by a ''senior terrorist operative,'' who said he overheard an Al Qaeda agent speak of a mission to seek biological or chemical weapons training in Iraq, according to Secretary of State Colin Powell's statement to the United Nations in February.

But intelligence specialists told the Glove last August that they have never confirmed that the training took place, or identified where it could have taken place. ''The general public just doesn't have any independent way of weighing what is said,'' Cannistraro, the former CIA counterterrorism specialist, said. ''If you repeat it enough times . . . then people become convinced it's the truth.''

Mr. MCGOVERN. Before the war, we were told that Iraq possessed stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons. Today, the administration is singing a very different tune. They now talk about Iraq ''maintaining the capability to develop'' those weapons. Maintaining the capability to develop? Is that what passes for proof in the Bush administration?

There are those who occasionally attempt to give straight answers. Larry Lindsay gave an accurate prediction of how much the war would cost. He got

fired. General Shinseki told the truth about how many troops would be needed in Iraq. He has been replaced.

In the Bush administration, it seems loyalty to the party line is more important than candor.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about important issues here, issues of war and peace, life and death. The American people deserve to know the truth. They deserve straight talk, not some intentionally muddied rationale created for political purposes. They deserve a lot better than they are getting from this administration.

AMERICORPS' OVERENROLLMENT AND QUESTIONABLE ACCOUNTING RECORDS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, just as freedom and liberty are interwoven into the very fabric of our Nation, so too is the American pastime of volunteering. Recently, AmeriCorps' backers have been seeking an additional $100 million in supplemental funding, but I believe we should look carefully at their request.

AmeriCorps was not able to place anywhere from 20,000 to 37,000 employees, volunteers, and this is based upon a statement from them, the Save AmeriCorps Coalition, on September 4, because of its own muddy accounting records and overenrollment. Basically, what they did was overhire 20,000 plus volunteers without authorization.

Of further interest, during the August recess we learned of the distribution of cash bonuses to 265 senior staff at the parent agency, which is the Corporation for National Community Service, CNCS. While the amounts are nominal to their overall budget, what is disturbing is the apparent lack of judgment from CNCS officials. This Congress has been engaged in over a year's worth of hearings and legislation on corporate misbehavior and disproportionate executive compensation in ailing companies. The public expresses outrage over such private sector firm actions and demands that Congress investigate and would probably refer to emergency funding, in the example of such firms as we have been examining, as a bailout. CNCS should be subject to no less scrutiny and adhere to no lower standards.

Some of us question Federal funding of community service in the first place. AmeriCorps pays people to volunteer. Remuneration in exchange for choosing to contribute one's time, energy and/or money would seem to belie the very definition of the word ''volunteerism.''

This country does indeed have many needs. Thankfully, through the work of volunteers, many of those needs are met and fulfilled every day. Americans share their hearts, weekends, muscles and wallets in a multitude of activities.

To this end, a recent exhortation by the Save AmeriCorps Coalition should be mentioned here. This is what they say, ''Our generation is volunteering at unprecedented rates, making vital contributions to communities across the country through AmeriCorps. This opportunity, however, is at risk. Drastic cuts in Federal funding will result in the reduction of critical services for children, the elderly and hundreds of organizations that rely on AmeriCorps volunteers.''

If AmeriCorps is suggesting volunteerism might collapse in the United States, one might forgive our skepticism. Reflect that America has relied on the contribution of volunteers for centuries. AmeriCorps has existed for all but a decade, whereas our Nation's charitable sector thrived since before its creation.

After visiting America for the first time, the French social commentator Alexis de Tocqueville said, ''I have often admired the extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object to the exertions of a great many men, and in getting them voluntarily to pursue it.'' He wrote this in his book Democracy in America.

Further, analysis published in October 2003 in the Reason magazine article on AmeriCorps quantifies that according to AmeriCorps' and Bureau of Labor Statistics' numbers on volunteers both as members of AmeriCorps and as Americans on their own, ''AmeriCorps cuts then represent about four-tenths of 1 percent of total American volunteer hours.''

Even those of us who see the benefit in some Federal role in civic service question some of the endeavors in which AmeriCorps volunteers over the years have participated. While some of the activities undertaken by AmeriCorps members may be meritorious, AmeriCorps also has a history of participating in some activities of questionable value.

That these programs may be described as worthy to some, while questionable to others, might be a needless debate at all were not the taxpayers who are being charged in the first place for this volunteer work. For a decade now, members on both sides of our aisle have sought to legislate whether AmeriCorps members could spend time with political activities, campaigns, faith-based initiatives or unions. If the Federal Government were not involved in what should be a personal preference in the first place, we would not have to have these discussions in the first place. Any American, go volunteer where he or she wants, end of message.

Let us celebrate the pure volunteerism that occurs in our communities every day. Let us encourage it to flourish just as it was 200 years ago, selflessly and generously, from the heart.

THE MIDDLE EAST AND THE FAILED PEACE PROCESS

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this House to address the tragic situation in the Middle East and the failed peace process. It is obvious to all that the continued dispatching of these so-called suicide or homicide bombers into civilian Israeli targets like buses and restaurants is intended to prevent any peaceful resolution of the Palestinian problem.

For any peace process to work, both parties involved must want peace. The Palestinian Authority and Mr. Arafat have demonstrated that they do not want to end and they are unwilling and incapable of preventing this ongoing violence against Israeli civilians.

The repeated call by Mr. Arafat for martyrs by the millions, reiterated by him again last week, should be a stark reminder to us all that we cannot work with him or the beliefs he represents. There can be no real peace when these are the sentiments of this man's heart. Let us not delude ourselves.

Ariel Sharon's primary responsibility, and the primary responsibility of the Israeli government, above and beyond everything else is to maintain the safety and security of its people. While the opinions of European ministers, the U.S. Government and our State Department are important, they are not more important than the lives of women and children.

Now is the time to acknowledge that Oslo has been a terrible failure and the road map is not working. Hundreds of Israelis are dead and buried as a testimony to this fact. Many more are left to face a lifetime of painful disability.

I feel strongly that the Israeli government should be supported in doing whatever it takes to protect its people. If this includes expelling Arafat so be it. If it includes completing the fence, so be it. Whatever is necessary to defend itself and protect its people.

Our State Department was recently quoted as saying that expelling Arafat will not be helpful. I strongly disagree. It may prove to be very helpful. It might end these attacks on Israeli civilians, and what is more, it could be very helpful to the Palestinians themselves.

Since Arafat's return in 1993, the Palestinian economy has shrunk by 70 percent, while at the same time the Israeli economy has doubled. There is widespread corruption and no freedom of speech in the Palestinian-controlled territories. Any Palestinian who openly criticizes Arafat or the Authority's policy is killed. Removing this man and the evil and corrupt regime around him could be the best thing for the peace process.

I know I do not stand alone in these sentiments and that a majority of this House, the Senate and the American

people will support Israel in this. Certainly, the American people expect our leaders to do whatever it takes to protect our people.

Witness what is happening today. In response to the attacks of 9/11, we have waged all-out war, first attacking Afghanistan, then Iraq. Did America rise up and say we need to negotiate with bin Laden and develop a peace process? No.

The American people understand that there is no negotiating with blood-thirsty murderers. The only road to peace and safety is the obliteration of al Qaeda and the regimes that aid it. President Bush said: ''Every Nation has a choice to make. In this conflict there is no neutral ground. If any government sponsors the outlaws and killers of innocents, they have become outlaws and murderers themselves. And they will take that lonely path at their own peril.''

I could not agree with the President more. If this is the standard for America, why should it not be the same for another country? To deny Israel the right to do what it takes to defend itself is to deny Israel the right to exist and to turn our back on an ally and over 50 years of U.S. policy.

We must allow Israel to pursue the same goals for its people that we want for ourselves, the right to live in freedom peace and prosperity. We must stop defending and supporting this brutal, dysfunctional Palestinian Authority and its leader Arafat.

□ 1300

I agree with all those who say we may never end this war on terror until a solution to the Palestinian problem is found. However, negotiating with vicious murderers who seek the destruction of Israel is no solution. It only worsens the problem.

Let us give Ariel Sharon and the Israeli government the freedom to do what is right, to defend and protect their people.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 1 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 at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord of history, we know You were with the Framers of our Constitution. Be with us here and now.

Be present to Your people across this Nation as they gather for community affairs, business and to pray.

The strength of this Nation has always been shown in its spirit. This free society is always at its best when in the face of diversity or adversity, we show tolerance, understanding, and compassion.

Before You, the task of building strong relationships comes from honest communication rooted in the silence of deep convictions. Trust grows with kind words and consistent behavior.

Mindful of our freedom, let us choose to water the seeds of tolerance, understanding and compassion in ourselves and in our children.

Then we will become the people the Founders envisioned and become a sign of hope for the world.

You, Lord, hold us together in the present moment and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CALVERT 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.

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TODAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with today.

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

There was no objection.

RICHMOND'S LITTLE CHAMPIONS

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I want to take a moment to recognize the members of the 2003 Lamar Little League all-stars from Richmond, Texas, for their sterling performance in the Little League World Series.

First of all, I want to commend Jim Michalek, the team's dedicated manager for his magnificent leadership.

Mr. Michalek and his coaches, Tim Hollek and Tom Staudt, devoted an enormous amount of time and effort to these young men. They made this team their lives for the summer of 2003, and the team's success is a testament to their dedication.

As for the boys themselves, Brian Foster, Randal Alexander Grichuk, Brandon Hollek, Marcus Martinez, Jimmy Michalek, Robert Psenka, Cody Robinson, Brady Rogers, Eli Sepulveda, Chris Smith, Garrett Austin Staudt, and Wayne Willis, they did Richmond and Fort Bend County proud this year and gave us a series to remember.

After that heroic battle with the kids from Saugus, Massachusetts, it will be a long while before the rest of the Nation forgets what the Richmond all-stars are made of.

I am honored to represent these young men and their families. Their determination and dedication is an inspiration, an example to Texans of all ages.

Over the course of this spring and summer, the Richmond all-stars have refined their characters along with their batting swings. They have learned the virtues of teamwork, virtues that will make them better boys, and one day, better men.

Competing in team sports teaches children the virtues of honesty, perseverance, loyalty, and courage; and doing so in the name of their hometown instills in them a sense of civic pride as well.

More than that, they have helped instill that very pride in all of us, their fans, who watched and cheered their amazing march to Williamsport.

No matter what the scoreboard said at the end of the game, the Richmond, Texas, Little Leaguers of 2003 will always be our champions.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

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

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, it has been 859 days since President Bush and the Republican Party embarked on their economic plan of our country. During that time the national debt has increased by $1,169,750,943,211.93. According to the Web site for the Bureau of Public Debt at the U.S. Treasury yesterday at 4:30 p.m. eastern daylight time the national outstanding debt was $6,810,076,329,570.70.

Furthermore, in fiscal year 2003, interest on our national debt, or the ''debt tax'' is $304,978,878,641.11 through August 31.

VOTE ON JUDGE WILLIAM PRYOR

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, our judicial system is under attack. The weapon of choice? The filibuster.

As cases back up in the Federal courts, some politicians are using the filibuster to prevent a vote on several highly-qualified, well-respected judicial nominees, and one of these nominees is William Pryor, highly-principled and well-qualified nominee for the Federal bench. Opponents to his nomination say that his personal views

will prevent him from being an effective judge, but experience proves otherwise.

His conduct during the Alabama Ten Commandments case has proven that his professionalism enables him to carry out and enforce current constitutional jurisprudence. In fact, it is his opponents who are allowing their personal views to stand in the way of carrying out the constitutional duty of filling Federal judicial vacancies.

It is that intolerance of anyone who disagrees with their political views that has brought our judicial system to a halt, and that is not right.

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, two days ago developing nations walked out of the World Trade Organization meeting, exposing irreconcilable differences between poorer developing countries and the U.S., the European Union, and Japan. Rather than dealing with the still broken promises of the past, U.S. negotiators wanted to press forward on a privatization agenda, restricting governments' ability to act in the public interest and giving more rights to multinational corporations at the expense of workers all over the world, in this country and abroad and at the expense of the environment.

The world obviously now knows with what U.S. citizens already know. The Republican trade policy does not work, that President Bush's desire to expand NAFTA to the rest of the world is antiworker, antienvironment, and hemorrhages jobs. That is why 10 percent of manufacturing jobs in this country have disappeared since President Bush took office because of these trade policy.

The U.S. cannot continue pushing this antidevelopment, antiworker, antienvironment agenda on the rest of the globe. The failure of the talks in Cancun is a victory for the people of the world, a reality the Bush administration cannot ignore. The Bush NAFTA trade model is broken. We should fix it.

SUPPORT THE MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 2003

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

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for America's museums and libraries. Libraries are the fundamental part of our society. In Georgia, 26.5 million patrons visited public libraries in 2002. They visited these libraries to check out materials, to use public access computers, access word processors, or the Internet, perhaps to attend free and fun learning activities with their families.

Later today, we are going to consider the Museum and Library Services Act. This bill will maintain the Congress's support for museums and libraries across our country. Georgia's public libraries need this legislation and the funding to continue to provide the best possible library services to meet the needs of local communities and to continue working toward a more educated Georgia.

I urge my colleagues to support the Museum and Library Services Act later today.

THE HEMORRHAGE OF MANUFACTURING JOBS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the President appeared in Michigan yesterday but failed to address the hemorrhage of jobs that continues to plague Michigan and Ohio and indeed our entire country, good jobs in the manufacturing sector, which is where our economy has made the most productivity gains; Ohio losing over 180,000 jobs and Michigan 182,000 jobs, manufacturing jobs since he took office.

Our part of the country is really hurting, and all the President can propose is an assistant secretary in the Department of Commerce. What we need, Mr. Speaker, is a trade policy that puts people first, not the profits of multinational corporations first. We need to turn the U.S. Trade Representative's office upside down and clean it out and start striking trade agreements that create jobs and income in America again and do not create enemies for America abroad. NAFTA is not working. China PNTR is not working. And now the Bush administration wants to expand NAFTA to Central America and the rest of the hemisphere calling it CAFTA and FTAA.

Mr. Speaker, we need to export products, not jobs, and we need a trade policy that works for working Americans. I wish President Bush had talked about that in Monroe, Michigan yesterday.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 2658, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2658, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2658) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, CUNNINGHAM, FRELINGHUYSEN, TIAHRT, WICKER, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, VISCLOSKY, MORAN of Virginia, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 2559, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2559, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2559) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KNOLLENBERG, WALSH, ADERHOLT, Mrs. GRANGER, and Messrs. GOODE, VITTER, KINGSTON, CRENSHAW, YOUNG of Florida, EDWARDS, FARR, BOYD, BISHOP of Georgia, DICKS, and OBEY.

There was no objection.

□ 1415

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8, 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 a vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes or postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

FREEMONT-MADISON CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 520) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain facilities to the Freemont-Madison Irrigation District in the State of Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 520

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Fremont-Madison Conveyance Act''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District, an irrigation district organized under the law of the State of Idaho.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF FACILITIES.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the Fremont-Madison Irrigation District, Idaho, pursuant to the terms of the memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the District and the Secretary (Contract No. 1425–01–MA–10–3310), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the canals, laterals, drains, and other components of the water distribution and drainage system that is operated or maintained by the District for delivery of water to and drainage of water from lands within the boundaries of the District as they exist upon the date of enactment of this Act, consistent with section 8.

(b) REPORT.—If the Secretary has not completed any conveyance required under this Act by September 13, 2004, the Secretary shall, by no later than that date, submit a report to the Congress explaining the reasons that conveyance has not been completed and stating the date by which the conveyance will be completed.

SEC. 4. COSTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require, as a condition of the conveyance under section 3, that the District pay the administrative costs of the conveyance and related activities, including the costs of any review required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), as described in Contract No. 1425–01–MA–10–3310.

(b) VALUE OF FACILITIES TO BE TRANSFERRED.—In addition to subsection (a) the Secretary shall also require, as a condition of the conveyance under section 2, that the District pay to the United States the lesser of the net present value of the remaining obligations owed by the District to the United States with respect to the facilities conveyed, or $280,000. Amounts received by the United States under this subsection shall be deposited into the Reclamation Fund.

SEC. 5. TETON EXCHANGE WELLS.

(a) CONTRACTS AND PERMIT.—In conveying the Teton Exchange Wells pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall also convey to the District—

(1) Idaho Department of Water Resources permit number 22–7022, including drilled wells under the permit, as described in Contract No. 1425–01–MA–10–3310; and

(2) all equipment appurtenant to such wells.

(b) EXTENSION OF WATER SERVICE CONTRACT.—The water service contract between the Secretary and the District (Contract No. 7–07–10–W0179, dated September 16, 1977) is hereby extended and shall continue in full force and effect until all conditions described in this Act are fulfilled.

SEC. 6. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Prior to conveyance the Secretary shall complete all environmental reviews and analyses as set forth in the Memorandum of Agreement referenced in section 3(a).

SEC. 7. LIABILITY.

Effective on the date of the conveyance the United States shall not be liable for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the conveyed facilities, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees, agents, or contractors prior to the date of conveyance. Nothing in this section may increase the liability of the United States beyond that currently provided in chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

SEC. 8. WATER SUPPLY TO DISTRICT LANDS.

The acreage within the District eligible to receive water from the Minidoka Project and the Teton Basin Projects is increased to reflect the number of acres within the District as of the date of enactment of this Act, including lands annexed into the District prior to enactment of this Act as contemplated by the Teton Basin Project. The increase in acreage does not alter deliveries authorized under the District's existing water storage contracts and as allowed by State water law.

SEC. 9. DROUGHT MANAGEMENT PLANNING.

Within 60 days of enactment of this Act, in collaboration with stakeholders in the Henry's Fork watershed, the Secretary shall initiate a drought management planning process to address all water uses, including irrigation and the wild trout fishery, in the Henry's Fork watershed. Within 18 months of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress, which shall include a final drought management plan.

SEC. 10. EFFECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects—

(1) the rights of any person; or

(2) any right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation to water based on a treaty, compact, executive order, agreement, the decision in Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564 (1908) (commonly known as the ''Winters Doctrine''), or law.

(b) CONVEYANCES.—Any conveyance under this Act shall not affect or abrogate any provision of any contract executed by the United States or State law regarding any irrigation district's right to use water developed in the facilities conveyed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 520, authored by Senator CRAPO of Idaho, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey the title of specific Bureau of Reclamation facilities to the Freemont-Madison Irrigation District. The district has operated and maintained these facilities and will have paid all construction costs to the Federal Government prior to conveyance.

As part of this legislation, transfer proponents and several other water interests worked together on drought management provisions to address the needs of all water users in the watershed. This will protect and enhance the Henry's Fork fishery while continuing to provide water to the area's irrigators and other users.

The measure also would require compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and is consistent with the Bureau of Reclamation policy to transfer title to water districts that have operated and maintained their facilities and paid out their construction costs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this consensus-based bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power for his extreme help on these three measures.

Mr. Speaker, Senate 520, the Freemont-Madison Conveyance Act, would direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Freemont-Madison Irrigation District all rights, title, and interest to specific Bureau of Reclamation facilities in Idaho. Prior to the title transfer, there will be an environmental review conducted pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

The gentleman from California, my esteemed colleague, has explained the legislation. We support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 520.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRRIGATION PROJECT CONTRACT EXTENSION ACT OF 1998 AMENDMENT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2040) to amend the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998 to extend certain contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and certain irrigation water contractors in the States of Wyoming and Nebraska.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2040

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION PROJECT CONTRACTS.

Section 2 of the Irrigation Project Contract Extension Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2816, 114 Stat. 1441, 1441A–70) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''December 31, 2005''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''beyond December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''beyond December 31, 2005''; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking ''prior to December 31, 2003'' and inserting ''before December 31, 2005''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2040, introduced by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), extends specific water contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and water contractors in Nebraska and Wyoming. This legislation responds to continuing work on a multiparty agreement aimed at restoring habitat for endangered species on the Platte River.

While these good-faith efforts take place, the irrigators have asked for repayment certainty until a clear regulatory water-use road map is put in place. This is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this consensus-based bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2040 would extend for 2 years the term of 10 water contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and several irrigation districts in Nebraska and Wyoming. This is the third time Congress has been asked to extend these contracts. This bill would enable the Department of the Interior to complete an environmental impact statement containing information relevant to the renewal of the water contracts. This EIS is expected to recommend an alternative that will allow the irrigation districts to receive water and satisfy the consultation and recovery requirements under the Endangered Species Act.

We support the bill and recommend its adoption.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), the author of this bill, to explain this legislation.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2040. As has been mentioned, this extends irrigation contracts between the Bureau of Reclamation and the irrigation contractors in Nebraska and Wyoming.

A proposed cooperative agreement between Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming was established in 1997. Parenthetically, I might just mention that this agreement was to provide additional water in a 50-mile stretch of Platte River in Central Nebraska. This water is to provide habitat for the whooping crane, the least tern, the piping plover and the pallid sturgeon, all of which are either endangered or threatened, according to the Endangered Species Act.

However, less than 2 percent of the whooping crane population ever visits the Platte River during their migration. As a matter of fact, many years the whooping crane is not seen at all on the Platte River. The least tern and the piping plover do not seem to nest in this area of the river, and the pallet sturgeon is located 150 miles away in the Missouri River. Therefore, there is considerable confusion as to whether this is really critical habitat.

Therefore, the cooperative agreement, which has been formed to preserve water for critical habitat, is under study. We currently have a National Academy of Sciences study, which you have graciously encouraged and we appreciate that. Until this study is completed, the cooperative agreement really cannot move forward.

Therefore, we are requesting this 2-year extension. Because of the delays in finalizing the cooperative agreement, it is necessary to extend existing irrigation contracts until such time as the cooperative agreement is finalized. So I urge passage of 2040.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for their support and urge passage.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2040.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS AUTHORIZATION AND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1992 AMENDMENT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1284) to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to increase the Federal share of the costs of the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1284

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE OF SAN GABRIEL BASIN DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

Section 1631(d)(2) of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 390h–13) is amended—

(1) by striking ''In the case'' and inserting ''(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), in the case''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) In the case of the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project authorized by section 1614, the Federal share of the cost of such project may not exceed the sum determined by adding—

''(i) the amount that applies to that project under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) $12,500,000.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1284, introduced by my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), increases the authorized Federal cost ceilings for the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project by $12.5 million. Local project sponsors have expressed a desire to expand the demonstration program, which treats contaminated groundwater and then delivers the effluent to nearby localities to justify the Federal cost ceiling increase.

This bill will help lessen Southern California's dependence on foreign water and project groundwater quality. It is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I once again thank my colleague and friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Chairman CALVERT), on this issue, because this is an important issue for the Southern California area.

I rise today in support of my legislation, H.R. 1284, to increase the spending cap imposed on the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project. I want to thank my colleagues on the other side, the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER), the gentleman from California (Chairman CALVERT), and the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO), for their continued assistance to me and other Members who are also working to ensure a clean and reliable water supply for their communities.

May I also thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS), who could not be here to speak to her support on this issue, as two of her cities we are proposing are in her district.

H.R. 1284, if enacted, would simply allow the cities of Industry, El Monte and South El Monte, located and adjacent to my district in Southeast Los Angeles County, to have the ability to request an additional $12.5 million in funding for assistance from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation for cleanup of volatile organic compounds, otherwise known as DOCs, once they are able to secure their 75 percent matching funds.

Earlier this year, the Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on the bill, and witnesses representing the local municipalities and water agencies from the San Gabriel Valley, home to

approximately 1.7 million residents, clearly established that there is a clear and compelling need to extend the funding for this very successful program.

This is part of the San Gabriel Basin, home to one of the country's largest Superfund sites, spanning 170 square miles. It has been contaminated by a number of substances over the past 5 decades as a result of manufacturing and agriculture activities and other components that we are now finding, such as perchloric, affecting our drinking water supply.

Unfortunately, the funding level for this critical basin program was capped at $38 million in 1996, before these three communities were able to establish their case to Congress. This is all part and parcel of that Superfund site cleanup.

A majority of the unfunded projects to date are in the southern part of the basin, and that includes these three cities of Industry, El Monte, and South El Monte. These projects are conjunctive-use projects and could be funded under the existing Bureau of Reclamation's demonstration project only if the 1996 budget cap is raised.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Chairman POMBO), the gentleman from California (Chairman CALVERT), and every California delegation member who serves on the House Committee on Resources understands the need for California to live up to our agreement with the other Colorado River Basin States and ultimately take no more than 4.4 million acre feet of water from the Colorado River per year.

Continuing effective aquifer cleanup activities, which H.R. 1284 allows, combined with water conservation, recycling, desalination, above and underground storage, will allow the State of California to meet the commitment to the 4.4 plan by the year 2016.

I would also like to express my most sincere appreciation to the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), and the former ranking member of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for their continued support for the Bureau's title 16 water reclamation and recycling projects.

I certainly urge my colleagues to pass this issue. It is an important issue for all of California and the rest of the Nation.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1284, which amends the San Gabriel Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992. This bill will increase the Federal cost share for the San Gabriel Basin groundwater cleanup project.

During the project's onset in 1992, the Federal Government was authorized to pay 2.5 percent of the cost of projects to cleanup local water supplies. In 1996 the funding level for the program was capped at $38 million, funding only a portion of the projects that had been designed. As a result of the cap, projects in the southern portion of the basin were not funded, including the El Monte Operable Unit and the South El Monte Operable Unit in my district. Since the cap was put in place, the Southern Operable Units have been working with EPA to develop groundwater cleanup plans. Now, we need money to make the cleanup happen.

Cleanup literally means the difference between healthy and unhealthy families. This area is contaminated with perchlorate, trichloroethene and other chlorinated solvents known as ''volatile organic compounds'' or VOCs. Each of these contaminants can cause serious health complications. Perchlorate increases chances of cancer and can induce thyroid problems. Trichloroethene has been shown to make people more susceptible to lung and liver tumors. VOCs are harmful to the central nervous system, the kidneys and the liver and can cause a higher risk of cancer, especially leukemia.

The pollution that these communities have sustained has not only impacted their health and environment, but also their economy. Unemployment in the area is as high as 10 percent in some areas. According to the U.S. Census, 26 percent of the residents live in poverty. It has been difficult to attract businesses and jobs to the area. One of the factors preventing those businesses and jobs from coming to the area is the pollution.

When the cap was put in place, these areas lost the chance to access Federal funds to clean up their environment, protect their health and help their economy. Now we have the opportunity to make a difference in this region by helping them accomplish these much-needed goals. I urge adoption of this legislation and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1284, a bill that amends the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to increase the Federal share of the cost of the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project.

The San Gabriel Basin Demonstration Project was originally authorized in 1992 under the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Title XVI program. This initiated the Federal-local partnership for this project, which is an integral component in cleaning up the San Gabriel Valley's drinking water supply.

The San Gabriel Demonstration Project is unique among the projects authorized by Title XVI in that it does not focus on water reclamation or reuse. Rather, the project will remove harmful contaminants, including volatile organic compounds, for the San Gabriel Valley Superfund site in order to provide the Valley with a safe supply of drinking water. The project further involves monitoring of water wells, construction of treatment facilities, and development of systems to convey, pump, and store water.

H.R. 1284, championed by my good friend, neighbor, and colleague, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, recognizes the critical funding needs for this project's sustainability and success. By increasing the ceiling of this authorization by $12.5 million, the Federal Government's commitment to safe drinking water supply in our region will continue.

I commend Chairman KEN CALVERT and his Subcommittee on Water and Power for moving this bill through the committee process, and urge my colleagues to vote for this measure.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1284.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 520, H.R. 2040 and H.R. 1284.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF LAWRENCE EUGENE ''LARRY'' DOBY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 235) celebrating the life and achievements of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 235

Whereas on December 12, 1923, Larry Doby was born in Camden, South Carolina and moved to Paterson, New Jersey in 1938, where he became a standout 4 sport athlete at Paterson Eastside High School;

Whereas Larry Doby attended Long Island University on a basketball scholarship before enlisting in the United States Navy;

Whereas in 1943, Larry Doby was the first African American to play professional basketball for the Paterson Panthers, a member of the American Basketball League;

Whereas after playing baseball in the Negro League for the Newark Eagles, Larry Doby's contract was purchased by Bill Veeck of Major League Baseball's Cleveland Indians, a member of the American League, on July 3, 1947;

Whereas on July 5, 1947, Larry Doby became the first African American to play professional baseball in the American League;

Whereas Larry Doby played in the American League for 13 years, appearing in 1,533 games and batting .283, with 253 home runs and 969 runs batted in;

Whereas in 1948, Larry Doby was the first African American to win a World Series and the first African American to hit a home run in the World Series;

Whereas Larry Doby was voted to play in 7 All Star games and led the American League in home runs for two seasons;

Whereas in 1978, Larry Doby became the manager of the Chicago White Sox, only the second African American manager of a Major League team;

Whereas Larry Doby was the Director of Community Relations for the National Basketball Association's New Jersey Nets, where he was deeply involved in a number of inner-city youth programs;

Whereas Larry Doby resided, was active in the community, and raised his family in Montclair, New Jersey;

Whereas Larry Doby received honorary doctorate degrees from Princeton University, Long Island University and Fairfield University; and

Whereas Larry Doby was elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame in 1998: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representative—

(1) expresses profound sorrow on the death of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby, and extends condolences to his family;

(2) expresses its deep appreciation to Larry Doby and his family for the impact that he made in pioneering civil rights by breaking down racial barriers in baseball and in America; and

(3) commends Larry Doby as a courageous leader, a role model, and a paradigm of the American Dream.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 235.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 235, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), celebrates the life and achievements of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the House is considering this legislation that honors an American hero we just do not know as much as we should about. We all know the story of Jackie Robinson, who courageously abolished the color barrier in major league baseball by first playing for the Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947. What many may not have learned is that 3 months later, in July of 1947, Larry Doby became the first black player in the American League when he suited up for the Cleveland Indians.

As the first black player in American League history, the pressures and prejudices Doby experienced were heartbreaking. His Hall of Fame Indians teammate, Bob Feller, described Doby as a sensitive man and added, the way many fans and other players treated him was very tough. Doby spoke with Jackie Robinson frequently during his early major league playing days. He recounted to the L.A. Times in 1974 that by talking about the issues he and Robinson faced, that ''Maybe we kept each other from giving up.'' Since Doby was a gentleman, he once said, ''I couldn't react to prejudicial situations from a physical standpoint. My reaction was to hit the ball as far as I could.'' And he did that, channeling that energy to greatness.

Indeed, not only did Doby bravely change minds with his mere presence on the field, he also turned heads with his outstanding play. He won a World Series title with the Cleveland Indians in his first full year in 1948. During the season, he hit an average 301 with 16 home runs, and he led the club with a .318 average during the 1948 World Series. He finished his historic career with 253 home runs and 970 runs batted in. In 1998, Larry Doby was deservedly inducted into the baseball Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, America sadly lost Larry Doby in June at the age of 79. On behalf of this entire House, I offer my sincere condolences of all Members to the friends and the family of Larry Doby.

America has long had a deep obsession with sports, and there is little doubt that the common goals of athletics have had a profound impact on race relations in this country.

In 1947, Larry Doby inducted himself to the all-white baseball world as a courageous man with an awe-inspiring lefthanded swing. His bravery unquestionably opened the door of opportunity to many players from so many backgrounds, all the way to this present day. But beyond the baseball field, Larry Doby helped to prove that a person's skin color has nothing to do with his or her abilities at a time when America needed to learn that lesson.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution is seen as a fitting tribute to a man that all of us still owe a debt of gratitude. I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 235, and I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey for his work on this 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 join with the gentlewoman from Tennessee in consideration of H. Con. Res. 235, celebrating the life and achievements of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby.

Mr. Speaker, Larry Doby, who broke the color barrier in the American League in 1947, 3 months after Jackie Robinson became the first black in modern major league baseball, died on Wednesday, June 18 in Montclair, New Jersey. He was 79 years old.

Born on December 13, 1923 in Camden, South Carolina, Larry Doby was also the first player to jump straight from the Negro leagues to the majors. He was signed by the Cleveland Indians owner Bill Veeck. He later integrated Japanese baseball in 1962 and went on to become the sport's second black manager and one of its first black executives.

However, it was in his role as the second black player in baseball that Larry Doby had his most significant impact on professional athletics. Larry Doby was an all-State athlete in football, basketball, and baseball in high school. He then continued his athletic career at Long Island University. When Bill Veeck, who was determined to integrate his team, sought to sign a black player, Larry Doby was his obvious choice. He had led the Negro National League with a batting average of .458 and 13 home runs.

Like Jackie Robinson, Doby faced extraordinary pressures that first season, including open hostility from teammates and opposing players. Larry Doby and Jackie Robinson formed a close relationship through their lifetimes. Doby's debut opened the way for three more blacks to enter the majors within a month, and made it clear that baseball was on a permanent course toward integration. His presence as a player for the Indians also contributed to the more general cause of civil rights for blacks when Washington's exclusive Hotel Statler, formerly whites-only, permitted Larry Doby to room with his team.

In 1948, he batted an impressive .301 with 14 home runs and 65 runs batted in. He led the Indians to a victory over the Boston Braves in the World Series, becoming the first black to play on a World Series championship team. He later led the American League in home runs in 1952 and again in 1954. When he retired after 13 seasons with the Indians, White Sox, and Detroit Tigers, he had a formidable career batting average of .285 and 253 lifetime home runs. For his achievements, he was elected to baseball's Hall of Fame in 1998.

Doby became the Indian's manager in 1978 and later became a special assistant to Dr. Gene Budig, the President of the American League. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, when blacks were welcome on the baseball field and in the stands but not in the front office, Larry Doby continued to push for expanded opportunities for people of color.

Lawrence Eugene Doby was a great American and his life and achievements make him worthy of this recognition today. I would like to commend the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and I urge swift passage.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at this point I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois. I want to thank also the gentlewoman from Tennessee. Both of my colleagues I think struck appropriate words about a great American, a great American.

This resolution, this concurrent resolution honors the life and achievements of Lawrence Eugene ''Larry'' Doby. He left this Earth just a few months ago. His wife died a few years ago. They were inseparable individuals. I know one can read about the history of Larry Doby and one can hear about it and see it in film, but there is something that is spoken today that one will not find in those documentations.

Mr. Speaker, in our commercial world of endorsements, free agents, $6.50 a beer at a ball game, and Astroturf, I want to pause today to praise the great stature of a man who played baseball when baseball was baseball. He was more than a civil rights leader. He was more than a Hall of Fame baseball player. He was a Hall of Fame human being. To him, to Larry Doby, community was critical. No man was living on an island.

I am so proud to be a resident, a lifelong resident of Paterson, New Jersey, and I always say one ''T'', because that is where Larry made his fame, at East Side High School. He was a star in four sports, and he achieved. He attended Long Island University, went into the Navy, served this country, served this country, and came out and played minor league baseball for a while on teams where you had to be all one color.

So he made the movement and was asked to come aboard the Cleveland Indians, just after Jackie Robinson, 3 months prior, became a part of the Brooklyn Dodgers. And many fans never saw him play because obviously there was not inter-league play at that particular time. And we know what happened with Jackie Robinson when he went to the Brooklyn Dodgers: They even changed the camp where they trained, got it away from people so there would be no problems. And we know that Larry Doby, when he came into the American League, some of his own teammates isolated him, ignored him.

He was grateful to the owner of the Cleveland Indians, Bill Veeck. Mr. Speaker, there always has to be somebody who is willing to make the change. There always has to be somebody that runs point and who is willing to say, this is the right thing. This is the thing we need to do. We should have done it a long time ago. It should not have had to be done. This should be a natural process of growing up in the greatest of all democracies.

□ 1445

It was not. So this young man who came out of Camden, South Carolina, came to Paterson with his family when he was 15 years of age, found himself at the center of a tremendous amount of attention, and he deserved it. But to the end he remained modest, and he was a gracious, true gentleman, unlike some of the bravado that we hear in sports today when we hold up Nike sneakers. This is a man of a different age but a man for all ages. Beyond the record that he broke, beyond the sports world, Larry Doby was a good person, beautiful family, a great career. Responsive to the community he lived in, Paterson and then Montclair, New Jersey, where he passed. And Helen who passed 2 years ago, every time you saw Larry Doby you saw everyone. Every time you saw Helen, you saw Larry Doby. Our thoughts are with Larry's surviving children, Larry, Jr., Leslie Feggan, Kimberly Martin, Susan Robinson, and Christina Fearington. And I had the privilege, as many of us did back in 1998 on this floor to have a post office, the main post office in our county, named after Larry Doby.

Just a few months before he passed from this Earth we all stood at Eastside Park and commemorated, and it was like a 15-year old young man who had just come to Paterson, we commemorated a baseball field with the stands and everything, Larry Doby Field. And Larry insisted that we would lock the field when it was not being used because he wanted it to remain a baseball field, and it has. People go there with respect. A great statue, a great statue right in front of this great ballpark.

I want to thank the Speaker. I want to thank the ranking member. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate so much the remarks that have been made about Larry Doby and his career. We recognize the importance of Larry Doby. As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) was saying, Jackie Robinson and Shoeless Joe Jackson, and we talk about the importance of having heroes, and these were men who were heroes, and how important that we honor Larry Doby. So I commend my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for introducing the resolution.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), where Larry Doby played much of his ball.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), and I thank particularly the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for his sponsorship on this piece of legislation.

I stand also to honor Larry Doby. I saw Larry Doby after his career in Cleveland for the White Sox had finished. My dad took me as a 6-year-old kid to see Larry Doby, and I saw him play then and met him later for a moment when he threw out the first pitch of the House baseball game.

Larry Doby in some sense was as courageous or even more courageous than Jackie Robinson. I asked a group of people as I was walking through an office earlier today what they knew about Larry Doby. These people were in their twenties and thirties. They knew almost nothing of him. Several people had heard of him. They knew he was a baseball player. They knew very little else.

Larry Doby was the second African American player to play major league baseball, the first in the American League. As I said, in some sense he was as courageous, maybe even more courageous than Jackie Robinson. In his words, and he said with certainly no bitterness but just as an observation, Larry Doby said, The only difference between us, Jackie Robinson and himself, was that Jackie Robinson got all the publicity. You did not hear much about what I was going through because the media did not want to repeat the same story, the same story they had written not long before.

He said, ''I could not react to prejudicial situations from a physical standpoint. My reaction was to hit the ball as far as I could.''

He had the same kinds of anger and bitterness and racist catcalls and violent behavior all aimed at him as Jackie Robinson did, and he was every bit the hero that Jackie Robinson was.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) pointed out, he also changed not just baseball history, but he helped as a pioneer in pulling this country together, a pioneer in beginning to start to erase the racial prejudice in this country. He did it in a variety of ways. He did it as a baseball player in the way he played. He also did it with the strength in which he played. He also did it as a manager, and also in his professional and personal life back in Paterson. But he also did it in a way that is interesting.

In the spring of 1947, Bill Veeck, the Indians' general manger, understanding that Larry Doby was going to be playing, moved spring training camp to Arizona, away from the South, understanding that it would make things a little bit more even tempered, if you will, for Larry Doby to deal with.

So then the Brooklyn Dodgers moved their training camp from Florida to Havana, Cuba, again to deal with some of those problems, and the New York Giants moved their training camp from Florida to Arizona, and that is the advent of spring training being held in different areas around the country.

He was a pioneer. He changed not just the baseball world, he changed society. All of us should be proud of what Larry Doby did.

In my City of Cleveland where he played his best, most important baseball, he played in two World Series, made a difference in the last time the Indians won the World Series in 1949, but more importantly, what he did later with his life in Paterson, New Jersey, throughout the baseball world, and what he contributed to this country.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank everybody who

participated in this debate. Larry Doby was indeed a great athlete but an even greater American.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Larry Doby, the first African American to play professional baseball in the American League. It is important that Congress acknowledge and appreciate the accomplishments of someone who has broken the color barrier and added diversity to an otherwise segregated sport.

Larry Doby was an extraordinary individual and a sports legend that broke through barriers by becoming the second African American to play professional baseball, but the first in the American League.

We are all well aware of Jackie Robinson, the first African American to play professional baseball. He is a hero that we teach our children about. His efforts for integration and the struggle for racial equality provide lessons that we strive never to forget. Similarly, Larry Doby endured a struggle that was no less heroic or difficult. He too should remain in our memory and his story told to our children.

Born in Camden, S.C., Larry Doby lost his father when he was just 8 years old. His family moved to Paterson, New Jersey, when he was in his teens. Larry Doby attended Long Island University on a basketball scholarship before enlisting in the United States Navy.

In 1947, Larry Doby began his illustrious career with the Cleveland Indians. Teammates recalled Mr. Doby as a man of quiet dignity who never said an unkind word, even about those hostile to his joining the Indians.

Larry Doby played in the American League for 13 years. He appeared in 1,533 games and batting .283, with 253 home runs and 969 runs batted in. He was the first African American to win a World Series and the first African American to hit a home run in the World Series. In 1998, Larry Doby was elected to the National Baseball Hall of Fame.

Apart from baseball, Larry Doby showed his integrity by being deeply committed to his community. He deserves recognition not only for his contribution to America's pastime, but also for his courageous leadership and the inspiration he gave to millions of Americans as he fought racism and served as an example of the American Dream.

In expression of his commitment, Larry served as the Director of Community Relations for the NBA's New Jersey Nets. The position gave Mr. Doby the opportunity to use his character and stature to influence youth in many of New Jersey's inner cities.

Sadly, Larry Doby died on June 18, 2003 in Montclair, N.J. Let us come together and express profound sorrow over the death of Larry Doby. On behalf of the 18th congressional district of Texas, I extend my condolences to his family and express my deep appreciation for the impact Larry Doby made in the fight for racial equality. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I support H. Con. Res. 235 to celebrate the life and achievements of Larry Doby.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 235.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON OF AUGUST 18, 1963

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 352) remembering and honoring the march on Washington of August 28, 1963.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 352

Whereas the first call for a march on Washington was initiated in 1941 by A. Philip Randolph, President of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, in response to the blatant discrimination that had become a constant hardship in the lives of African-American workers;

Whereas in the spring and summer of 1963, more than 20,000 United States citizens were arrested and detained while nonviolently protesting the racial injustice that was widespread throughout the southern United States at that time;

Whereas Randolph told President Kennedy that the African-American population was going to march peacefully on Washington to demand their full and equal constitutional rights in the face of severe civil rights violations and harsh economic inequality;

Whereas in June of 1963 the ''Big Six'' civil rights leaders—Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, John Lewis, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, and A. Philip Randolph—convened to plan a mass protest that would begin at the Washington Monument and end in front of the Lincoln Memorial;

Whereas the march was initially termed the ''March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom'', and aimed to advance support for a new Federal jobs program and a higher minimum wage;

Whereas the Big Six expanded the focus of the march to include civil rights injustices due to the disturbing events that had occurred in the months prior to the march, such as police dogs attacking peaceful demonstrators in Birmingham, the assassination of Medgar Evers in Jackson, and the lack of congressional support for President Kennedy's civil rights bill;

Whereas Government officials were concerned about the outbreak of violence, but many civil rights organizations held orientation meetings before the march that taught and stressed the intrinsic non-violent principles of the movement;

Whereas on August 28, 1963, people from throughout the country arrived in Washington by plane, bus, train, and foot to express the urgent need for forceful and immediate action on the issue of civil rights;

Whereas demonstrators pledged their commitment and continued participation in the struggle for civil rights;

Whereas March leaders met with President Kennedy and Members of Congress to discuss the importance and consequential impact of the pending civil rights bill that aimed to end discrimination of African-Americans in the work place, voting booth, educational facilities, and all other public domains;

Whereas the demonstrators peacefully marched through the streets of the capital and, at the Lincoln Memorial, heard empowering and inspiring words from the Big Six leaders, as well as Walter Reuther, Rev. Eugene Blake Carson, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Matthem Ahmann, and Floyd McKissick;

Whereas police officers had their days of leave cancelled, suburban forces were given special control training, and 15,000 paratroopers were put on alert, but no Marchers were arrested or jailed and the march dispersed without incident;

Whereas the March was one of the first events to be televised worldwide, and thus brought international attention to the social and economic plight of African-Americans;

Whereas 15 Senators and 60 Representatives attended the rally at the Lincoln Memorial and witnessed the commitment of the demonstrators to the struggle for domestic and universal human rights;

Whereas the March sparked the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965;

Whereas the public display of humanity exhibited by the March educated the public and helped to correct some of their misconceptions, and demonstrated the possibility that an entire country could be changed through non-violent protest; and

Whereas the 1963 March on Washington was the largest political demonstration in United States history and proved to the nation that prejudice and discrimination against African-Americans and other minorities could be successfully fought by a collective force committed to the principles of non-violence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the 1963 March on Washington as one of the largest political demonstrations in United States history;

(2) recognizes the monumental importance of the 1963 March on Washington in the ongoing struggle for civil rights and equal rights for all Americans; and

(3) extends its gratitude to the organizers and participants of the 1963 March on Washington for their dedication and commitment to equality and justice.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 352, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 352 introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from the State of Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), remembers and honors the march on Washington of August 28, 1963.

Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago this summer almost a quarter of a million people gathered here in Washington, D.C. to take a stand for freedom and for equality.

They came to our Nation's capital to tell America that civil rights could no longer be exclusive rights denied to millions of Americans based on nothing more than the color of their skin.

Known as the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, the event was

originally planned to focus on economic concerns at a time when more than 1½ million black Americans were searching for work. The march expanded, becoming a massive rally in support of civil rights legislation that had been recently introduced by President Kennedy.

On the morning of August 28, 1963, supporters arrived at the Washington Monument. At about noon the marchers advanced as an incredible mass to the Lincoln Memorial, a memorial that honors the President who gave his presidency and his life in the name of liberty for all people.

At the memorial the marchers heard speeches from the most influential leader of the civil rights movement, including the NAACP's Roy Wilkins; Whitney Young of the Urban League; my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), then of the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee; and it was here that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., delivered a speech that has changed America, a speech that captured the idea that is America, asking why our country was failing to keep its promise to treat all men as equals.

The ''I Have A Dream'' speech, delivered at the Lincoln Memorial is passionate, it is reasoned, and it has made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, the march on Washington was the largest political demonstration in our Nation's history at the time. It was an awesome display by thousands of people who loved and craved freedom, and above all else, people who deserved freedom. The three major television networks aired the speeches at the memorial and the event captivated the world. Forty years later, it is appropriate that this House take time to remember what a powerful day that late summer afternoon in August 1963 was for Americans who wanted to end racism.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for introducing such a worthwhile measure that remembers the march on Washington in 1963. I urge all Members to support its adoption.

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, the march on Washington, August 28, 1963 marks a cornerstone in American history and especially in African American history. It was a movement towards civil rights whose purpose was to embrace freedom and justice for all.

The civil rights movement has had a long and difficult journey from slavery to today. Part of this journey in history towards equal justice is highlighted with Abraham Lincoln, our 16th President of the United States. On January 1, 1863, he signed the Emancipation Proclamation document that declared many slaves to be free, but it did not end slavery. It took the 13th amendment to the United States Constitution to end slavery on December 18, 1865. It took the 14th amendment to establish Negroes as citizens of the United States on July 9, 1868, and the 15th amendment to allow blacks to vote in this country on February 3, 1870.

Our citizenship and privileges were always questioned and in most situations denied until the march on Washington led to passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was 39 years ago that Jim Crow laws were subjugating and denying blacks the right to vote in certain southern States, the imposition of poll taxes, segregation of schools, housing, bus and train transportation, restrooms and other public accommodations.

The march on Washington of 1963 was originally initiated by A. Philip Randolph, who was an activist and founder of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. He, 22 years earlier, had planned a march on Washington in 1941 with the purpose to focus the attention of the American public and the world that African Americans needed more jobs and equal protection under the law.

This march was extremely close to occurring until just before the day of it. Mr. Randolph met with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt and he agreed to issue an executive order declaring that ''there shall be no discrimination in employment of the race, creed color or national origin.''

Executive Order 8802 represented the United States Government's most stringent civil rights action since the post-Civil War Reconstruction era.

In return for this agreement with President Roosevelt, Mr. Randolph called off the protest march.

Mr. Randolph and his colleague, Bayard Rustin, met with labor and civil rights leaders to plan the march on Washington that included nine demands. I think it is important that we remember those.

One, passage of a meaningful civil rights legislation at this session of Congress with no filibustering.

Two, immediate elimination of all racial segregation in public schools throughout the Nation.

Three, a big program of public works to provide jobs for all the Nation's unemployed, including job training and a placement program.

Four, a Federal law prohibiting racial discrimination in hiring workmen, either public or private.

Five, $2 an hour minimum wage across the board Nationwide.

Six, withholding of Federal funds from programs in which discrimination exists.

Seven, enforcements of the 14th amendment, reducing congressional representation of States where citizens are disenfranchised.

Eight, a broadened Fair Labor Standards Act to include currently excluded employment areas.

Nine, authority for the Attorney General to substitute injunctive suits when any constitutional right is violated.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding the time.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 352, a resolution remembering and honoring the march on Washington of August 28, 1963. Let me first thank the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle who have worked together in the best spirit of bipartisanship in order to bring this important resolution to the floor of the House in short order: the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman; and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform; the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the majority whip; the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader; and the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT).

I would also like to recognize from our staffs Howard Moon, Jerry Hart, Kyle Nevins, Seth Webb, Rob Cogorno, Tania Shand, Keith Ausbrook and Phil Barnett for their attention to this important resolution in working together to move it through committee and to the floor expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, in the spring and the summer of 1963, 100 years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, the ''big six'' civil rights leaders, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., James Farmer, Whitney Young, Roy Wilkins, A. Philip Randolph and our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), now a Member of Congress, convened to plan a peaceful mass protest against the racial and civil rights injustices that were widespread at that time. This historic event, the largest U.S. demonstration ever assembled to that point, featured Dr. King's famous and historic ''I Have a Dream'' speech, which challenged Americans to answer the call of the United States Constitution: I have a dream that one day this Nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: that all men are created equal. These words helped to spark and fuel the movement that transformed the state of race relations and civil rights in America forever.

How did it all begin? In response to the blatant discrimination that had become a constant hardship in the lives of African American workers, A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood

of Sleeping Car Porters, was the first to call for a march on Washington back in 1941. Twenty-plus years later, the event was planned in direct response to the tragic events of the spring and summer of 1963 in which more than 20,000 U.S. citizens were arrested and detained while nonviolently protesting notable injustices, including police dogs attacking peaceful demonstrators in Birmingham, the tragic assassinations of civil rights activists, the lack of congressional support for President Kennedy's civil rights bill that aimed to end discrimination against African Americans in the workplace, voting booths and schools and all other public domains.

As a direct result of the march, Dr. King's historic speech and the movement, they spawned the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 came to fruition, effectively ending segregation and ensuring voting rights for all Americans.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act outlawing discrimination in employment, housing, public accommodations, interstate commerce, all of these were expanded later as a result of the march to include protections for women against discrimination and for the disabled.

So we come together today, 40 years later, to celebrate freedom, to celebrate justice, to celebrate equality for all Americans for which this historic march was indeed a catalyst. Some call it an accident. Others call it fate. Some call it the human hand, some the hand of God. Which it is I will not argue, but something strange, something inexplicable, something mysterious, something almost miraculous happened on that day when Dr. King was able to stand before thousands and thousands and to articulate the aims and the aspirations of the masses, not just in these United States, but all across the world in their quest for freedom. Something happened and today we are grateful because we all are the beneficiaries of what happened that fateful day.

Yes, some call it an accident. Others fate, some the hand of God, others the hand of man. Which it is I will not argue, but I will say that on this day, this Congress, in the form of this resolution, has an opportunity to say thank you, thank you to Dr. King, thank you to James Farmer, to Whitney Young, to Roy Wilkins, to A. Philip Randolph, and to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and all who participated in this monumental and historic event for blazing a trail of freedom and equal rights under the law that lives on today and hopefully will live on even better tomorrow.

In the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., ''Now is the time to open the doors of opportunity to all of God's children. Now is the time to lift our Nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood.''

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, for that call to conscience, to morality and to action for America and the world that we benefit from today. I urge my colleagues to stand with me in support of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) who has been referred to as one of the ''big six'' in 1963, but he is even bigger in 2003.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding the time.

I also, Mr. Speaker, want to thank my good friend and colleague from the State of Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for bringing this resolution to the floor. I think it is so fitting and appropriate to pause and take note of the march on Washington 40 years later.

250,000 Americans gathered on the Mall and listened to Martin Luther King, Jr. say, I have a dream, a dream today that is deeply rooted in the American dream. This speech, this march, created the climate to make our Nation a better place. We have come a great distance since that time.

Forty years ago, in much of the American South, racial segregation was alive and well. Blacks could not attend the same schools as whites. We could not eat at the same restaurants. We could see the signs that divide our Nation: White men, Colored men. White women, Colored women. White waiting, Colored waiting.

In the spring and summer of 1963, as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) said, people were being beaten, jailed and even killed for participating in nonviolent protest. Millions of Americans could not register to vote because of the color of their skin. In Birmingham, Alabama, the commissioner of police, Eugene Bull Connor, used attacks dogs and fire hoses on peaceful, nonviolent protestors. In the State of Mississippi, NAACP leader Medgar Evers was assassinated.

We had come to Washington to say to the President and Members of Congress that America must change. We had to do something to dramatize the sense of urgency. Mr. Speaker, I can never, and I will never, forget that day as I stood and looked out on the Mall and saw a sea of humanity. It was a feeling that America was going to change and change forever.

Back in 1963 we did not have a fax machine, a Web site, a cellular telephone. We did not even have a computer. We stood on the Constitution, on the Bill of Rights. We used our feet, and we put our bodies on the line. We live in a different country, in a much better country because of the march on Washington.

I say today, 40 years later, we must recall the passion and spirit of that march. We must recapture the spirit as a Nation and a people. We must make this spirit part of our thoughts, our action and our lives. If we do this, we can make Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dream come true. We can build what we call the Beloved Community, a true interracial community, a community at peace with itself.

All of us, 40 years later, black and white, Hispanic, Asian and Native American, must pull together for the common good. This was our mission then. This is our mission, and this is our calling now.

If we reach the Beloved Community, where we are one Nation, one people, one house and one family, we would come to the end of a march that our Nation started some 40 years ago.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there was so much hope, there was so much optimism when we left Washington 40 years ago, but 18 days after the march on Washington some of that hope, some of that optimism was shattered. Forty years ago yesterday, September 15, 1963, was a terrible bombing of a church in Birmingham where four little girls were killed while attending Sunday school on Sunday morning.

We did not give up. We did not give in. We did not give out. We did not become bitter. We did not get lost in a sea of despair. We kept fighting, we kept pushing, and we kept pulling to make our democracy better, to open up our democracy and let all of our people come in.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), another person who was at that march and has been marching since.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois and his counterpart on the other side of the aisle for her leadership in bringing forward this important resolution.

I want to recognize the leadership of two gentlemen from Georgia, of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) who is the sponsor of this resolution for stepping forward with a resolution that belongs on the floor, and, of course, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) who has just spoken, who led a commemoration in Statuary Hall for the 40th anniversary of the march before recess, and who is the last remaining living leader of the civil rights march on Washington. He led us, who were then members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, as a very young, the younger leader then, and he continues in that role as one of America's preeminent civil rights leaders today.

I do not think this is an occasion for doing what people around the country have been doing all through August, were you there. Of course, we were there, and people really think about being there in a way they ask where were you when John F. Kennedy was killed. They remember where they were then or where were you on September 11. The march on Washington is like that for millions of Americans, where were you, and people like to say

I was there, and of course, people are very proud of having been there because it was the first civil rights march for equality in the history of the United States here in Washington.

I was there as a law student, a staff member of the march on Washington. Frankly, this is not a time for nostalgia. I think that grand occasions like this, when we commemorate a change-making event like a march on Washington, are occasions for taking stock, the distance traveled, the distance to go.

Nothing could have been more moving than the events around the 40th anniversary, our own commemoration, here in the House, the moment the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) will remember when he and Mrs. King and I unveiled that stone marker and saw for the first time the marker where Martin Luther King spoke before, now on the Lincoln Memorial. Three of Reverend King's four children were there, the very four children he spoke of in that speech on August 28, 1963.

This is an occasion, if one is a Member of the House of Representatives, for looking at how the world has changed since then and how the civil rights movement has changed our world. When the march was held, essentially African Americans had carried one demand, one single demand for the more than hundred years since the civil war. It was not a plethora of issues we had before us. It was one demand: Enact into law, country of mine, equality unto law. That is all.

After that march, that happened, the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Little did I know then that I would come to enforce a section of that Act, Title VII, as Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission 15 years later. The 1965 Voting Rights Act, perhaps the most important because it empowered African Americans to do what they had to do for themselves; and the 1968 Fair Housing Act.

Actually, much of the legislative agenda of black America has been accomplished if we think about actual laws that need to be written to say thou shalt not discriminate. We will have a hard time thinking about it. Most of our time will be spent on enforcement.

There is one I hope this House thinks about and that is a law that should be attached to the Transportation Bill outlawing racial profiling.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, that is the single example of overt discrimination left unattended in our laws. But while we had one challenge and I can tell Members that staff had no problem coming up with that idea at the March on Washington, today if I would ask what is the one demand of the civil rights movement, Members would say wait one moment, and then go down a whole list of demands because we can now come forward with those demands: economic parity; educational opportunities; the criminal justice system where a whole generation of young black men are being locked up for minor drug offenses, killing the black family in our community; health care.

We can move on to these challenges. We have 38 African American Members, and we can move on to these challenges because the civil rights movement moved us on, the overriding challenge of equality under law. There is much to be done even to that reality, equality under law; but the resolution we honor today, the 40th anniversary of the March on Washington, should send us first into reflection about moving toward the completion of the job of laying aside our racial past and moving on into a period of full equality.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had all intended to be here to make comments on this resolution. Unfortunately, they were not able to make it, but I wanted to make sure that their hopes and aspirations were entered into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for an opportunity to work with her as we brought this resolution to the floor. As has been indicated, September of this year, as we look back 40 years ago to August on that great day, none of us who are around will ever forget that march. None of us who were alive can forget the vibrancy that there was in the air, the hopes, the dreams, the aspirations. It is a day to long remember as we continue to march, not one day but to continue to march until freedom, justice, and equality exist for all in this great Nation.

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

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

Again, I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia for introducing this meaningful legislation, and I urge all Members to join us in adoption of House Resolution 352.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 352, a resolution honoring the March on Washington of August 28, 1963, a turning point in the long road to justice and equality. In the struggle for civil rights, the March will forever hold a place in American history, and in the eyes of the world, as a day that showed that individuals united can affect change and progress without violence.

On that hot August day forty years ago, thousands of people converged on our nation's capital to stand up for civil rights, workers' rights, voting rights, equality in education, and fair pay. They marched for equality with a unified message that they as African-Americans would no longer wait patiently for civil rights to be delivered and practiced in society, but that they were demanding that the federal government take bold steps to ensure that the Constitution's promise was delivered to all Americans; that they would no longer be second-class citizens.

The words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. continue to resonate today and to serve as an inspiration for his generation and future generations to create a society in which all are treated equally because we are all created equal. I want to especially commend the work of Congressman JOHN LEWIS, my friend and colleague, who spoke on that day and who continues to inspire others and to fight for justice everyday.

The resolve of the speakers, the sheer number of marchers, the strong commitment to nonviolence, and the intensity of the sentiment on that day created an energy that spread throughout the country in the coming months and years. It allowed all Americans to see the struggle for civil rights articulated in a manner that was uninterrupted by violence and chaos and was highlighted by peace and unity and strength.

The March gave life to a Movement that continues to manifest itself today. While the March was successful in helping to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the fight for justice and equality is far from over. Today we are fighting to hold on to our civil liberties as the Bush administration works to chip away at our right to privacy, free speech, and freedom of religion. Immigrants, the people who bring diversity and strength to our nation, must fight to live free from harassment as the administration advocates unfair and discriminatory policies against them. People of color continue to fight for the opportunity to get a good education and to be treated fairly by the criminal justice system while President Bush opposes affirmative action. Low-income working families fight for fair treatment under the tax code as Republican Congressional leaders continue to deny them the child tax credit. And many, including elderly adults, persons with disabilities, and people of color, continue to fight for the right to have their vote count while our nation's election system has yet to catch up and meet the needs of all of America's voters.

Today, we remember the people who were at the March on Washington forty years ago—their perservance, their commitment to justice and nonviolence, their courage, their hope, and their success. But we must do more than just remember; we must use their example to continue the struggle today until Dr. King's dream of equality truly comes to life for all who live in the United States.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as Martin Luther King, III said, on the 40th Anniversary of the historic march, of the objectives of his great father, the late Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to eradicate poverty, racism, militarism, and violence, although we have, with Dr. King's leadership, made enormous strides, these issues are ''still very much in our midst.'' People of African-American, Latino, Asian, European, and all races enjoy benefits of the struggle endured by the Civil Rights heroes who marched in Washington, DC on August 28, 1963. The blood, sweat, and tears shed by them have given us the ability to get even closer to ''the Promised Land'' spoken of by the great Reverend Doctor. The ''I Have a Dream'' speech of that

man, along with those of A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, Roy Wilkins of the NAACP, Whitney Young of the National Urban League, James Farmer of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), and Congressman John Lewis then of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) still resonate in my mind and the minds of a multitude of people who share ''the Dream.'' We celebrated and commemorated that historic march by ''re-living the day'' both in Washington and in Houston, Texas; however, it was far from the celebration of a victory having been won. We still have an uphill battle to fight with respect to racism, bigotry, unemployment and disparate employment trends.

The U.S. has an unemployment rate of 6.2%, up from 5.9% last year. African Americans have had their highest unemployment rate ever in June and July of 2003 at 12%, compared to their White counterparts at 5.6% and 5.5% respectively. This illustrates that the task of our Civil Rights heroes is far from complete. According to the Urban League Report this year, one-third of Black families are near or below the poverty line, leading to a social impasse in the 21st century until crime is minimized, political respect is had, and their economic power fully utilized.

The phrase ''A voteless people is a hopeless people'' has as much relevance to minorities now as it did 40 years ago, which is amazing given the technological and social advancements that we now have. In many respect it is an embarrassment and disrespect to the great Civil Rights leader that some people now do not vote or are constrained in their right to vote in some fashion. As I'm sure you all are well aware, the redistricting dilemma which we face in the Texas legislature and in the Federal Government exemplifies that the fundamental right to vote still remains vulnerable to abuse and manipulation by those who do not truly respect it. Furthermore, language, racial, and educational barriers continue to preclude the most informed and truly ''representative'' voting process. Citizenship Workshops, which I recently introduced and plan to hold in the near future to educate and to assist the Legal Permanent Residents in Houston in obtaining U.S. naturalization and therefore perfected voting rights, will help to bridge these gaps and open the barriers that hinder the effectiveness of our system.

In the area of human rights, we must fulfill the Reverend Doctor Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dream of a nonviolent and peaceful world in Israel. The latest news of the failing cease-fire agreement in Israel, the continued battles, and constant fear of death by sniper or suicide bombing make it clear that we have yet to ''overcome.'' Innocent people cannot enjoy their basic human right to live without terror, and children die by the masses. The Roadmap to Peace cannot perish, and neither should our efforts to maintain our journey thereon.

Further evidence that we have yet to ''overcome'' can be found in Baghdad, Iraq. Our soldiers are beset by snipers and terrorists who threaten to attack them while their backs are virtually unprotected. They cannot secure peace alone, and they should not be charged with that duty. The spirit of the Civil Rights Movement dictates that we reach out and join hands with the international community to usher in peace together. Instead of having to celebrate the martyrdom of heroes such as the late U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sergio Vieira de Mello, I would much rather we now bring him, and the other brave individuals whom we lost, home to their families in celebration of peace and a successful mission.

Moreover, our brothers and sisters in Liberia, who have reached the first stage of the establishment of a democratic and humane society, must receive the assistance and manpower that are required. It is an atrocity that, in the international community, there are parties that are armed with the tools and the knowledge necessary to bring stability to that nation who have made but minimalist approaches to date. The U.N., ECOWAS troops, and other commissioned officials need help in building infrastructures of government and health.

Furthermore, the suffering and death by the cruel pandemic effects of HIV/AIDS and famine in Ethiopia, Zambia, and South Africa are unspeakable. I had the opportunity to witness these atrocities first-hand on a Congressional Delegation with Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. Each child, mother, and father in these regions has a right to eat, to survive, and to see tomorrow. Severe drought and inadequate agricultural policy are not their fault. Promiscuity and prostitution without protection are begotten from hunger and suffering. Their lack of education only exacerbates their proclivity to live a high-risk lifestyle in these regions. Again, the international community can eradicate these problems by joining hands and marching forward bearing combined resources and expertise.

This celebration and commemoration of the Historic March also paid homage to other great pioneers who have recently passed on. The life and accomplishments of the late Mayor Maynard Jackson, Jr. bestowed upon many minorities the opportunity to compete and succeed in building a prosperous small business. Similarly, the late Gregory Hines opened the doors for many minorities in entertainment. We see the fruits of his inspiring achievements and the level of his excellence in performances of talented individuals such as Savion Glover. The 40th Anniversary celebration was about remembering the achievements of the Civil Rights Leaders, of individuals who have shared their talents with the world, and from which we have all received gifts that enhance our enjoyment of everyday liberties. The celebration was about expanding from and extrapolating these gifts to build a better and more peaceful world. This celebration was about embarking upon a whole new journey, a whole new march that will not end until peace, unity, equality, and self-determination are achieved for all of our brothers and sisters.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for introducing this important resolution that we are considering on the House floor today.

Over 40 years ago, hundreds of thousands of citizens marched together upon Washington D.C. demanding two things, jobs and freedom. From all corners of our great nation people of all races, ethnicities and all walks of life came to participate in a peaceful demonstration that would leave a lasting legacy upon our country.

The march on Washington—now forever known as just the march—represented one of those watershed moments in American history that deserves to be remembered and commemorated by all of us.

Televised worldwide, the march brought to the world the continuing social and economic discrimination faced by African Americans, as well as the inspirational words of many leaders of the Civil Rights movement, like the great Martin Luther King Jr., and my dear friend and colleague, Congressman John Lewis.

Looking out upon the masses gathered around the Lincoln Memorial, Dr. King's delivered his now immortalized ''I Have a Dream Speech'' which proved to be the focal point of the march that day.

Speaking of the impetus for the march, Dr. King said:

> We have come here today to dramatize an appalling condition. In a sense we have come to our nation's capital to cash a check. When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir.
>
> This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note insofar as her citizens of color are concerned. Instead of honoring this sacred obligation, America has given the Negro people a bad check which has come back marked ''insufficient funds.'' But we refuse to believe that the bank of justice is bankrupt. We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of opportunity of this nation.

The disconnect between white America and people of color regarding the issues of social and economic freedom and opportunity that Dr. King spoke so eloquently about remains with us today, as does that same optimism and sense of urgency that pervaded his speech and the march that day.

To be sure, substantial progress has been made in the 40 years since the march took place. But clearly we have a very long way to go before we can truly say that the ideals of the march have been met, particularly when we talk about economic freedom and opportunity for African Americans, the poor and people of color.

This is most clearly reflected in the labor and employments statistics that are released every month. In virtually all categories, African Americans and Hispanics, have higher rates of unemployment than their counterparts.

And we must equally warn that racism still very much exists in this country today. Only now it is much more subtle and insidious than the discrimination we faced in the 60's or that which our parents before that. Discrimination is still about racial profiling by law-enforcement. It is still about environmental injustice, which has become entrenched in our society by the unequal distribution of federal, state, and local funds which could provide needed healthcare, education and housing services to minority communities. And sadly as evidenced by the recent 9th Circuit Federal Appeals Court ruling, it is still about voting rights—only in this case the right to have our votes counted equally.

So I close today by reminding my colleagues that there is still much, much more to be done. Our march goes on, and will continue to go on until—in the words of Dr. King—we can say ''justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.''

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to express my

support of H. Res. 352, a resolution to remember and honor the historic March on Washington of 1963. This 40th anniversary of the historic March on Washington and Dr. Martin Luther King's universally famous ''I Have a Dream'' speech is a bittersweet moment.

I would like to especially thank my colleague, Representative SANFORD BISHOP for sponsoring this resolution. For many, Dr. King's dream has not come to fruition. It remains unfulfilled. As thousands gather from around the nation and the globe to reenact the fabled march and to rehearse the words of the visionary civil rights leader, we will celebrate the tremendous strides the nation has made on the issues of race, equality and social justice during the past forty years.

However, as the leaders and representatives of more than 500 organizations converged at the Lincoln Memorial, we are also reminded that the ''Dream'' Dr. King so eloquently articulated is still beyond the aspirations and the grasp of millions of our citizens. They have been left behind and are left out of the ''Great American Dream.''

Forty years later, some 13 million children in this country do not have enough food to eat. Four decades later 41.2 million people lack health insurance. As the economy shows certain signs of recovery, more than 9.6 million Americans still cannot find jobs. Matters are even worse in minority communities. The African-American unemployment rate hovers at 11.1 percent compared to 5.5 percent for whites.

Forty years ago we said, ''I have a dream!'' Today, we say, ''How long will we suffer injustice in America?'' The American people are in jeopardy of losing 50 years of progress in civil rights and civil liberties.

In fact, under the guise of the PATRIOT Act we are experiencing a rollback of these hard-earned rights. Elections have been stolen and voting rights have been denied.

In Texas, a proposed redistricting plan would disenfranchise minority voters across the state.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to take the time to acknowledge the 40th anniversary of the event that affords all of us an opportunity to rededicate and to recommit ourselves to the vision articulated by Dr. King. Like Dr. King, we can say: ''. . . That in spite of the difficulties and frustrations of the moment, I still have a dream.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 352.

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. DAVIS of Illinois. 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.

POSTMASTERS EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 678) to amend chapter 10 of title 39, United States Code, to include postmasters and postmasters organizations in the process for the development and planning of certain policies, schedules, and programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 678

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Postmasters Equity Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. POSTMASTERS AND POSTMASTERS' ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) PERCENTAGE REPRESENTATION REQUIREMENT.—The second sentence of section 1004(b) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting ''that an organization (other than an organization representing supervisors) represents at least 20 percent of postmasters,'' after ''majority of supervisors,''; and

(2) by striking ''supervisors)'' and inserting ''supervisors or postmasters)''.

(b) CONSULTATION AND OTHER RIGHTS.—Section 1004 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h)(1) In order to ensure that postmasters and postmasters' organizations are afforded the same rights under this section as are afforded to supervisors and the supervisors' organization, subsections (c) through (g) shall be applied with respect to postmasters and postmasters' organizations—

''(A) by substituting 'postmasters' organization' for 'supervisors' organization' each place it appears; and

''(B) if 2 or more postmasters' organizations exist, by treating such organizations as if they constituted a single organization, in accordance with such arrangements as such organizations shall mutually agree to.

''(2) If 2 or more postmasters' organizations exist, such organizations shall, in the case of any factfinding panel convened at the request of such organizations (in accordance with paragraph (1)(B)), be jointly and severally liable for the cost of such panel, apart from the portion to be borne by the Postal Service (as determined under subsection (f)(4)).''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (i) of section 1004 of title 39, United States Code (as so redesignated by subsection (b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) 'postmaster' means an individual who is the manager in charge of the operations of a post office, with or without the assistance of subordinate managers or supervisors;

''(4) 'postmasters' organization' means an organization recognized by the Postal Service under subsection (b) as representing at least 20 percent of postmasters; and

''(5) 'members of the postmasters' organization' shall be considered to mean employees of the Postal Service who are recognized under an agreement—

''(A) between the Postal Service and the postmasters' organization as represented by the organization; or

''(B) in the circumstance described in subsection (h)(1)(B), between the Postal Service and the postmasters' organizations (acting in concert) as represented by either or any of the postmasters' organizations involved.''.

(d) THRIFT ADVISORY COUNCIL NOT TO BE AFFECTED.—For purposes of section 8473(b)(4) of title 5, United States Code—

(1) each of the 2 or more organizations referred to in section 1004(h)(1)(B) of title 39, United States Code (as amended by subsection (b)) shall be treated as a separate organization; and

(2) any determination of the number of individuals represented by each of those respective organizations shall be made in a manner consistent with the purposes of this subsection.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this section shall take effect 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 678.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 678, the Postmasters Equity Act, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Senator DANIEL AKAKA, and it gives our Nation's most valued postmasters the same options available to postal supervisors when negotiating pay and benefits with the U.S. Postal Service. My colleague on the Committee on Government Reform, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), who is the chairman of the special panel on Postal Reform and Oversight, introduced an identical bill, H.R. 2249, which passed this House back in July; and I am proud to be a cosponsor of that bill, and I am pleased the House is considering the Senate version of that bill today.

This legislation extends to postmasters and other nonunion postal employees the fact-finding procedures already established under current law for postal supervisors. This process allows for an unbiased review of issues in dispute during negotiations, as well as the ability to issue nonbinding recommendations to resolve those issues. Currently, without this right, postmasters lack any form of recourse when pay talks under the consultation process fail.

Based on the 38,000 post offices across the country, postmasters provide an essential link to the Federal Government and to other nations' citizens. This bill provides essential fairness to postmasters, and this legislation has already unanimously passed the Senate

and unanimously passed the House in its House version. I am very pleased that this legislation will soon be on the President's desk and enacted into law, and I want to commend the Senator from Hawaii and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for their diligence on the Postmasters Equity Act and for their support. I urge all Members to support its passage.

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 my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), in consideration of S. 678, the Postmasters Equity Act of 2003.

S. 678 was introduced on March 20, 2003, by Senator DANIEL AKAKA. This measure would amend chapter 10 of title 39 to include postmasters and postmasters' organizations in the process for the development and planning of pay policies and benefits.

S. 678 is cosponsored by 39 Senators, including the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Government Affairs Committee, Senator SUSAN COLLINS and Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN. On July 25, the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee unanimously approved S. 678, the Postmasters Equity Act of 2003.

The bill was amended to substitute the language of the House bill, H.R. 2249, sponsored by me and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH). H.R. 2249 had been reported earlier out of the Committee on Government Reform by voice vote. During the 1996 Congress, President Carter signed into law legislation creating a fact-finding process for resolving disputes over pay and benefits and to make recommendations to the Postal Service. It did not provide for arbitration of the disputes, and the recommendations were not binding on the Postmaster General. However, the law only applied to postal supervisors, not postmasters.

S. 678, like its House counterpart, H.R. 2249, would extend to the postmaster the option of a fact-finding panel to make nonbinding recommendations to the Postal Service. Currently, when pay and benefit discussions between the Postal Service and postmasters fail, postmasters have no recourse and have to accept what is offered by the Postal Service. Passage of S. 678 would bring consistency in the manner by which the two categories of postal managers negotiate with the Postal Service over pay and benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been a sponsor of this legislation. I urge swift adoption of this bill and commend Senator AKAKA for all of his hard work on behalf of postmasters.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for cosponsoring this bill and for all of the hard work he has put in on this and a lot of other pieces of legislation before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator AKAKA for introducing this important bill and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for his hard work. I urge all Members to support the passage of Senate bill 678.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 678.

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. BURTON of Indiana. 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 PROFOUND SORROW FOR DEATH OF INDIANA GOVERNOR FRANK O'BANNON AND EXTENDING THOUGHTS, PRAYERS, AND CONDOLENCES TO FAMILY, FRIENDS, AND LOVED ONES

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 369) expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives for the death of Indiana Governor Frank O'Bannon and extending thoughts, prayers, and condolences to his family, friends, and loved ones.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 369

Whereas Frank O'Bannon devoted his entire life to public service and to the people of the State of Indiana;

Whereas Frank O'Bannon dedicated his life to defending the Nation's principles of freedom and democracy, serving in the Air Force from 1952 until 1954;

Whereas Frank O'Bannon served 18 years in the Indiana State Senate and 8 years as Lieutenant Governor of Indiana;

Whereas, on November 5, 1996, Frank O'Bannon was elected the 47th Governor of the State of Indiana, where he served until his death on September 13, 2003;

Whereas Governor O'Bannon was a true friend to Indiana, and a gentle man of integrity, kindness, and good works; and

Whereas Governor O'Bannon will be remembered as a loving husband to his wife Judy, and a devoted father to his 3 children and caring grandfather to his 5 grandchildren: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Frank O'Bannon, Governor of Indiana, on September 13, 2003, and extends its condolences to the O'Bannon family, especially to his wife Judy, his children Jonathan, Jennifer, and Polly, and his grandchildren Beau, Chelsea, Asher, Demi, and Elle;

(2) expresses its profound gratitude to Frank O'Bannon for the services that he rendered to the Nation in the Air Force, the Indiana State Legislature, and as Governor of Indiana; and

(3) recognizes with respect Frank O'Bannon's integrity, steadfastness, and loyalty to the State of Indiana and to the United States.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I met Frank O'Bannon, our now-deceased Governor, I met his father back in the late 1960s when I served with his father in the Indiana State Senate. His father was editor and publisher of a newspaper in Corydon, Indiana; and he was one of the finest men I ever served with. He was a real gentleman. Even though we had our differences, Governor O'Bannon's father was a wonderful man.

Mr. Speaker, we know a lot about people by their children. And although I knew Senator O'Bannon, Governor O'Bannon's father, very well, I was not sure about what kind of family man he was. But then I met his son who became Senator after his dad retired, and Senator Frank O'Bannon was also one of the finest men I ever served with in the Indiana State Senate. His brother, Bob, who is a businessman in Indianapolis, is also fine man. We know a lot about people by their children, and Governor O'Bannon was a wonderful man, and I am sure his mother was a wonderful woman as well.

Governor O'Bannon was revered by everyone who knew him, whether it was a Republican or a Democrat. He was a very fine public servant, a man who really cared about his fellow man and his civic responsibilities. He learned that from his father and mother and worked hard in both the Indiana State Senate and as Governor.

Although we had political differences, I always admired him because he was a man of honor. If he gave you his word, you could take it to the bank. He always said what he meant, and he meant what he said. We are going to miss him in Indiana.

I will tell one little anecdote. Senator O'Bannon sat directly in front of me when I was a freshman when he was a State Senator. I was seated on the Democrat side, and he was the minority leader for the Democrats in the State Senate. He was such a nice guy we would kid each other. One day I said, Senator, you are such a nice guy and so intelligent and you read papers, I know you can read, I do not know why you do not become a Republican. And he turned around and looked at me without batting an eye; and he said you

have the same qualities, I do not know why you do not become a Democrat. That was one of the more interesting and funny anecdotes I remember about Governor O'Bannon.

He was a wonderful man. We are going to miss him in Indiana. I wish his wife the very best. I know she is suffering a great deal, as well as the rest of his family right now; but I hope that Judy O'Bannon is doing well, and we wish her the very best. She and her family have our prayers.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Speaker, Governor O'Bannon was in my congressional district when he passed away. Certainly I would want to extend on behalf of all of the people in Chicago and the people of Illinois our sympathies to his family and to the people of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, Frank O'Bannon, the 47th Governor of Indiana, died last week at the age of 73 from a stroke. After serving 18 years as Lieutenant Governor to Evan Bayh, Frank O'Bannon was elected Governor of Indiana November 5, 1996, and was reelected on November 7, 2000.

Frank O'Bannon's two inaugurations as Governor made history. After he was elected in 1996 he invited Indiana's fourth grade history students to witness his inauguration, something no Governor had ever done. Despite subzero temperatures that day, hundreds of Hoosier schoolchildren for the first time ever watched as their Governor was sworn in.

After his 2000 reelection, Governor O'Bannon repeated his invitation to the fourth grade history students. This time, however, the festivities were moved inside the RCA Dome in Indianapolis. More than 25,000 students and visitors from across Indiana watched as the Governor was sworn in, making it the largest gubernatorial inauguration crowd in Indiana history.

Although Governor Frank O'Bannon was sometimes criticized by other lawmakers for not being more assertive, he followed his own instincts for achieving consensus quietly. Born on January 30, 1930, in Louisville, Kentucky, Frank O'Bannon devoted his entire life to public service and to the people of the State of Indiana.

Education, health care, building communities, promoting public safety and economic development are the hallmarks of Frank O'Bannon's legacy as Governor of Indiana. He taught those fourth grade students a valuable lesson in leadership, integrity and good works.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a few thoughts about our Governor from Indiana for people outside Indiana who are not as familiar with him.

The past few days have been an outpouring of grief and almost a celebration with the O'Bannon family about our Governor that is different than anything I have seen in Indiana politics. It is partly, I think, a transition of an era. Frank O'Bannon represented a different part of politics when it was not quite as, how would you say, aggressive, it was not quite as negative. He was a friend to everyone. Even when we had differences it was a different type of relationship.

He came from the little town of Corydon, which was our State capital. As you would look at it, it would be a picturesque vision of what Indiana was when we started in southern Indiana and moved to the north. And Indianapolis in the north has now the bulk of the population and the bulk of the power, but Corydon still represents kind of old Indiana.

When he ran his campaign, no matter who his opponent was and no matter what kind of campaign they ran, he ran a Hoosier-roots type of a campaign. You would see him and his wife on their porch in Corydon. You would see him talking with his grandkids. You would see him talking and sending a different signal than often is put forth in politics. It was a symbol of comfort much like Governor Bowen used to have, saying in Indiana we may not be flashy, we may not all have blow-dried hairdos, we may not be as slick as other people, but we are going to produce good, honest government that is going to continue to move Indiana forward.

We are in a period of transition. And, interestingly, this man whose family was deeply rooted in early Indiana history and whose father had been a public servant, in addition to his normal public service he realized that Indiana was in this transition period. And while we sometimes disagreed on how best to do it, I think one of the things he will most be remembered for is his commitment to education at a time when Indiana is struggling with funds, like everybody else, and we have limited funds in education, to take those education funds right now and concentrate them on getting kids able to read by age 3.

He understood that if Indiana was going to move forward, whether you had the old Indiana or the new Indiana, whether you were kind of a comforting grandfather figure like he has been in Indiana, or a young slick politician coming up, if we did not have basic education in Indiana we weren't going to be able to compete with the States around us and around the country.

He and his wife have a tremendous legacy of preserving Indiana landmarks of many different things. But I think his effort to make sure that all kids can read will be one of his major legacies and also his legacy of how a public servant should be in relationship to other members of his party, of other parties, and to the people of Indiana. That is why we are seeing this extended outpouring of grief because we are worried that the Nation is changing and we are losing the type of values that Frank O'Bannon brought to government.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Governor's Congresswoman, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Chicago and certainly my colleague from Indiana for bringing forth this resolution today in tribute to a young man whose service to his family, to the State of Indiana, and to this Nation is unsurpassed.

The Governor just 3 weeks ago met the President at the airport in Indianapolis when he came out to Indianapolis for disaster relief, and the Governor had just hosted the National Governors' Association there.

Frank O'Bannon was the type of guy who gave of himself, who lived for a cause, not just because.

Frank O'Bannon even in death contributed his organs so that somebody else may have a quality of life. Since his passing, I was telling his wife yesterday, I spent an enormous amount of time with the widow, ''Wouldn't it be great if Frank from on high could hear all of the attributes that are being given to him now that he did not hear when he was living?''

Unlike many other Governors in the United States, he came under a great deal of pressure because of the economic crisis that Indiana faced, a problem over which he had no control and had nothing in fact to do with it. But time and time and time again he came under a heap of criticism for Indiana's woes. I think he reminds all of us that even though we may not have control over something, it is unjust, it is like man's inhumanity to man, to heap that kind of pain and frustration on an individual who had done so much in improving the lives of the people in the State of Indiana.

I remember when Frank O'Bannon first decided he wanted to be a Governor. I was a member of the Indiana State Senate along with him. And because EVAN BAYH decided he too wanted to be the Governor at that time, Frank O'Bannon in his own genteel way stepped aside and allowed our now junior Senator to become the Governor of Indiana and Frank yielded to become the Lieutenant Governor in the State of Indiana. I was telling his wife yesterday that fate had undoubtedly orchestrated that, because he was not Governor just for 8 years, he was almost Governor for 16 years. He served as Lieutenant Governor for 8 years and almost completed 8 years as Indiana's Governor.

Frank O'Bannon served over 6.15 million people and he served them well.

Politics, economic situations, religious denominations all paled under Frank O'Bannon's leadership. Today is a very difficult day for me, because I had so much respect for Frank O'Bannon, but then I remember the words of Ecclesiastes that reminds us that there is a time for all things.

Frank O'Bannon, I suppose, could have continued to suffer, but God would have it another way. Danny, your hospital took great care of our Governor. I want to thank you and your hospital for that. They had one of the best neurosurgeons that this country has right there at Chicago hospital. So I want to thank you and yours. And certainly to Judy O'Bannon, who has been a yeoman throughout this ordeal, who has been very stately, like a stateswoman throughout the pain that she and her family endure, my heart, my prayers go out to Judy, to Jennifer, to Polly and to Jonathan. I know in due time that pain will pass but precious memories never fade into eternity.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to share with my colleagues and with the Nation just a glimpse of what Indiana has been going through in recent days.

Last week our Governor Frank O'Bannon, a gifted and gentle man on loan from God, suffered a massive stroke while hard at work for Indiana. Through the week, as he lay stricken, we thought of him, remembered him, worried about him and prayed for him. Then, on Saturday, we lost him.

My Governor, ''Frank'' as everyone called him, was a kind and intelligent man of great substance. A gifted man with many choices before him, he made a selfless choice: to spend a lifetime in public, a lifetime in service.

Now in public life, as we know—borrowing a bit from James Taylor—'we see fire, we see rain, and sunny days we thought would never end'. Our duty is serve our way through, keeping the people and the responsibility ever in mind, looking again to reach those sunny days.

For My Governor, it was ever so. The sunny days were many—his work in our Senate, as our Lieutenant Governor, and as Governor the last 6½ years, saw great leadership and many sunny days, great prosperity and great progress, turning finally to fire and rain, as economic suffering reached Indiana and the blame was laid at his feet. Through it all, Frank never stopped working for Indiana, knowing, as we all do, that we would reach sunny days again.

As we know, too, public service can be lonely, wearying at its worst. As he soldiered on, this fine man absorbed the dismay, the frustration, the anger. Wherever I was, I spoke to him each week, not so much as our Governor but as a man I had known many years, whose friendship I treasured and whose commitment I admired, to remind him not to be ground down, that his commitment was a wise one, that sunny days would come again. And he returned the favor, with good counsel about the heart of public service.

He is gone now, recalled in a way. Indiana is in good hands, but we shall miss him greatly.

To My Governor, our ''Frank'', our prayers on the way. And, to Judy, ever his active partner and helpmate, to the kids, Jennifer, Polly and Jonathan, it is my prayer that your precious memories of all that was so fine will help to sustain you through these mysterious days and hours of our farewell.

FRANK

You can do an article about Governor Frank O'Bannon, but you can't do it justice, not in any language I know. But I have to try.

In the prefaces of The 1600 Killers and Slander and Sweet Judgement, the two volumes of my memoir, I wrote: ''One of the principal and principled inspirations for this work was the Honorable Frank O'Bannon, forty-seventh governor of Indiana. He, his wife Judy and his lieutenant governor, war-hero Joe Kernan, brought a refreshing wholesomeness and down-to-earth wisdom to the people of Indiana, of whom I am privileged to be one. The headline on The Indianapolis Star/News story that reported Frank's 1996 Election was, 'Nice guy finishes first.' Amen''

The name of our dearly departed governor is O'Bannon, but his face was not ''the map of Ireland;'' it was the map of Indiana. His voice inflections, the twinkle in his eyes, the generous smile made him the personification of all that is good in what we call Hoosier.

An old cake ad read and said, ''Nobody doesn't like Sarah Lee.'' Noboby didn't like Frank. And nobody doesn't like the superlatively eloquent Judy.

Several years ago, Hoosier Congressman PETE VISCLOSKY was seated inside a banquet hall, awaiting the arrival of the principal speaker, the slightly behind schedule, then-Lt. Governor Frank O'Bannon. Suddenly, someone told PETE that his nearly octogenarian father had slipped and fallen on the ice outside. PETE rushed to his father's side and found Indiana's second highest elected official helping the elderly man to his feet.

We use the word ''gentleman'' over and over, but how often do we stop to realize what it means? A gentleman is a man who is gentle and the heroine of the play Love is a Many Splendored Thing, declares, ''There is no greater strength than gentleness.'' By that definition and declaration, Frank O'Bannon was a person of towering strength. John F. Kennedy said it: ''Civility should not be confused with weakness.''

Michel Eyquem de Montaigene wrote, ''Sit ye never so high upon a stool, yet sit ye but upon your own tail.'' Frank intuitively knew, felt and lived this. He was no big shot. He did have a stuffed shirt, though, stuffed with a warm, caring and giving heart.

Hoosier journalist William Miller Herschell asked, ''Ain't God good to Indiana?'' When I think of Frank O'Bannon, I know the answer.

ANDY JACOBS, JR.,
Former Member of Congress.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Eighth District of Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER).

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. I thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues from the great State of Indiana in extending our thoughts and prayers to the family of Governor Frank O'Bannon during this difficult time. I have had opportunities to work with Governor O'Bannon over the last several years and have come away with several impressions. First, Frank was a public servant, committed to working tirelessly on behalf of Hoosiers from Michigan to the Ohio River. Second, when working with the Governor on issues such as the completion of Interstate 69 through Indiana, he proved himself to be a visionary and a leader, willing to address tough issues head-on, to do what is best for the entire State. Finally and most importantly, Mr. Speaker, Governor O'Bannon was in every circumstance a gentleman. In an era of declining civility, Frank stood out for his warmth, his comity and good humor.

I ask my colleagues today to lift the O'Bannon family up in your prayers that they might derive strength and joy from God even as they pass through these most difficult days. Mr. Speaker, I urge immediate passage of this resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness and a very heavy heart that I rise today in support of the resolution in honor of Indiana Governor Frank O'Bannon. Governor O'Bannon, as was mentioned, tragically passed away this past Saturday. I also want to extend my deepest sympathy, prayers and offer of assistance to Governor O'Bannon's wife Judy and their children and family.

One of the finest opportunities my career in politics has given me is meeting, working with and becoming friends with Frank O'Bannon. Frank was one of the most gentle men, one of the most decent men and one of the kindest individuals I have ever, ever met in my life. He is a man who could have been successful at any pursuit in life. He chose a life of public service because it was a life he could give to others. Except for his love for Judy and their children and their family, nothing was more important to Governor O'Bannon. His commitment to the future in children was foremost as far as his administration. And because Frank O'Bannon always knew who he was, he allowed his quiet demeanor and gentle nature to mask his inherent strength and ability to make very hard and very tough decisions for the good of all of the citizens of Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have mentioned anecdotes and we all deal with individuals on a personal level, and I would add my two. Many years ago when Frank O'Bannon was first campaigning for Governor, I was at St. Mary's Orthodox Church hall in Gary, Indiana, at a political rally. Someone came in and said my father had fallen on the ice and snow outside. I go outside, Dad was perfectly fine, but there was Frank O'Bannon because

he was near my father. There was nothing more important to Frank at that moment in time and if it took all night he was going to make sure he was up, he was fine, he was cleaned off and he got in that hall, no matter what his other demands were.

The other continuing recollection I have is I tried not to impose upon the Governor's good nature or offices very often but whenever I called for assistance, he never said he would do it. He never said yes. He always said, ''I'll see what I can do.'' And invariably the problem was solved, someone was helped or the State of Indiana moved ahead because you knew he was always going to do his best.

Frank O'Bannon was a good, good man. We are all going to miss him not only in our State but in this great country.

□ 1545

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have been very moved by the comments of my colleagues today, and I also rise to express, as this resolution suggests, the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives for the death of Indiana Governor Frank O'Bannon.

I was greeted by my wife, Karen, as I returned from the grocery store Saturday. She, with tears in her eyes, told me simply that Frank had died. And throughout last week, along with tens of thousands of Hoosiers, our family labored in prayer, not so much on behalf of a Governor as we did on behalf of a friend, because that is what Frank O'Bannon was to tens of thousands of Hoosiers.

I will never forget years ago, long before I entered public life, chatting with Governor Frank O'Bannon about the State of Indiana, and his face virtually lit up as he said, you do get to feel that you know somebody in every little town in this State when you do this job.

I always had the feeling for Governor Frank O'Bannon that Indiana was a small town, if not even a family, and it did not matter what our politics were, that was 8:00 to 5:00 with Frank O'Bannon. After 5 o'clock we were Hoosiers, and we came together and on so many occasions. I remember, with great fondness, his intense interest in me and in my family and in my children. He had this unusual quality, that I have reflected on with my colleagues from Indiana, of making everyone else in the room feel that they were more important than him. Even when he was the highest elected official in our State, he had a quality of humility that will always remain for me a standard in public life.

In closing, I just add, as the gentlewoman from Indianapolis, Indiana (Ms. CARSON) said, the Good Book gives us comfort in time of loss, and I think of those verses in Micah, chapter 6 verse 8. It says ''In what, O, man, is required of you but this: To do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God.''

When I look at the public career of Frank O'Bannon as a man, a State senator, a Lieutenant Governor, a Governor, a husband, a father, a grandfather, he was a man who did justice, who lived and loved kindness, and who walked humbly, in a way that will ever inspire this public servant to do likewise. To Judy and the children, to Governor Kernan and Maggie, our condolences and our prayers.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois, and I thank the other gentleman from Indiana for bringing this resolution so quickly to the floor. I join my Indiana colleagues.

I knew Frank O'Bannon pretty well. I was asked by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) in 1995 to serve in the capacity of the liaison to the National Governors' Association and to the Democratic Governors' Association, and I, therefore, know firsthand the loss that the Hoosier State has sustained and the loss of this extraordinarily popular Governor, who presided over great change and progress in his State. Our Nation, as I think the last speaker indicated so well, has lost a model public servant and citizen.

A few years ago when I served as the House liaison, I had the pleasure of working with Governor O'Bannon, both on issues that were in front of the Congress and on politics, and I can confirm what so many have written and said about him. He was a wonderful, intelligent, kind, and humble gentleman who, along with Judy, worked tirelessly for all Hoosiers and who cared deeply about his country and his State.

It is noteworthy, I think, that Governor O'Bannon never lost a political election. Democracy is an extraordinary process, and the people's wisdom is what makes it so great because they choose well. They choose different types of people, and we contend politically, but I am always impressed with how well, ultimately, they do choose. But it is telling what his last opponent David McIntosh, a former Member of this body said about him. This is somebody who ran against him, ran a hard campaign, an extraordinarily able young man. He said this: ''Everywhere I'd go, people would say to me: 'How are you going to run against someone who is everyone's grandfather?' And it was the truth,'' David McIntosh said. ''He was a congenial guy that everyone liked.''

After serving 18 years in the Indiana Senate including 8 as Democratic floor leader and 8 as Lieutenant Governor and more than 6 years as Governor, Frank O'Bannon pulled off a rare feat in politics: He was both effective and well-liked. However, his gentle nature is not his only legacy. His many accomplishments, as the colleagues from Indiana know better than I do or others, include creating a community college system, adopting of academic standards that are among the best in the Nation, extending health insurance to nearly half a million children, and engineering an overhaul of the State tax system to entice business to Indiana and to relieve property tax owners.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that Frank O'Bannon lived life to the fullest, graduating from Indiana U, where he played basketball, serving in the Air Force, practicing law, and working as a newspaper publisher in his native Corydon. And there is no doubt that we are fortunate for his service. I am pleased to join my colleagues in lamenting for ourselves, for Indiana, and for our country the loss of this extraordinary individual and being joyous in the fact that, as a man of faith, he is better off, and joyous in the fact that we had the opportunity to know him and to work with him and to know that his State and country were better for his life.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

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

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support with my colleagues of this resolution with great sadness and great respect. This certainly is a sad day for all Hoosiers when we learned of the passing of our Governor, Frank O'Bannon. Although I have served in Congress for a short period of time, and my personal experience with Governor O'Bannon has been limited, I have great respect for the man he was and the life he lived.

One did not need to know Frank O'Bannon very well to know what kind of a person he was. He had the rare ability to project his sincerity and his genuine nature to all that he came in contact with.

And those who knew him well, regardless of their political affiliation, were unanimous in their praise and respect for the man and his character. I think we are seeing a great example of that today.

I consider it my loss that I did not have a greater opportunity to work with and learn from Frank O'Bannon, and certainly the entire State of Indiana will miss him and his lifetime of public service. But in the end, we are all fortunate and grateful for the example he gave us and thankful for his legacy of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak on behalf of all my constituents in the 2nd District of Indiana when I thank Frank O'Bannon for his service to our State, and our thoughts and our prayers are with his wife, Judy, and his entire family.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I have been most impressed by the quality of remarks that have been talked about here this afternoon, most impressed about the sincerity of the remarks that have been made here this afternoon. I believe that it demonstrates the quality that Frank O'Bannon had and that he transcended politics. Both Republicans and Democrats admired him and respected him and loved him. They may have had differences, but never lost the respect.

I have known Frank O'Bannon for over 20 years. He was one of the first people that I ever became acquainted with in politics. His home, where his wife and his children were raised, is in Corydon, Indiana, a town that is in the 9th District, in my district. I have been to his house, stayed all night with him, loved him and admired him and respected him, and we miss him in Indiana. For the last week we have mourned our great Governor, but in the next couple of days we are going to celebrate the life of Frank O'Bannon and the many accomplishments that he had.

Probably the greatest accomplishment in his life was the fact that one could be a nice guy and get elected to the highest office in Indiana. Good guys can finish first, and Frank is a perfect example of that.

I wish many people and Members of Congress could have witnessed the class that the First Lady of Indiana demonstrated to the people of Indiana and to this Nation. She really held her strength and demonstrated that, while she could mourn, she could remain strong for the people that she loved in Indiana.

We are going to miss Frank O'Bannon, but I am convinced of one thing: He has a one-way ticket to heaven, and I hope to join him there someday.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Therefore, I urge swift passage of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just end by saying that in the 1997 inauguration speech, Frank O'Bannon made some very poignant remarks that I think are appropriate at this time. He said: ''Life is no brief candle for me. It is sort of a splendid torch which I got hold of for a moment, and I want to make it burn as brightly as I can before turning it over to future generations.'' Frank O'Bannon did just that, and we all miss him, and we wish his family the very best, and they are in our prayers.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, today, we pay tribute to Governor Frank O'Bannon—a statesman, loving husband and father and a friend to many.

A loyal servant of Indiana for over 30 years, Frank O'Bannon lived life as a country gentleman, with an unassuming strength to hold to his convictions to lead a State but more important, a deep and endless devotion to family.

The life of Frank O'Bannon is one to look at with inspiration and thanks. Our thoughts and prayers are with his wife Judy, their three children—Jonathan, Jennifer and Polly and their 5 grandchildren.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 369.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 369, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 368) honoring the Small Business Administration on the occasion of its 50th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 368

Whereas the Nation's economy is built on and draws its strength from the creativity and entrepreneurship of its people;

Whereas the Nation's 25 million small businesses employ more than half of all private sector employees, pay 44.5 percent of the total United States private payroll, and generate 60 to 80 percent of all net new jobs annually;

Whereas the men and women who own and operate the Nation's small businesses make a vital contribution to the Nation's prosperity through their ongoing work to create new technologies, products, and services;

Whereas small businesses produce 13 to 14 times more patents per employee than large patenting firms, and these patents are twice as likely as large firm patents to be among the 1 percent most cited;

Whereas the Small Business Administration was officially established in 1953 and for the past 50 years has played a vital role in ensuring that the door to the American Dream is truly open to all entrepreneurs;

Whereas the mission and high calling of the Small Business Administration is to champion the interests of the Nation's entrepreneurs for the benefit of all Americans;

Whereas the Small Business Administration is marking its 50th anniversary by celebrating the accomplishments of small-business owners across the country throughout the year; and

Whereas the President has designated the week beginning on Monday, September 15, 2003, as ''National Small Business Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Small Business Week, and the events surrounding the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Small Business Administration;

(2) commends the Administrator and the employees of the Small Business Administration for their work on behalf of the Nation's small businesses; and

(3) reaffirms that the Small Business Administration, through its loan, technical assistance, and entrepreneurial development programs, plays an important role in assisting small businesses to ensure a brighter, stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION OF MEMBER TO BE ORIGINAL COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 368

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking minority member of the committee, be added as a an original cosponsor of H. Res. 368.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1600

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

Mr. Speaker, as has been the tradition for the past 40 years, the President of the United States has issued a proclamation calling for the celebration of Small Business Week, which I include for the RECORD today. We are now in the middle of Small Business Week for 2003, which is being sponsored by the Small Business Administration.

The purpose of this week's celebration is to honor over 25 million businesses that make up the U.S. small business community. It is very appropriate for us, today, to recognize the importance of America's small businesses and the significant role played by the Small Business Administration in our Nation's economic growth.

This year is particularly important in recognizing the 50th anniversary of the SBA. President Eisenhower and Congress established the SBA in 1953 to provide financial and management assistance to startup and growing small businesses.

Over the past 50 years, the SBA has helped countless numbers of small businesses survive and succeed in this economy. It maintains a portfolio of guaranteed small business loans and disaster loans totaling more than $45 billion. The 7(a) program alone accounts for approximately 40 to 50 percent of all long-term capital needs for small businesses. The SBA has also guaranteed another $13 billion in venture capital investments to small businesses. To complement its successful credit programs, the SBA's management assistance programs were delivered to more than 1 million small businesses during the past year.

Some of the great American companies that are now household names were initially started with assistance from the SBA. Allen-Edmonds Shoe, the Panda Restaurant Group, Winnebago Industries with help from the 7(a) program, Callaway Golf, FedEx, Hewlett Packard, Intel Corporation, Jenny Craig, Outback Steakhouse, Staples, Sun Microsystems and the Gymboree Corporation all started with infusions of capital from the Small Business Investment Company program.

U.S. small businesses are the driving forces behind our economy and are poised to lead this Nation out of its economic doldrums. More than 99 percent of all employers in the U.S. are small businesses, providing between 60 and 80 percent of the net new jobs added to our workforce. In fact, the National Federal of Independent Businesses said that in August hiring intentions among small businesses are at the highest level in a year.

Small businesses have proven, year in and year out, that they are a potent force in the economy, accounting for over 50 percent of the private sector output. And their sights are not just set at home. Leading the way towards a global economy, the small business community represents 96 percent of all U.S. exporters.

Over the past 3 years, I have been the chairman of the Committee on Small Business and the previous 6 years as the subcommittee chairman. I have witnessed the enormous potential of America's small businesses at work. As someone who grew up in a small, family-owned business and who ran his own law firm, I know that small businesses are flexible, creative, give us jobs, provide economic growth, and, most importantly, provide hope in a future for millions of families and communities across our Nation.

The resolution now before the House recognizes the critical role played by small businesses and the Small Business Administration in our economy. It is appropriate that we take a moment from our busy schedule to acknowledge the success of small businesses and to encourage our Federal Government to continue to provide it help to ensure future successes.

I urge each of my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 368 as a way to say thank you to the SBA and the small business community for its contributions to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the White House proclamation.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK, 2003—BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA—A PROCLAMATION

The success of small businesses in America reflects the innovation, determination, and hard work of the American people. During Small Business Week, we celebrate the entrepreneurs and business people who create goods, services, and jobs, and bring opportunity and economic prosperity to communities throughout our country. We also reaffirm our commitment to helping more small business owners and their employees realize the American Dream.

Small businesses create the majority of new jobs in our Nation and account for more than half of the output of our economy. They lead the way in generating new ideas and creating new technologies, goods, and services for our country and for the world.

Small businesses also reflect the diversity of America. Nearly 40 percent of small companies in the United States are owned by women. There are also more than 3 million minority-owned small businesses across the country.

Because small businesses are vital to our Nation's prosperity and reflect the hard work of the American people, my Administration has taken important steps to assist small businesses and the people they employ. We have reduced taxes, encouraged investment, and removed obstacles to growth. The Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 I signed into law will provide 23 million small business owners with tax cuts averaging more than $2,200 each. The Act also quadrupled the amount that small businesses can expense for new capital investments, encouraging new investment in technology, machinery, and other equipment. This new technology and equipment will increase productivity and create new jobs, thereby contributing to the overall strength of our economy.

We are also seeking to permanently eliminate the death tax. With the repeal of this tax, small business men and women will be able to pass their life's work to the next generation without having to pay a punitive tax that in many cases forces the sale of the business or many of its assets. And I support legislation that would make it easier for small businesses to offer health coverage options to their employees. Through Association Health Plans, small businesses could pool together to offer group plans to all of their employees, like those available to large businesses. In addition, we are working to streamline small business regulations and paperwork. To this end, I issued an Executive Order that requires all Federal regulatory agencies to minimize these burdens on our Nation's small businesses.

The Small Business Administration (SBA), which helps American innovators and risk-takers launch and build their businesses, celebrates its 50th anniversary this year. By helping small businesses succeed, the SBA continues to strengthen America.

Now, Therefore, I, George W. Bush, President of the United States of America, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, do hereby proclaim September 14 through September 20, 2003, as Small Business Week. I call upon all the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs that celebrate the achievements of small business owners and their employees and encourage and foster the development of new small businesses.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of September, in the year of our Lord two thousand three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and twenty-eighth.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 368, which recognizes the contributions that America's entrepreneurs make across the Nation and within our communities.

Often, people believe that GM, Lockheed Martin and IBM power our economy; but the reality is that small businesses are the driving force. Our country's 23 million small businesses create three out of every four new jobs, represent 99 percent of all employers and provide 70 percent of workers with their important first paycheck. It is because of this we, on the committee, say that small business is big business in America.

Success in small business ownership is one of the unique opportunities of our economy. Yes, in other countries their citizens can own their own businesses, but nowhere to the extent found in America. Americans grow up with the entrepreneurial spirit around us. The reality of owning your own business is not a far-off dream, but an achievable goal. We all know small business success stories, whether they are friends, grandparents, parents, or our sisters and brothers. The opportunity to start a small business is what draws many to our country. No place else in the world can someone with hard work turn an idea into a thriving business.

As these opportunities become more available, the face of small business is changing. Today, minorities are becoming business owners on a scale never seen before. Between 1997 and 2002, the number of Latino-owned firms increased by almost 40 percent and African American-owned businesses increased by 25 percent.

Small business ownership has also become a new avenue for empowering women. Whether because of family concerns or because the corporate glass ceiling still exists, women are striking out and starting their own companies at twice the rate of all businesses. This is simply phenomenal.

Make no mistake, it is not easy being a small business owner today. Small businesses are confronting health care premiums rising 14 percent this year alone, Federal regulatory compliance costs are increasing for small businesses, and the Federal Government continues blocking them from benefiting from the $235 billion Federal procurement market. While it is never easy, small business owners are in desperate need of health care reform, a national energy plan to reduce skyrocketing costs, access to capital, targeted tax relief, and access to government procurement.

Small businesses are a proven tool to guide the Nation out of economic downturns. Small businesses have done it before, and small businesses can do it again. However, their success can only be achieved if we provide them with the help they require.

So, today, as we recognize the hard work and commitment of America's entrepreneurs, it is also important that we recommit ourselves to working to create an economic environment that encourages growth for them. We must strive to make the job of our Nation's small businesses all the much easier. It is at least what we can do, given all they have done for us.

Today, with the adoption of this resolution, in a very small way we thank our Nation's entrepreneurs for the contributions they make every day. They are the catalyst for economic growth, and they are the anchors of our communities.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Small Business, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for their leadership on small business matters.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 40 years, the President has issued a proclamation calling for the celebration of Small Business Week. I rise in support of the Small Business Administration's designating the week of September 14 through 20, 2003, as National Small Business Week. This celebration will honor the estimated 25 million small businesses in America who have created three out of every four new jobs and generate more than 55 percent of America's innovations.

Small Business Week recognizes outstanding small business owners for their personal achievements and contributions to our Nation's economy. One outstanding entrepreneur is named to represent each State as the State's Small Business Person of the Year. From this group, the National Small Business Person of the Year is chosen.

Small businesses employ half of our workers and account for half of our gross domestic product. Small businesses have and will continue to pull the U.S. economy out of recession. They anchor our neighborhoods, employ and train our workers, and take care of our families. They are the reason that the United States economy has consistently been known as the strongest in the world.

Today, we honor our small businesses and entrepreneurs for their efforts and what they mean to America.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), for their leadership and urge passage of this resolution.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise as an original cosponsor in strong support of H. Res. 368, introduced by the Committee on Small Business chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

This legislation honors the Small Business Administration on the occasion of its 50th anniversary and designates this week as National Small Business Week.

In 1953, the SBA was created to champion the interests of the Nation's entrepreneurs for the benefit of all Americans. Our Nation's economy is built on and draws its strength from the creativity and entrepreneurship of its people.

Over 25 million small businesses employ more than half of all private sector employees. They pay 44.5 percent of the total United States private payroll. They generate 60 to 80 percent of all new jobs annually. Small businesses are, in fact, the engine of this Nation's economy, as was said earlier by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

I worked with my father in south Texas to build a small business in my district that today employs over 300 people. The SBA played a key role in this company's development by assisting my family in growing this business during the last 54 years. Presently, Ms. Sylvia Zamponi, the district director for the SBA in the Lower Rio Grande Valley District, is providing similar assistance to my constituents. I want to commend her for all her efforts on behalf of the small business owners in my congressional district.

I also want to express my appreciation for all of the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) to support small businesses and to improve their situation, particularly the manufacturing sector in the United States that currently is in a crisis with the dramatic loss of manufacturing jobs.

To help address this crisis, the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) organized the Congressional Manufacturing Caucus, which I have joined, to preserve manufacturing jobs in America. The caucus will not only educate Washington on the importance of manufacturing in America, but it will work to enact policies to stem job losses and to put people back to work, including in south Texas and throughout the country.

I also commend the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), for taking appropriate actions to ensure that SBA continues to perform effectively the mission Congress gave it over 50 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, again, I congratulate the SBA on its 50th anniversary and hope that the current administration will continue to fully fund SBA so it may continue to assist entrepreneurs throughout this country.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Mr. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor America's small business community during national Small Business Week and recognize those small businesses on Guam that are the backbone of our island economy.

I would also like to take this time to thank Mr. Kenneth Lujan, the director of Small Business Administration District Office in Hagatna, Guam, for his continued hard work to provide important services to assist small businesses on Guam to grow and thrive. I want to wish Mr. Lujan and the entire SBA office on Guam a happy 50th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of businesses on Guam are small operations. I guess you could call Guam the SBA community of the United States. I am grateful for the continued hard work and the innovation of our island's entrepreneurs, which help grow and enhance the economy on Guam, as well as provide jobs.

□ 1615

In particular, I want to congratulate Mr. John Shen for being selected as the Small Businessman of the Year on Guam. Mr. Shen is the owner of Shen's Corporation, which operates Prestige Automobiles on Guam. Mr. Shen was born in Taiwan, but immigrated to Guam in 1979. Mr. Shen and his wife started several small business operations before the opportunity presented itself for Mr. Shen to acquire the local BMW dealership on Guam in 1991. He worked diligently to pull the company out of financial distress and has turned Prestige Automobiles into a strong and profitable small enterprise. In a time when Guam is experiencing the effects of 20 percent unemployment, Mr. Shen serves as an example of how hard work, innovation, and commitment to small enterprise can overcome serious obstacles.

As we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the SBA, let us not forget our responsibilities as legislators to create an environment where people like Mr. Shen can, with hard work, realize his dreams. Let us reaffirm our commitment in assisting our Nation's entrepreneurs so that they may too live the great American Dream.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thought there could not be a better matching of two legislative initiatives that we have had the opportunity to speak on today, and that is

the 40th anniversary of the March on Washington and the honoring and recognition of the anniversary, the 50th anniversary of the Small Business Administration, and particularly recognizing Small Business Week.

I first want to acknowledge the work of the Committee on Small Business of this House and to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for the cooperative, singular spirit that they have on the issue of improving and promoting small businesses in the United States of America. Clearly, I believe, their very cooperative work has been an example of the very fine committee work that all of us admire, and that is, the purpose is to ensure that our small businesses are successful and they work very effectively, both the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and his emphasis on buying American and, as well, the insight he has given to the idea of the loss of manufacturing jobs and the need to restore them. And the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has been enormously effective in ensuring that all government agencies and all contracts between the United States and the private sector have as a component small businesses, women-owned businesses, and minority-owned businesses. I collectively thank both of them for their effort and this tribute and this anniversary should be a reflection on their good works.

I do want to also acknowledge the good works of our Small Business Administration regional centers all over the Nation by tribute to all of them who take a special opportunity to work with and to help our small businesses. Likewise, I would say that it is very important to note the regional director, Milton Wilson, who heads the office in Houston, Texas.

The reason why I believe that the tribute to the Small Business Administration's 50th year anniversary and the March on Washington have a lot in common is because there is work undone. I pay tribute to those who were brave enough to go to Washington in 1963 to lead not just the 250,000 plus, but to lead the Nation for a more equal and just community. A. Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, James Farmer, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), and Martin Luther King understood that unless we lifted all boats, no boats would be lifted. They promoted equality and justice among all, irrespective of religion and race.

The Small Business Administration promotes small business, recognizing that they are in fact the backbone of America, including small businesses, minority-owned businesses, and women-owned businesses. I believe that we have a lot of work undone, Mr. Speaker. We need to provide more tax incentives for small businesses, and certainly we must consider the fact that they need to have more training and opportunity to work with the government.

Finally, I would say there is no doubt that as it relates to the cause of civil rights, there is much work to be done; and I hope this Congress will rise to the occasion and ensure that there are equal rights for all. My congratulations to the Small Business Administration and to the brave souls who marched on Washington in 1963.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the author of this resolution and also staffer Patrick Wilson for taking the lead on today's resolution.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 40 years the President has issued a proclamation calling for the celebration of Small Business Week. This year National Small Business Week runs from September 15th through the 20th. Since the founding of our country, small businesses have contributed immeasurably to our progress and economic strength.

Let us celebrate the entrepreneurial spirit in America during National Small Business Week. The approximately 23 million small businesses in the United States employ more than half of the country's private work force, create three of every four new jobs, and generate most of America's innovations. Small businesses are the backbone of this country and they are an enduring symbol of the American Dream.

For example, five years ago a young couple in my district had a dream to open a grocery store in the City of Whittier, California. Their vision for the store was to specialize in fresh, ready to prepare Hispanic foods in the historic district of Whittier. Country Fresh Market has found a niche in the grocery retail market that has posted double-digit gains from last year. Subsequently, on March 27th Country Fresh Market was featured on the Food Network in a nationally broadcast segment of ''Food Finds,'' hosted by Sandra Pinkney.

Country Fresh Market is a business success story, and they make many contributions to their local community, including the local Boys and Girls Club and YMCA's Annual Pancake Breakfast. Since its inception, Country Fresh Market has also had four employees graduate from college and helped many of its employees purchase homes. Country Fresh Market prides itself in its employees' success, because its employees are its ''familia'' (family).

Country Fresh Market is a true business success in my district. As a member of the small business community, I'm working to increase the SBA's microloan program from $35,000 to $50,000. By helping small businesses gain access to capital, I hope to bolster the number of small businesses that succeed each year.

Today, let us honor small businesses, like Country Fresh Market. By celebrating America's small businesses, we are keeping the American Dream alive and well for today, and for future generations.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Small Business Week, and the Small Business Administration is celebrating its 50th Anniversary. I would like to congratulate the Small Business Administration, its employees and all of its resource partners on this truly momentous occasion.

Created by the passage of the Small Business Act in 1953 during the Eisenhower administration, the SBA was charged to ''aid, counsel, assist and protect'' the interest of small businesses in this nation.

Mr. Speaker, the SBA has made tremendous strides following its original mandate over the past half century. According to the agency, nearly 20 million small firms have received either direct or indirect assistance over the past fifty years.

Small businesses are the engine that drives our nation's economy, generating over half of the nation's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and the SBA plays a key part in ensuring the engine remains strong and viable, especially in tough economic times.

There are currently about 23 million small businesses in the United States, which represents 99.7 percent of all private sector employers. Small businesses also generate 60 to 80 percent of net new jobs annually.

American small businesses are extremely diverse. Women owned small businesses generated $819 billion in revenues, and employed more than 7 million workers in 1997, the last year such data is available. In that same year, 5.8 percent of small businesses were owned by Hispanic Americans, 4.4 percent by Asian Americans, and 4 percent by African Americans.

Small businesses also made up 97 percent of all identified exporters and produced 29 percent of the known export value in fiscal year 2001.

As the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Tax, Finance and Exports, I am especially proud of the agency and its tireless efforts to help all small businesses.

Two weeks ago, I held a field hearing in my District, Long Beach, California, where a very distinguished group of panelists discussed the importance of small businesses to not only southern California but to the nation as well.

I was pleased to learn during the course of that hearing that the SBA Los Angeles District Office is the number one business lending office in the United States. Over the past three years, the office has provided $128 million in financing to 381 businesses in my home District.

I am sure that there are many more success stories nationwide about the hard work the SBA does on behalf of our nation's entrepreneurs, and I am sure that the SBA will be helping small businesses in their efforts to keep our economy strong for years to come.

Congratulations on 50 years of service to our small businesses.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 368.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 13) to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Museum and Library Services Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. TABLE OF CONTENTS.

The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Table of contents.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. General definitions.
Sec. 102. Institute of Museum and Library Services.
Sec. 103. Director of the Institute.
Sec. 104. National Museum and Library Services Board.
Sec. 105. Awards; analysis of impact of services.

TITLE II—LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY

Sec. 201. Purpose.
Sec. 202. Definitions.
Sec. 203. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 204. Reservations and allotments.
Sec. 205. State plans.
Sec. 206. Grants to States.
Sec. 207. National leadership grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements.

TITLE III—MUSEUM SERVICES

Sec. 301. Purpose.
Sec. 302. Definitions.
Sec. 303. Museum services activities.
Sec. 304. Repeals.
Sec. 305. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 306. Short title.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT

Sec. 401. Amendment to contributions.
Sec. 402. Amendment to membership.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 501. Amendments to Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act.
Sec. 502. National children's museum.
Sec. 503. Conforming amendment.
Sec. 504. Technical corrections.
Sec. 505. Repeals.
Sec. 506. Effective date.

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. GENERAL DEFINITIONS.

Section 202 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) DETERMINED TO BE OBSCENE.—The term 'determined to be obscene' means determined, in a final judgment of a court of record and of competent jurisdiction in the United States, to be obscene.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (4);

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (5);

(4) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) FINAL JUDGMENT.—The term 'final judgment' means a judgment that is—

''(A) not reviewed by any other court that has authority to review such judgment; or

''(B) not reviewable by any other court.

''(4) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term 'Indian tribe' means any tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska native village, regional corporation, or village corporation (as defined in, or established pursuant to, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)), which is recognized by the Secretary of the Interior as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.''; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.—The term 'Museum and Library Services Board' means the National Museum and Library Services Board established under section 207.

''(7) OBSCENE.—The term 'obscene' means, with respect to a project, that—

''(A) the average person, applying contemporary community standards, would find that such project, when taken as a whole, appeals to the prurient interest;

''(B) such project depicts or describes sexual conduct in a patently offensive way; and

''(C) such project, when taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value.''.

SEC. 102. INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES.

Section 203 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9102) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking the last sentence; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.—There shall be a National Museum and Library Services Board within the Institute, as provided under section 207.''.

SEC. 103. DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE.

Section 204 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9103) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following: ''Where appropriate, the Director shall ensure that activities under subtitle B are coordinated with activities under section 1251 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6383).''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The Director may promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary and appropriate to implement the provisions of this title.

''(g) APPLICATION PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to be eligible to receive financial assistance under this title, a person or agency shall submit an application in accordance with procedures established by the Director by regulation.

''(2) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—The Director shall establish procedures for reviewing and evaluating applications submitted under this title. Actions of the Institute and the Director in the establishment, modification, and revocation of such procedures under this Act are vested in the discretion of the Institute and the Director. In establishing such procedures, the Director shall ensure that the criteria by which applications are evaluated are consistent with the purposes of this title, taking into consideration general standards of decency and respect for the diverse beliefs and values of the American public.

''(3) TREATMENT OF PROJECTS DETERMINED TO BE OBSCENE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The procedures described in paragraph (2) shall include provisions that clearly specify that obscenity is without serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific merit, and is not protected speech.

''(B) PROHIBITION.—No financial assistance may be provided under this title with respect to any project that is determined to be obscene.

''(C) TREATMENT OF APPLICATION DISAPPROVAL.—The disapproval of an application by the Director shall not be construed to mean, and shall not be considered as evidence that, the project for which the applicant requested financial assistance is or is not obscene.''.

SEC. 104. NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.

The Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 207 as section 208; and

(2) by inserting after section 206 the following:

''SEC. 207. NATIONAL MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES BOARD.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Institute a board to be known as the 'National Museum and Library Services Board'.

''(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall be composed of the following:

''(A) The Director.

''(B) The Deputy Director for the Office of Library Services.

''(C) The Deputy Director for the Office of Museum Services.

''(D) The Chairman of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

''(E) 10 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are citizens of the United States and who are specially qualified by virtue of their education, training, or experience in the area of library services, or their commitment to libraries.

''(F) 10 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among individuals who are citizens of the United States and who are specially qualified by virtue of their education, training, or experience in the area of museum services, or their commitment to museums.

''(2) SPECIAL QUALIFICATIONS.—

''(A) LIBRARY MEMBERS.—Of the members of the Museum and Library Services Board appointed under paragraph (1)(E)—

''(i) 5 shall be professional librarians or information specialists, of whom—

''(I) not less than 1 shall be knowledgeable about electronic information and technical aspects of library and information services and sciences; and

''(II) not less than 1 other shall be knowledgeable about the library and information service needs of underserved communities; and

''(ii) the remainder shall have special competence in, or knowledge of, the needs for library and information services in the United States.

''(B) MUSEUM MEMBERS.—Of the members of the Museum and Library Services Board appointed under paragraph (1)(F)—

''(i) 5 shall be museum professionals who are or have been affiliated with—

''(I) resources that, collectively, are broadly representative of the curatorial, conservation, educational, and cultural resources of the United States; or

''(II) museums that, collectively, are broadly representative of various types of museums, including museums relating to science, history, technology, art, zoos, botanical gardens, and museums designed for children; and

''(ii) the remainder shall be individuals recognized for their broad knowledge, expertise, or experience in museums or commitment to museums.

''(3) GEOGRAPHIC AND OTHER REPRESENTATION.—Members of the Museum and Library Services Board shall be appointed to reflect persons from various geographic regions of the United States. The Museum and Library Services Board may not include, at any time, more than 3 appointive members from a single State. In making such appointments, the President shall give due regard to equitable representation of women, minorities, and persons with disabilities who are involved with museums and libraries.

''(4) VOTING.—The Director, the Deputy Director of the Office of Library Services, the Deputy Director of the Office of Museum Services, and the Chairman of the National Commission on Library and Information Science shall be nonvoting members of the Museum and Library Services Board.

''(c) TERMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, each member of the

Museum and Library Services Board appointed under subparagraph (E) or (F) of subsection (b)(1) shall serve for a term of 5 years.

''(2) INITIAL BOARD APPOINTMENTS.—

''(A) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS SERVING ON EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), each individual who is a member of the National Museum Services Board on the date of enactment of the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003, may, at the individual's election, complete the balance of the individual's term as a member of the Museum and Library Services Board.

''(B) FIRST APPOINTMENTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), any appointive vacancy in the initial membership of the Museum and Library Services Board existing after the application of subparagraph (A), and any vacancy in such membership subsequently created by reason of the expiration of the term of an individual described in subparagraph (A), shall be filled by the appointment of a member described in subsection (b)(1)(E). When the Museum and Library Services Board consists of an equal number of individuals who are specially qualified in the area of library services and individuals who are specially qualified in the area of museum services, this subparagraph shall cease to be effective and the board shall be appointed in accordance with subsection (b).

''(C) AUTHORITY TO ADJUST TERMS.—The terms of the first members appointed to the Museum and Library Service Board shall be adjusted by the President as necessary to ensure that the terms of not more than 4 members expire in the same year. Such adjustments shall be carried out through designation of the adjusted term at the time of appointment.

''(3) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which the predecessor of the member was appointed.

''(4) REAPPOINTMENT.—No appointive member of the Museum and Library Services Board who has been a member for more than 7 consecutive years shall be eligible for reappointment.

''(5) SERVICE UNTIL SUCCESSOR TAKES OFFICE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, an appointive member of the Museum and Library Services Board shall serve after the expiration of the term of the member until the successor to the member takes office.

''(d) DUTIES AND POWERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall advise the Director on general policies with respect to the duties, powers, and authority of the Institute relating to museum and library services, including financial assistance awarded under this title.

''(2) NATIONAL AWARDS.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall advise the Director in making awards under section 209.

''(e) CHAIRPERSON.—The Director shall serve as Chairperson of the Museum and Library Services Board.

''(f) MEETINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Museum and Library Services Board shall meet not less than 2 times each year and at the call of the Director.

''(2) VOTE.—All decisions by the Museum and Library Services Board with respect to the exercise of its duties and powers shall be made by a majority vote of the members of the Board who are present and authorized to vote.

''(g) QUORUM.—A majority of the voting members of the Museum and Library Services Board shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business at official meetings, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

''(h) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—

''(1) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Museum and Library Services Board who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may be compensated at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not to exceed the daily equivalent of the maximum annual rate of pay authorized for a position above grade GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5108 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Museum and Library Services Board. Members of the Museum and Libraries Services Board who are full-time officers or employees of the Federal Government may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Museum and Library Services Board.

''(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Museum and Library Services Board shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with applicable provisions under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

''(i) COORDINATION.—The Director, with the advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, shall take steps to ensure that the policies and activities of the Institute are coordinated with other activities of the Federal Government.''.

SEC. 105. AWARDS; ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF SERVICES.

The Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 208 (as redesignated by section 104 of this Act) the following:

''SEC. 209. AWARDS.

''The Director, with the advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, may annually award National Awards for Library Service and National Awards for Museum Service to outstanding libraries and outstanding museums, respectively, that have made significant contributions in service to their communities.

''SEC. 210. ANALYSIS OF IMPACT OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES.

''From amounts described in sections 214(c) and 275(b), the Director shall carry out and publish analyses of the impact of museum and library services. Such analyses—

''(1) shall be conducted in ongoing consultation with—

''(A) State library administrative agencies;

''(B) State, regional, and national library and museum organizations; and

''(C) other relevant agencies and organizations;

''(2) shall identify national needs for, and trends of, museum and library services provided with funds made available under subtitles B and C;

''(3) shall report on the impact and effectiveness of programs conducted with funds made available by the Institute in addressing such needs; and

''(4) shall identify, and disseminate information on, the best practices of such programs to the agencies and entities described in paragraph (1).

''SEC. 210A. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CONSTRUCTION.

''No funds appropriated to carry out the Museum and Library Services Act, the Library Services and Technology Act, or the Museum Services Act may be used for construction expenses.''.

TITLE II—LIBRARY SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

Section 212 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9121) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (5) and inserting the following:

''(2) to promote improvement in library services in all types of libraries in order to better serve the people of the United States;

''(3) to facilitate access to resources in all types of libraries for the purpose of cultivating an educated and informed citizenry; and

''(4) to encourage resource sharing among all types of libraries for the purpose of achieving economical and efficient delivery of library services to the public.''.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

Section 213 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1); and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

SEC. 203. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 214 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9123) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subtitle $232,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2005 through 2009.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''3 percent'' and inserting ''3.5 percent''.

SEC. 204. RESERVATIONS AND ALLOTMENTS.

Section 221(b)(3) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9131(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) MINIMUM ALLOTMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the minimum allotment for each State shall be $340,000, except that the minimum allotment shall be $40,000 in the case of the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

''(B) RATABLE REDUCTIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year is insufficient to fully satisfy the requirement of subparagraph (A), each of the minimum allotments under such subparagraph shall be reduced ratably.

''(C) EXCEPTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), if the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year exceeds the aggregate of the allotments for all States under this subsection for fiscal year 2003—

''(I) the minimum allotment for each State otherwise receiving a minimum allotment of $340,000 under subparagraph (A) shall be increased to $680,000; and

''(II) the minimum allotment for each State otherwise receiving a minimum allotment of $40,000 under subparagraph (A) shall be increased to $60,000.

''(ii) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS TO AWARD ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM.—If the sum appropriated under the authority of section 214 and not reserved under subsection (a) for any fiscal year exceeds the aggregate of the allotments for all States under this subsection for fiscal year 2003 yet is insufficient to fully satisfy the requirement of clause (i), such excess amount shall first be allotted among the States described in clause (i)(I) so as to increase equally the minimum allotment for each such State above $340,000. After the requirement of clause (i)(I) is fully satisfied for any fiscal year, any remainder of such excess amount shall be allotted among the States described in clause (i)(II) so as to increase equally the minimum allotment for each such State above $40,000.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection and using funds allotted for the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau under this subsection, the Director shall award grants to the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau to carry out activities described in this subtitle in accordance with the provisions of this subtitle that the Director determines are not inconsistent with this subparagraph.

''(ii) AWARD BASIS.—The Director shall award grants pursuant to clause (i) on a competitive

basis and after taking into consideration available recommendations from the Pacific Region Educational Laboratory in Honolulu, Hawaii.

''(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Director may provide not more than 5 percent of the funds made available for grants under this subparagraph to pay the administrative costs of the Pacific Region Educational Laboratory regarding activities assisted under this subparagraph.''.

SEC. 205. STATE PLANS.

Section 224 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9134) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''not later than April 1, 1997.'' and inserting ''once every 5 years, as determined by the Director.''; and

(2) in subsection (f)—

(A) by striking ''this Act'' each place such term appears and inserting ''this subtitle'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''section 213(2)(A) or (B)'' and inserting ''section 213(1)(A) or (B)''; and

(ii) by striking ''1934,'' and all that follows through ''Act, may'' and inserting ''1934 (47 U.S.C. 254(h)(6)) may''; and

(C) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''section:'' and inserting ''subsection:''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''given'' and inserting ''applicable to''.

SEC. 206. GRANTS TO STATES.

Section 231 of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9141) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

''(1) expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats, in all types of libraries, for individuals of all ages;

''(2) developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, State, regional, national, and international electronic networks;

''(3) providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries;

''(4) developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community-based organizations;

''(5) targeting library services to individuals of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to individuals with limited functional literacy or information skills; and

''(6) targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children (from birth through age 17) from families with incomes below the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''between the two purposes described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such subsection,'' and inserting ''among such purposes,''.

SEC. 207. NATIONAL LEADERSHIP GRANTS, CONTRACTS, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.

Section 262(a)(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9162(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''education and training'' and inserting ''education, recruitment, and training''.

TITLE III—MUSEUM SERVICES

SEC. 301. PURPOSE.

Section 271 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 271. PURPOSE.

''It is the purpose of this subtitle—

''(1) to encourage and support museums in carrying out their public service role of connecting the whole of society to the cultural, artistic, historical, natural, and scientific understandings that constitute our heritage;

''(2) to encourage and support museums in carrying out their educational role, as core providers of learning and in conjunction with schools, families, and communities;

''(3) to encourage leadership, innovation, and applications of the most current technologies and practices to enhance museum services;

''(4) to assist, encourage, and support museums in carrying out their stewardship responsibilities to achieve the highest standards in conservation and care of the cultural, historic, natural, and scientific heritage of the United States to benefit future generations;

''(5) to assist, encourage, and support museums in achieving the highest standards of management and service to the public, and to ease the financial burden borne by museums as a result of their increasing use by the public; and

''(6) to support resource sharing and partnerships among museums, libraries, schools, and other community organizations.''.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

Section 272(1) of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9172(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Such term includes aquariums, arboretums, botanical gardens, art museums, children's museums, general museums, historic houses and sites, history museums, nature centers, natural history and anthropology museums, planetariums, science and technology centers, specialized museums, and zoological parks.''.

SEC. 303. MUSEUM SERVICES ACTIVITIES.

Section 273 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9173) is amended to read as follows:

''SEC. 273. MUSEUM SERVICES ACTIVITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director, subject to the policy advice of the Museum and Library Services Board, may enter into arrangements, including grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other forms of assistance, with museums and other entities as the Director considers appropriate, to pay the Federal share of the cost of—

''(1) supporting museums in providing learning and access to collections, information, and educational resources in a variety of formats (including exhibitions, programs, publications, and websites) for individuals of all ages;

''(2) supporting museums in building learning partnerships with the Nation's schools and developing museum resources and programs in support of State and local school curricula;

''(3) supporting museums in assessing, conserving, researching, maintaining, and exhibiting their collections, and in providing educational programs to the public through the use of their collections;

''(4) stimulating greater collaboration among museums, libraries, schools, and other community organizations in order to share resources and strengthen communities;

''(5) encouraging the use of new technologies and broadcast media to enhance access to museum collections, programs, and services;

''(6) supporting museums in providing services to people of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds and to individuals with disabilities;

''(7) supporting museums in developing and carrying out specialized programs for specific segments of the public, such as programs for urban neighborhoods, rural areas, Indian reservations, and State institutions;

''(8) supporting professional development and technical assistance programs to enhance museum operations at all levels, in order to ensure the highest standards in all aspects of museum operations;

''(9) supporting museums in research, program evaluation, and the collection and dissemination of information to museum professionals and the public; and

''(10) encouraging, supporting, and disseminating model programs of museum and library collaboration.

''(b) FEDERAL SHARE.—

''(1) 50 PERCENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share described in subsection (a) shall be not more than 50 percent.

''(2) GREATER THAN 50 PERCENT.—The Director may use not more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this subtitle for a fiscal year to enter into arrangements under subsection (a) for which the Federal share may be greater than 50 percent.

''(3) OPERATIONAL EXPENSES.—No funds for operational expenses may be provided under this section to any entity that is not a museum.

''(c) REVIEW AND EVALUATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish procedures for reviewing and evaluating arrangements described in subsection (a) entered into under this subtitle.

''(2) APPLICATIONS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director may use not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated to carry out this subtitle for technical assistance awards.

''(B) INDIVIDUAL MUSEUMS.—Individual museums may receive not more than 3 technical assistance awards under subparagraph (A), but subsequent awards for technical assistance shall be subject to review outside the Institute.

''(d) SERVICES FOR NATIVE AMERICANS.—From amounts appropriated under section 275, the Director shall reserve 1.75 percent to award grants to, or enter into contracts or cooperative agreements with, Indian tribes and organizations that primarily serve and represent Native Hawaiians (as defined in section 7207 of the Native Hawaiian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 7517)), to enable such tribes and organizations to carry out the activities described in subsection (a).''.

SEC. 304. REPEALS.

Sections 274 and 275 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9174 and 9175) are repealed.

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 276 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9176) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''$28,700,000 for the fiscal year 1997, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1998 through 2002.'' and inserting ''$38,600,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2005 through 2009.''; and

(2) by redesignating such section as section 275 of such Act.

SEC. 306. SHORT TITLE.

Subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 271, 272, and 273 as sections 272, 273, and 274, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after the subtitle heading the following:

''SEC. 271. SHORT TITLE.

''This subtitle may be cited as the 'Museum Services Act'.''.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT

SEC. 401. AMENDMENT TO CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 4 of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act (20 U.S.C. 1503) is amended by striking ''accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts, bequests, and devises of property,'' and inserting ''solicit, accept, hold, administer, invest in the name of the United States, and utilize gifts, bequests, and devises of services or property,''.

SEC. 402. AMENDMENT TO MEMBERSHIP.

Section 6(a) of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act (20 U.S.C. 1505(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''and at least one other of whom shall be knowledgeable with respect to the library and information service and science needs of the elderly'';

(2) by striking the fourth sentence and inserting the following: ''A majority of members of the

Commission who have taken office and are serving on the Commission shall constitute a quorum for conduct of business at official meetings of the Commission''; and

(3) in the fifth sentence, by striking ''five years, except that'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''five years, except that—

''(1) a member of the Commission appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which the member's predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term; and

''(2) any member of the Commission may continue to serve after an expiration of the member's term of office until such member's successor is appointed, has taken office, and is serving on the Commission.''.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. AMENDMENTS TO ARTS AND ARTIFACTS INDEMNITY ACT.

Section 5 of the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act (20 U.S.C. 974) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking ''$5,000,000,000'' and inserting ''$8,000,000,000'';

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''$500,000,000'' and inserting ''$600,000,000''; and

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ''or'' after the semicolon;

(B) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) not less than $400,000,000 but less than $500,000,000, then coverage under this chapter shall extend only to loss or damage in excess of the first $400,000 of loss or damage to items covered; or

''(8) $500,000,000 or more, then coverage under this chapter shall extend only to loss or damage in excess of the first $500,000 of loss or damage to items covered.''.

SEC. 502. NATIONAL CHILDREN'S MUSEUM.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Capital Children's Museum located at 800 Third Street, NE, Washington, D.C. (or any successor location), organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, is designated as the ''National Children's Museum''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Capital Children's Museum referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the National Children's Museum.

SEC. 503. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 170(e)(6)(B)(i)(III) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to the special rule for contributions of computer technology and equipment for educational purposes) is amended by striking ''section 213(2)(A) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122(2)(A)'' and inserting ''section 213(1)(A) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9122(1)(A))''.

SEC. 504. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) TITLE HEADING.—The title heading for the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''TITLE II—MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES''.

(b) SUBTITLE A HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle A of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle A—General Provisions''.

(c) SUBTITLE B HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle B of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9121 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle B—Library Services and Technology''.

(d) SUBTITLE C HEADING.—The subtitle heading for subtitle C of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9171 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

''Subtitle C—Museum Services''.

(e) CONTRIBUTIONS.—Section 208 of the Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9106) (as redesignated by section 104 of this Act) is amended by striking ''property of services'' and inserting ''property or services''.

(f) STATE PLAN CONTENTS.—Section 224(b)(5) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9134(b)(5)) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end.

(g) NATIONAL LEADERSHIP GRANTS, CONTRACTS, OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 262(b)(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act (20 U.S.C. 9162(b)(1)) is amended by striking ''cooperative agreements, with,'' and inserting ''cooperative agreements with,''.

SEC. 505. REPEALS.

(a) NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE ACT.—Section 5 of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act (20 U.S.C. 1504) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b) and (c); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (b), (c), and (d), respectively.

(b) MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES ACT OF 1996.—Sections 704 through 707 of the Museum and Library Services Act of 1996 (20 U.S.C. 9102 note, 9103 note, and 9105 note) are repealed.

SEC. 506. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, except that the amendments made by sections 203, 204, and 305 of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 13.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003, authorizes Federal assistance to museums and libraries through fiscal year 2009. The bill before the House today maintains the modest, but essential, Federal support for museums and libraries; encourages model cooperation between museums and libraries; and authorizes funds for the one Federal agency, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, devoted exclusively to museums and libraries.

Last Congress, the Committee on Education and the Workforce reported a bipartisan authorization bill that had 94 cosponsors. It was supported by the administration, and it was endorsed by the American Library Association, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, and the American Association of Museums. To complete our work from last Congress, at the start of this year I introduced H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003. This year's bill has 126 cosponsors and makes several modifications to current law to streamline and strengthen museum and library services and builds on the bipartisan progress made by the committee during the 107th Congress.

In March, the House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 13 by a vote of 416 to 2. Since then, we have been working with the Senate to reach agreement on a consensus reauthorization bill that we could get to the President as quickly as possible. Today, the House will consider that consensus bill, which passed the Senate by unanimous consent on August 1, 2003.

Generally, this legislation authorizes the Federal Library and Museums program under the Institute of Museum and Library Services. More specifically, the bipartisan, bicameral version of the Museum and Library Services Act prohibits projects that are determined to be obscene from receiving funding; ensures that library activities are coordinated with activities under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001; consolidates museum and library advisory board activities under a single statute; and ensures that administrative funds are also used to conduct annual analyses of the impact of museum and library services to identify needs and trends of services provided under funded programs.

In addition, H.R. 13 contains provisions to increase indemnity caps under the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act. These changes to the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act are designed to better facilitate the international exchange between museum exhibitions in light of increased commercial insurance costs for international museum exhibitions since September 11, 2001.

The Library and Services and Technology subtitle of this legislation is the only Federal program solely devoted to supporting libraries and will assist libraries in providing crucial services to the communities they serve. Throughout our Nation, libraries are at the forefront of reading and family literacy programs. Additionally, libraries serve as essential links to the business community, assisting with job creation, training programs, and business development initiatives. They are also critical for many people with disabilities, providing them with specialized materials and resources that are obtainable in a single location. For older Americans, libraries provide a place to interact with others, use the Internet, and receive services. For those persons of limited resources or who live in remote areas, libraries provide access to books and reference materials, computers and the Internet and community-based social services that are often available nowhere else.

The Museum Services subtitle of this legislation supports museums and their educational role and assists museums in modernizing their methods and facilities so that they are better able to conserve the cultural, historic, and scientific heritage of the United States. Museums play an important role in the education of people of all ages. Many American museums provide K through

12 educational programming, with most using local and State curriculum standards to shape their programs. Additionally, museums increasingly partner with libraries to offer joint educational opportunities for adults as well as children.

The Museum and Library Services Act of 2003 makes commonsense reforms to authorize museum and library activities. This consensus bill includes provisions important to Republicans and Democrats in both the House and the Senate.

We have worked hard to ensure that views from all interested parties were considered as we crafted our compromise. I would like to thank all of those who participated in this process, which actually began in the last Congress, including the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA). I thank him again for his support in getting us to the point where we are today. The Institute of Museum and Library Services, the American Library Association, and the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies and the American Association of Museums, they deserve a great deal of credit for the bipartisan bill that is before us today.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the full committee, for their support of this legislation, and also to the committee staff on both the minority and majority side in both the House and the Senate that did a tremendous amount of work to get this bill to the floor today.

Today will complete the work on the Museum and Library Services Act. This bill will go to the President; and once it is signed into law, we can ensure that our Nation's museums and libraries are getting the best assistance we are able to provide from the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003. I would like to say to the over 117,000 libraries and to more than 16,000 museums nationwide, you have a real friend and champion in the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education. I also commend the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for their leadership in producing this bipartisan legislation. This bill not only has strong bipartisan support, it also has broad support from the library and the museum community throughout the country.

I am proud that with this bill we are reaffirming our national commitment to the institutions that provide access to information and technology for many in our community who would not otherwise have access to this wealth of information. Through this legislation, we are demonstrating to the Nation that we value the key institutions that preserve and promote our cultural heritage.

The Museum and Library Services Act strengthens the Federal support for museum and library programs. It reauthorizes the Library Services and Technology Act, raising the authorization level to $232 million and increasing the minimum State allotment to $680,000.

□ 1630

These grants can be used for expanding services, for learning and access to informational and educational resources in a variety of formats, for providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries and for targeting services to people of diverse geographic, cultural and socio-economic backgrounds.

This legislation also reauthorizes the Museum Services Act to encourage and support museums in carrying out their public service, educational and leadership roles as stewards of the cultural, historic, natural and scientific heritage of the United States of America. This part of the legislation increased the authorization of this important program to $38.6 million for fiscal year 2004.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district this program has provided invaluable support to the International Museum of Art and Sciences in my McAllen, as well as to the Donna Hooks Fletcher Historical Museum in Donna; and there are many others that have benefitted as well. As a result of this program these museums will strengthen their conservation programs and increase their base of support in their community.

Also, H.R. 13 incorporates the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM). This act increases the indemnity coverage to $600 million per exhibition. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her work on this important issue.

Finally, I would like to commend the committee staff for their excellent work on this bill. In particular, I commend Rich Stombres and Rebecca Hunt of the majority staff for their efforts on this bill. I also wish to applaud the hard work of our Democratic committee staff, Ricardo Martinez and Cheryl Johnson. This was a job well done.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), the former Official State Historian of the State of Michigan.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act. I would like to thank my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for introducing this legislation. His leadership on education issues has been instrumental, quite frankly, in preparing our Nation's youth for their future and for ensuring a high quality of life in our communities.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 13, I urge my colleagues to pass this very important legislation. The Museum and Library Services Act does more than simply authorize funds. It improves the efficiency and delivery of the services that libraries and museums supply to facilitate access to important resources such as reference materials, classical literature and the Internet also.

In addition, this legislation coordinates services offered by libraries and museums so they can match these goals outlined in No Child Left Behind. By giving these great institutions the tools they need to maximize their impact on schools and communities, this House can confirm its commitment to ensure that, indeed, no child is left behind.

The effect of libraries and museums on education cannot be overlooked, but we must also examine the role these institutions play in improving the quality of life of the communities that they serve. Libraries and museums are cultural centers and meeting places for friends and for families. They are foundations of learning and of entertainment. We must support these institutions so that they can continue to support our community.

Mr. Speaker, I found it imperative that I speak today on H.R. 13. As my distinguished colleague had mentioned, as Michigan's former Secretary of State, actually part of my responsibilities for 7 years was serving as Official Historian of the great State of Michigan and the department I oversaw had jurisdiction, of course, over the Michigan Historical Center. This center is truly one of the greatest cultural assets in our State, and so I have first-hand knowledge of the great work of our State's libraries and of our museums, and with the passage of H.R. 13, these institutions will be able to continue their great work.

In October of this year, the Clinton-Macomb Public Library will be dedicating its new main library back in my home County of Macomb. This facility will be the largest library in Macomb County and actually will be the seventh largest library building in our great State of Michigan.

The services of this new state-of-the-art library, some that they will provide, are simply remarkable. Not only will it have the newest technology that is available, but the library will enact a 24-hour delivery system. This will actually be the first of its kind in the world. Additionally, its automated sorting will be only one of 10 in the United States.

The Clinton-Macomb Public Library will be more than a collection of books or microfilm, its children services have been designed to meet the literacy needs of our children with a strong focus on pre-schoolers. The new library will include learning centers for children and there will be computers with educational software designed to inspire learning in young children.

In addition, new technology will be available to all library users regardless of age. The construction of this library is truly a great thing. With the advent of the Internet many believed that libraries would be a thing of the past. The Clinton-Macomb Public Library is proof positive that this is not true. Instead, the demands for services provided by libraries has absolutely exploded. It has expanded. The libraries and museums are often on the cutting edge in utilization of technology as a tool for customer service.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is good government. It supports the institutions that positively affect the lives of our citizens, and in a time when our children are exposed to so many things that are negative, libraries and museums offer services and resources that help our children grow and learn.

I was proud to cosponsor this bill. I was proud to vote in favor of this bill in March of this year, and I am certainly proud to speak in favor of the bill today.

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

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of this debate on H.R. 13, I wish to commend my friend and colleague, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), for the work that we have been able to do in our committee in a bipartisan manner. I look forward to working on many other bills that he and I have discussed as we move along this year and go into the second half on the 108th Congress.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Members on both sides of the aisle for the good work that has been done on this bill.

This year millions of Americans will visit a museum in America and millions more will visit their local library for books and other community services.

Libraries and museums play a vital role in educating our children and in promoting our communities. Throughout our Nation libraries are at the forefront of reading and family literacy programs. Libraries are critical to many people with disabilities, providing them with specialized materials and resources that are obtainable in a single accessible location.

For those of limited financial resources or who live in remote areas, libraries provide access available nowhere else to books and reference materials, computer services and other community-based services.

Museums across the country work with our local schools to provide K through 12 educational programming. They are an important source of cultural and historical knowledge, helping to promote learning about the history and traditions of our country and other nations around the world. In addition, museums serve as places where people of different backgrounds come together to share information about history, culture, and civilization.

In the last Congress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) worked in a bipartisan manner to report the Museum and Library Services Act of 2002 and he worked very closely with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA). In this Congress, these gentlemen continued to author H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003, that passed the House by a vote of 416 to 2, and that happened earlier this year.

Since then the two gentlemen have been working with the Senate on a bipartisan compromise bill that has the support of the Bush administration and has been endorsed by the American Library Association, the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, and the American Association of Museums. The Senate passed that compromise bill by unanimous consent on August 1 of this year.

I just want to commend both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the staff on both sides of the aisle for all of the work that they have put into this very important piece of legislation.

This legislation before us today funds the Institute of Museum and Library Services, a Federal agency devoted exclusively to museums and libraries which partner with our Nation's schools. It consolidates the Museum and Library Board activities to reduce unnecessary paperwork and duplication and prohibits projects that are determined to be obscene from receiving funding.

In addition, the reauthorization of the Museum and Library Services Act is an important next step in ensuring that the President's education reforms signed into law last year are properly implemented. The bill requires that all library activities are coordinated with activities under the No Child Left Behind Act, President Bush's landmark education reform legislation.

Let me also thank my good friend and colleague, the ranking Democrat on our committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), for his support of this bill as we moved it through committee and as we have gotten agreement with our colleagues in the other body. I think all of the Members on both sides of the aisle under the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) have an done an outstanding job in bringing us to this point. I want to congratulate them on their efforts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kind words. We have had a very successful year in the full committee. We are glad to contribute a bill that also has now made it through the committee.

I would like to recognize one of our colleagues on the minority side who is not here but who is the only librarian in Congress, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), for the assistance that he has provided in putting this bill together. I know he has been very interested in what we have been doing and has helped craft this final bill based on the background and the experience that he has had.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) for his help, and I look forward to working together with him on other pieces of legislation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great support for H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act of 2003. This compromise bill will provide libraries, throughout our nation with an additional $232 million in funding.

Libraries are at the forefront of promoting our reading and family literacy efforts. This additional funding will allow libraries to maintain their traditional commitment to educating all Americans, young and old, while also furthering their work to keep pace with the development of technology by adding electronic media and new computers.

This bill will also greatly benefit our museums, which showcase our heritage, art, and accomplishments. This year, more than 865 million people will visit a museum in America. Similarly, millions of students will check out their first book from their local library, and millions of families will gather for community literacy and learning programs. The role of libraries and museums in American society is critical.

I personally remember my hometown library and my hometown librarian, Marther Gould, who now serves on the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. She stands as a stalwart supporter of our library system and works diligently to ensure that they keep up with 21st century technology.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 13, so it can be signed into law to ensure that our libraries and museums can continue to serve our nation and future generations of Americans.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 13, legislation to reauthorize the Museum and Library Services Act.

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. HOEKSTRA, from Michigan, and Mr. HINOJOSA, from Texas, for their efforts on behalf of our nation's museums and libraries.

As a former teacher, I have witnessed firsthand the power of libraries.

Libraries in my district and across the Nation offer citizens the tools they need to stay informed, keep in touch with people far and wide, and be an active part of this community

and world. They are critical to our efforts to educate our citizens.

In my own district, thanks to the help of thousands of volunteers and donors, the main branch of the Kansas City library will soon open a state of the art facility in the newly renovated First National Bank Building located in downtown Kansas City. When it opens in the spring of 2004, the new library will feature expanded community meeting spaces, 107 more networked public computers, and 110 network ports for public use. In addition to its historical preservation, what is especially exciting about this project is the amount of public-private collaboration that has gone into the process. And that is what this bill today is all about.

The Institute for Museum and Library Services has been a model for collaboration between the Federal government and local communities and libraries. Since its inception in 1996, IMLS has provided more than $16.7 million to support library and museum activities in Missouri. The Kansas City Public Library has received considerable support, and the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art has also benefited from IMLS funding. The Museum and Library Services Act has made a difference in libraries and communities all over America and this reauthorization will help us continue that legacy.

Since this legislation was first passed in 1996, our nation has continued to lead the digital revolution. The Internet, e-mail, and wireless technologies have transformed the way we work and communicate. Unfortunately, many Americans are cut off from the jobs and economic benefits that these amazing technological advances offer.

Libraries are an important part of our efforts to bridge this divide. They offer networked public computers, access to the Internet, and personalized assistance. Today's legislation will provide funding for local communities to improve and expand these efforts.

Mr. Speaker, all of us agree that our libraries and museums are an integral part of our communities. Unfortunately, in these tough economic times, these vital community resources are often slated for funding cuts. The legislation we approve today offers a helping hand. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13, the Museum and Library Services Act, which will reauthorize the library and museums program under the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The role our libraries and museums play in educating our students, adults and families is incomparable. The lifetime learning encouraged by libraries and museums across the country is something we should all support.

I am particularly pleased that H.R. 13 raises the minimum State allotment. For smaller States like Delaware, this makes a huge impact. For example, with assistance from The Institute of Museum and Library Services, Delaware was able to set the model for evolving with growing technologies. Since 1996, DelAWARE, the Digital Library of the First State, has provided online information and services to all citizens with a library card. Delaware was also the first state to provide access for all its citizens to thousands of newspapers and periodicals in public libraries and remote access.

The support for libraries in Delaware is seen across the country. There are more than 117,000 libraries in the United States, including public libraries and libraries in schools, colleges and universities, hospitals, law firms, businesses, the armed forces and more. In fact, a recent study found that the majority of Americans felt libraries play a unique role because they provide access to everything on the Web or in print, as well as personal service and assistance in finding it.

The Institute for Museum and Library Services offers unique and vital educational services to all Americans. By funding libraries and museums, we improve access to information, improve care of collections and enhance community service.

With the growing momentum and implementation of No Child Left Behind, I encourage my colleagues to recognize museums and libraries as supporting players in helping our young students and engaging their families.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 13.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m.

□ 1836

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7, CHARITABLE GIVING ACT OF 2003

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–273) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT ON H.R. 1308, TAX RELIEF, SIMPLIFICATION, AND EQUITY ACT OF 2003

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1308, the Child Tax Credit bill. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1308 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides immediate payments to taxpayers receiving an additional credit by reason of the bill in the same manner as other taxpayers were entitled to immediate payments under the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003.

2. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment (not included in the House amendment) that provides families of military personnel serving in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other combat zones a child credit based on the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

3. The House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report all of the other provisions of the Senate amendment and shall not report back a conference report that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

4. To the maximum extent possible within the scope of conference, the House conferees shall be instructed to include in the conference report other tax benefits for military personnel and the families of the astronauts who died in the Columbia disaster.

5. The House conferees shall, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferees and the House conferees shall file a conference report consistent with the preceding provisions of this instruction, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The notice will appear in the RECORD.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to go to conference on H.R. 2657, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2657, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2657) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

For consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendments, except for title III in the Senate amendment numbered 3, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KINGSTON, LAHOOD, TIAHRT, CULBERSON, KIRK, YOUNG of Florida, MORAN of Virginia, PRICE of North Carolina, CLYBURN and OBEY.

For consideration of title III in the Senate amendment numbered 3, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, TAYLOR of North Carolina and OBEY.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, SEPTEMBER 18, 2003, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2657, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight, September 18, 2003, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2657) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2658, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2658 be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, providing that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and adopt House Resolution 352, by the yeas and nays, and a 15-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 678 by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—424

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

NOT VOTING—10

Carson (OK)
Conyers
Cubin
Deutsch
Fattah
Gephardt
Green (TX)
Pickering
Rohrabacher
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1859

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on rollcall vote 503 on H.R. 2658, the motion to close the conference. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE MARCH ON WASHINGTON OF AUGUST 28, 1963

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 352.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 352, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus

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

NOT VOTING—8

Cubin
DeLay
Deutsch
Fattah
Gephardt
Pickering
Rohrabacher
Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1908

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTMASTERS EQUITY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 678.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 678, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 0, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman

Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Cubin
Deutsch
Fattah
Ford
Gephardt
Miller, George
Pickering
Rohrabacher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1929

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during rollcall votes No. 503, No. 504, and No. 505. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all of these votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2038

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2038.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2225

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a sponsor of H.R. 2225.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1588, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1588, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2004.

The form of the motion is as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1, MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 1, the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Stenholm of Texas moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed as follows:

(1) The House recede to the Senate on the provisions to guarantee access to prescription drug coverage under section 1860D–13(e) of the Social Security Act, as added by section 101(a) of the Senate amendment.

(2) To reject the provisions of section 501 of the House bill.

(3) The House recede to the Senate on the following provisions of the Senate amendment to improve rural health care:

(A) Section 403 (relating to inpatient hospital adjustment for low volume hospitals).

(B) Section 404 (relating to medicare disproportionate share adjustment for rural areas), but with the effective date applicable under section 401(b) of the House bill.

(C) Section 404A (relating to MedPAC report on medicare disproportionate share hospital adjustment payments).

(D) The following provisions of section 405 (relating to critical access hospital improvements):

(i) Subsection (a), but with the effective date applicable under section 405(f)(4) of the House bill.

(ii) Subsection (b), but with the effective date applicable under section 405(c)(2) of the House bill.

(iii) Subsections (e), (f), and (g).

(E) Section 414 (relating to rural community hospital demonstration program).

(F) Section 415 (relating to critical access hospital improvement demonstration program).

(G) Section 417 (relating to treatment of certain entities for purposes of payment under the medicare program).

(H) Section 420 (relating to conforming changes relating to Federally qualified health centers).

(I) Section 420A (relating to increase for hospitals with disproportionate indigent care revenues).

(J) Section 421 (relating to establishment of floor on geographic adjustments of payments for physicians' services).

(K) Section 425 (relating to temporary increase for ground ambulance services), but with the effective date applicable under the amendment made by section 410(2) of the House bill.

(L) Section 426 (relating to appropriate coverage of air ambulance services under ambulance fee schedule).

(M) Section 427 (relating to treatment of certain clinical diagnostic laboratory tests furnished by a sole community hospital).

(N) Section 428 (relating to improvement in rural health clinic reimbursement).

(O) Section 444 (relating to GAO study of geographic differences in payments for physicians' services).

(P) Section 450C (relating to authorization of reimbursement for all medicare part B services furnished by Indian hospitals and clinics).

(Q) Section 452 (relating to limitation on reduction in area wage adjustment factors under the prospective payment system for home health services).

(R) Section 455 (relating to MedPAC study on medicare payments and efficiencies in the health care system).

(S) Section 459 (relating to increase in medicare payment for certain home health services).

(T) Section 601 (Increase in medicaid DSH allotments for fiscal years 2004 and 2005).

(4) The House insist upon the following provisions of the House bill:

(A) Section 402 (relating to immediate establishment of uniform standardized amount in rural and small urban areas).

(B) Section 403 (relating to establishment of essential rural hospital classification).

(C) Subsections (a), (b), (d), and (e) of section 405 (relating to improvements to critical access hospital program).

(D) Section 416 (relating to revision of labor-related share of hospital inpatient pps wage index).

(E) Section 417 (relating to medicare incentive payment program improvements).

(F) Section 504 (relating to wage index classification reform).

(G) Section 601 (relating to revision of updates for physician services).

(H) Section 1001 (relating to medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) payments).

HOLDING UP THE VALUES AND VIRTUES OF YALE UNIVERSITY

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most times when a Member goes to the floor to speak about their alma mater, they are raising up the flag of joy and promoting some football contest or sports contest and rooting their friends and fellow classmates on.

Today, I rise as alumnus of Yale University to ask them to uphold the values and virtues of our dear and beloved school, and that is equality and humanitarian service and respect for all.

Since being a student at Yale, one of the first women, we have encountered

this conflict between worker and university; 10,000 people gathered on the square in New Haven just last weekend.

It is time for the president of Yale University to uphold the values of the school and respect the working people who work there, the dining hall workers, the janitors, provide for arbitration, binding arbitration, and settle this matter.

Stop embarrassing the thousands upon thousands of Yale graduates, who every day go out and work to make life better for those who cannot work or improve their own lives. It is an unfortunate and disgraceful act, that we are continuing to undermine those who come to work every day to help students learn and be the best that they can be.

I say to the president of Yale University, settle this matter, and stop embarrassing those of us who believe that Yale has the greatest calling, to educate people who will serve not only the Nation, but save the world.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THIMEROSAL AND NEURODEVELOPMENTAL DISORDERS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 or 3 years, I have held hearings on the issue of autism in America. We used to have one out of 10,000 children that were autistic. That is where they will not focus on things, they will not talk, they yell, they stamp their feet, they have chronic diarrhea and constipation, they have all kinds of physical problems; and their parents lose either complete control over them or they cannot communicate with them, and it hurts these children for the rest of their lives, and ultimately they are going to be a burden on the taxpayers of this country.

It used to be one out of 10,000. Now it is one out of 150. We have an absolute epidemic of autism in America.

Many scientists who appeared before my committee believe and have substantial evidence that the mercury that is in vaccinations is a major contributing cause of this autism.

It used to be you only got one or two vaccinations. When I was a kid, if you had measles or mumps or anything like that, they would quarantine the house. Now they give vaccinations for all of that, and these vaccinations can contain a substance called Thimerosal. Thimerosal is 50 percent mercury, and children who are going to school get as many as 25 to 30 vaccinations before the school will let them enter the front door.

The mercury has a cumulative effect. Once it gets in the brain, it starts destroying brain tissue and causes all kinds of neurological problems including autism. Yet the Food and Drug Administration has never, ever tested Thimerosal. It is used as a preservative. It is 50 percent mercury, they have never tested it, and yet it has been in vaccines for years.

We fought with them and our health agencies for some time to get that out of these children's vaccines, and they said they would do it. So this last week I wrote a letter to the head of the Department of Health and Human Services, Tommy Thompson, the Secretary of HHS; and I asked him to give me a list of those vaccinations that still contain mercury, Thimerosal. We found that 20 of the 43 vaccinations that are manufactured here in the United States still contain mercury. People are still having that injected into their bodies, adults as well as children.

Three or four of the major vaccinations that children get still have mercury in them, and vaccinations that have not been used, the serum that has not been used that is still on shelves in many of the doctors' offices, predate the dates they started taking mercury out of the children's vaccinations. So the FDA has not ordered them to take the mercury out, nor did the FDA notify doctors that Thimerosal-free vaccinations were preferred and that pediatricians should take the mercury out of their stocks of vaccines.

Recently, I wrote to the Secretary of HHS. I got the list. Twenty of the 43 currently manufactured vaccines in the U.S. still contain mercury, still are poisoning our children and adults. Our troops over in the Persian Gulf and Iraq were getting as many as 11 shots in one day, and most of those contain Thimerosal-mercury.

We have a rise in Alzheimer's as well, an epidemic of that; and I believe that that, in large part, is caused by the neurologically damaging mercury that is in vaccines.

Anyhow, HHS is still allowing vaccinations containing mercury to be given to children, such as the flu vaccine given to children 6 years old down to age 23 months. Hepatitis B, diphtheria, and tetanus still contain Thimerosal. Those are being given to children. Those lots that are still on the shelves that contain mercury are still being given to children. The Food and Drug Administration is not doing anything about it, and everybody in this country ought to be raising cain, not just because their children have not been damaged, but because all of those children who are being damaged are going to be a burden in one way or another on the taxpayers of this country, and it is going to cost us literally trillions of dollars if this is not stopped.

We have to do everything we can to hold HHS and the vaccine manufacturers' feet to the fire to get mercury out of vaccinations. Mercury is a toxic substance. It is toxic to the brain. It hurts neurologically anybody that has it injected into them. Yet they are still using it as a preservative. This is something that has to end.

These are the faces of children who have been damaged, just a small number of them; and we have got to do something about that. How would you like to have a child, like my grandson, who got nine shots in one day, seven of which contained mercury, and two days later he became autistic, a perfectly normal child.

These are things that cannot and must not be tolerated. We need to do everything we can to put all the pressure we can on our Health and Human Services agencies, FDA, CDC, and all the rest. Our Secretary of HHS, Tommy Thompson, who is a fine man, needs to pay attention to this and get this mercury out of these vaccinations as quickly as possible. It is hurting us all; not just the children, but the adults as well.

Scientific evidence continues to accumulate regarding the biologically plausible connection between mercury containing Thimerosal in vaccines, autism and other neurodevelopment disorders.

As a result, many parents have become understandably concerned about the safety of childhood vaccines.

And they should be considering that Thimerosal is 50 percent mercury by weight and mercury is one of the most toxic substances on the planet.

Even though the FDA asked vaccine manufacturers to remove Thimerosal from vaccines in 1999, they did not order them to do so.

Nor did FDA notify doctors that Thimerosal-free vaccines were preferred nor did they recommend that pediatricians remove Thimerosal vaccines from their stocks.

Recently, I asked the Secretary of HHS, Tommy Thompson and the FDA Commissioner, Dr. Mark McClellan to provide me with a list of all commercially available vaccines, including routinely prescribed pediatric vaccines, which currently contain Thimerosal.

Although they both assured me that none of the routinely recommended pediatric vaccines contain Thimerosal as an additive, 20 of the 43 currently manufactured and U.S. licensed vaccines still contain this dangerous substance.

FDA says it recognizes and supports the Public Health Services goal of reducing exposure to mercury.

If this is so, then they have to do more to ensure that all 43 vaccines currently manufactured and licensed in the United States are free of Thimerosal.

The most shocking example of a vaccine that still contains Thimerosal is the Influenza vaccine, commonly known as the Flu Shot, which is given to millions of Americans every year, adults and children alike.

In fact, last year, the President of the American Academy of Pediatrics issued a statement saying that the Academy encourages that the flu vaccine be given to all healthy children aged 6–23 months.

The harm that mercury could potentially inflict on such children is incalculable.

In addition, commonly administered vaccines such as the Hepatitis B, and the Diphtheria and Tetanus shot still contain Thimerosal.

In closing, I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from the FDA Commissioner dated September 11, 2003, listing all of the Thimerosal containing vaccines.

I urge all Americans to contact the FDA to obtain this information to ensure that the vaccines that you and your children are getting are as safe as possible.

I strongly urge the FDA to finally eliminate this dangerous preservative from all vaccines and destroy any remaining stocks of Thimerosal containing vaccines in the interest of public safety.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,

Rockville, MD, September 11, 2003.

Hon. DAN BURTON,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Wellness and Human Rights, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your letter of July 30, 2003 in which you requested that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA or Agency) provide you with a list of all commercially available vaccines, including routinely prescribed pediatric vaccines that currently contain thimerosal.

The enclosed table provides the information you requested. In an effort to keep the public advised on this issue, we have posed this information on our FDA website since 2001 at: www.fda.gov/cber/vaccine/thimerosal.htm. We have been updating the website as new information becomes available.

We wish to assure you that FDA is committed to help ensure the safety and effectiveness of all vaccines. Vaccines continue to prevent serious illness and death, and the benefits of vaccination continue to outweigh the risks. Furthermore, FDA does recognize and support the Public Health Services' goal of reducing exposure to mercury. At this time, none of the routinely recommended pediatric vaccines (for children 5 years of age or under) contain thimerosal as a preservative. The routinely recommended vaccines are: Haemophilus b Conjugate Vaccine (Hib), Inactivated Polivirus Vaccine (IPV), Diphtheria and Tetanus Toxoids and Acellular Pertussis Vaccine (DTaP), Hepatitis B Vaccine (HepB), Measles, Mumps and Rubella Virus Vaccine (MMR), Varicella Vaccine, and the Pneumococtal Conjugate Vaccine.

Thank you again for your continued interest in the safety of vaccines. If you have further questions, please let us know.

Sincerely,

MARK B. MCCLELLAN, M.D., PHD.,

Commissioner of Food and Drugs.

TABLE.—THIMEROSAL AND EXPANDED LIST OF VACCINES

[Thimerosal content in currently manufactured U.S. licensed vaccines]

Vaccine/trade name	Manufacturer	Thimerosal concentration [1]	Mercury
Anthrax: Anthrax vaccine	BioPort Corporation	0	0
DtaP:			
Tripedia [2]	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	<0.0002%	<.05 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Infanrix	GlaxoSmithKline	0	0
Daptacel	Aventis Pasteur, Ltd.	0	0
DTaP-HepB-IPV: Pedlarix	GlaxoSmithKline	<0.000005%	<0.0125 μg/0.5 mL dose.
DT: No Trade Name	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	<0.00012% (single dose)	<0.3 μg/0.5 mL dose.
		0.01% (multi-dose)	25 μg/0.5 mL dose.
	Aventis Pasteur, Ltd.	0.01%	25 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Td:			
No Trade Name	Mass Public Health	0.0033%	8.3 μg/0.5 mL dose.
	Aventis Pastuer Inc.	0.01%	25 μg/0.5 mL dose.
TT: No Trade Name	Aventis Pasteur Inc.	0.01%	25 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Hib:			
ActHIB/OmniHIB [3]	Aventis Pasteur, SA	0	0
HibTITER	Wyeth-Lederle	0	0
PedvaxHIB liquid	Merck	0	0
Hib/HepB: COMVAX [4]	Merck	0	0
Hepatitis B:			
Engerix-B	GlaxoSmithKline	<0.0002%	<0.5 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Recombivex HB [5]	Merck.		
Pediatric/adolescent		0	0
Adult (adolescent)		0	0
Adult (adolescent)		0.005%	25 μg/1.0 mL dose.
Dialysis		0.005%	25 μg/1.0 mL dose.
Hepatitis A:			
Havrix	GlaxoSmithKline	0	0
Vaqta	Merck	0	0
HepA/HepB: Twinrix	GlaxoSmithKline	<0.0002%	<1 μg/mL dose.
IPV:			
IPOL	Aventis Pasteur, SA	0	0
Poliovax	Aventis Pasteur, Ltd.	0	0
Influenza:			
Fluzone [6]	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	0.01%	25 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Fluvirin	Evans	0.01%	24.5 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Fluzone (Preservative Free)	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	≤0.0004%	≤1 μg/0.5 mL dose.
			≤0.5 μg/0.25 mL dose.
Fluvirin (Preservative Free)	Evans	<0.0004%	<1 μg/0.5 mL dose.
Influenza, live FluMist	Medimmune	0	0
Japanese Encephalitis [7]: JE-VAX	BIKEN	0.007%	35 μg/1.0 mL dose.
			17.5 μg/0.5 mL dose.
MMR: MMR–II	Merck	0	0
Meningococcal: Menomune A, C. AC and A/C/Y/W–135	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	0.01% (multidose)	25 μg/dose.
		0 (single dose)	0
Pneumococcal:			
Prevnar (Pneumo Conjugate)	Lederie Laboratories	0	0
Pneumovax 23	Merck	0	0
Rabies:			
IMOVAX	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	0	0
Rabavert	Chiron Behring	0	0
Typhoid Fever:			
Typhim Vi	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	0	0
Typhoid Ty21a	Swiss Serum and Vaccine Institute	0	0
Varicella: Varivax	Merck	0	0
Yellow Fever: Y-F-Vax	Aventis Pasteur, Inc.	0	0

[1] Thimerosal is approximately 50% mercury (Hg) by weight. A 0.01% solution (1 part per 10,000) of thimerosal contains 50 μg of Hg per 1 ml dose or 25 μg of Hg per 0.5 mL dose.
[2] Aventis Pasteur's Tripedia may be used to reconstitute ActHib to form TriHIBit. TriHIBit is indicated for use in children 15 to 18 months of age.
[3] OmniHIB is manufactured by Aventis Pasteur but distributed by GlaxoSmithKline.
[4] COMVAX is not licensed for use under 6 weeks of age because of decreased response to the Hib component.
[5] Merck's Hepetitis B vaccine for adults (adolescents) is available in both preservative-free and thimerosal-containing presentations.
[6] Children under 3 years of age receive a half-dose of vaccine, i.e., 0.25 mL (12.5 μg mercury/dose.)
[7] JE-VAX is manufactured by BIKEN and distributed by Aventis Pasteur, Children 1 to 3 years of age receive a half-dose of vaccine, i.e., 0.5 mL (17.5 μg mercury/dose).

DISTURBING NEWS REGARDING IRAQ

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, each morning these recent months we are awakened with the disturbing news that one, two, perhaps three, young Americans have been killed in Iraq.

□ 1945

Our tours of duty for the National Guard and for the Reserves are being extended with great complications for many small American communities, and certainly for many American families.

It was just back on March 16 that Vice President CHENEY declared to the Nation that the most important rationale for war with Iraq was the fact Iraq had all of these weapons of mass destruction. And I think as the weeks go by and as the lives of young Americans are lost, that more and more of our American families are asking: Why is it that each morning we hear that the body of another young American has been found, but we hear nothing about the location of any weapons of mass destruction? In fact, that term has almost been banned now from administration speeches justifying the war in Iraq.

So desperate is the administration to make the claim about weapons of mass destruction that incredibly, yesterday, Secretary of State Powell went to the scene of a horrific crime involving weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, but it was a crime that happened 15 years ago, in 1988; and no evidence was provided suggesting any weapons of mass destruction had been located that would justify the loss of the lives of our sons and daughters in Iraq.

Now, surely, with thousands of people being paid by American taxpayers at this very moment to comb Iraq for weapons of mass destruction, sooner or later they will find at least a trace. But an honest assessment of this whole weapons of mass destruction question requires asking whether this third-rate tyrant, Saddam Hussein, unable to effectively defend himself and his own family, really ever had the capability to pose an imminent threat to our families here in America. Meanwhile, Americans continue to do most all of the dying, and American taxpayers are asked to continue to do most all of the paying for the cost of this administration's war justified by weapons of mass destruction.

In view of this, more and more Americans are contacting us here in Congress about the weapons of mass destruction question. Many of these people have done so through the organization called moveon.org, a citizens' organization to advance concerns in a way that I think is very healthy. I just want to share with my colleagues tonight the thoughts of some of those people from central Texas who share my concern about the rationale the administration used, how quickly it is walking away from that rationale, and the tremendous cost in the meantime, not only in dollars, but in blood.

Glee Ingram. Glee is a small business owner in Austin, and she writes: ''I strongly support an independent investigation of the claims that were made by the Bush administration as a prelude to declaring war on Iraq. Using deception to create support to go to war is absolutely unacceptable. We, the citizens who must reap the consequences of this decision, are due all honesty,'' and indeed they are. And it is particularly questionable why this administration that made such bold claims about how weapons of mass destruction posed a danger to our families now resists a complete investigation of why they have been unable to find them.

Chantal Tetreault, who is a University of Texas student, contacted me saying: ''Please support an independent commission to investigate the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs. My confidence in the government is shattered and will only be restored if the American people are given the truth about government intelligence prior to the Iraqi war. Innocent Americans have died and continue to die, along with many Iraqi civilians in this war.''

I think she raises some important questions, as does Kathy Goodwin, who is an Austin social worker who contacted me saying: ''I firmly believe that when we witnessed the bombing of September 11, people everywhere shared our grief and millions in the United States and all over the world have since come to the conclusion that war will not solve all our problems. The terrorism that caused 9–11 will not be stopped through a war with Iraq. We need the truth.'' And that is what an independent investigation of the whole WMD controversy would get to.

I believe the voices of these Austinites and others across the country should be heeded. We need action now to find out why and what occurred here.

SUPPORT H.R. 693, THE MILITARY DEATH GRATUITY TAX REPEAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor tonight to say to the House and to the other body, the Senate, that we need to pass legislation to remove the tax that is sent to the families of those who have given their loved one to die for this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to introduce my colleagues to a young man whose name is Tyler Jordan. Tyler's father, gunny sergeant Phillip Jordan, died for this country. He died in Iraq. He gave his life for this country. Yet, Mr. Speaker, because we have not removed a tax on the death gratuity that will be sent to his family this year, next year his family will have to pay a tax on $6,000.

Last year I put a bill in that would remove this tax; and it was supported by both parties, Democrat and Republican. It was sent in a larger bill to the Senate, but the Senate could not find the time to pass the legislation. This year again, the House, in a bipartisan way, Democrat and Republican, have sent to the Senate a larger bill with this provision in it to remove this tax on this death gratuity, and the Senate still has not taken the time to pass it.

Behind me are faces of those who have given their lives for this country. Their families next year will receive a tax bill from Uncle Sam. Mr. Speaker, I think when a family gives a loved one dying for freedom, the least that the House and the Senate can do is to repeal this tax.

The history of this is that in the early 1990s, there was a $3,000 death gratuity sent to the family. It was increased to $6,000, but the Congress did not take off the tax on the additional $3,000, so that means on the $6,000 death gratuity that is sent to the family, a tax will have to be paid. Mr. Speaker, I am going to call on the House leadership, both Republican and Democrat, the Senate leadership, and the President of the United States that we not leave here in November of this year and say to the families who have given a loved one that you are going to receive a tax bill from Uncle Sam.

I look at this young man that I hold up again, his name is Tyler Jordan. His father, Phillip, a Marine, gunny sergeant, died for this country. Yet not only did he give up his father, but also his family is going to be asked to pay a tax. This is unacceptable. There are many issues that we debate here in the House of Representatives, many issues that are so important; but is there anything more important than to say to a family, you gave a loved one for this country. The least we can do is to eliminate this tax.

So I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle to please help me encourage the House leadership, both Republican and Democrat, that we not leave this year without sending to the floor of the House H.R. 693, a bill that I have introduced supported by both sides, the military death gratuity tax repeal, get it to the floor and pass it. Because I do not want to come back here in 2004 and think that we have asked a family that gave a loved one that they had to pay a tax.

Let me give my colleagues a quick example. On September 11 of 2001, over 292 military families paid a tax on the gift of a loved one. In the year 2002, if this bill had passed last year, but since it did not pass, 1,700 families had to pay a tax on the gift of a loved one who died for freedom in America.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope as I conclude tonight that as we look at the faces of these who have given their lives for America, we look at the little boy who gave his father for this country, that we will not leave here in November without passing H.R. 693 on the floor of this House and let us send it to the other body and ask them to pass that legislation. I am going to write a letter to the President of the United States, send it tomorrow, and ask the President to please get behind this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I close as I do in my district and I did last night: I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless their families, and I ask God to please in his loving way in

his arms to hold the families who have given their loved ones dying for freedom. I ask God to please bless the American people, to bless the House and Senate that we will do what is right in the eyes of God Almighty. I ask God to please be with the President of the United States so that he will do what is right for the future of this country. And I ask three times, God please, God please, God please continue to bless America.

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.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORT LOWER PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICES THROUGH FREE MARKET ACCESS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, people from around the world come to America for their medical care, yet Americans are forced to travel the world for their medications. A recent Families USA study found that the prices of the 50 drugs most commonly used by seniors in America increased by an average of 3.5 times the rate of inflation over the past year. Between 2000 and 2003, seniors' expenditures on prescription drugs increased by 44 percent. For too long, seniors have been paying premium prices for the same prescription drugs that are available in Canada and European countries at 30, 40, 50 percent reductions.

What we are proposing through the market access bill is allowing people here in the United States to buy medications in Canada and Europe, is free market competition, allowing the market to work. That competition will bring prices down in the United States and save our consumers and our taxpayers thousands upon thousands of dollars.

We as public officials are entrusted by the American people to represent them. We are not entrusted to ensure that they pay the most expensive price, but get the best price for the medications they paid for the research on. A recent USA Today Gallup poll showed that 71 percent of the American people showed support for allowing them to buy their medications in Canada or Europe.

I stood just Sunday with the Governor of Illinois who announced that for the first State ever in the Union, that they will now study what would be the savings to the taxpayers of Illinois if the 230,000 retirees and State employees would be allowed to buy their medications in Canada. In the last year, the cost to the State for prescription drugs increased by 15 percent. Illinois now spends $340 million a year for prescription drugs for their employees and retirees. It is projected in the Illinois budget that that will increase by 17 percent next year and another 15 percent the following year after that.

There are early predictions of what the savings will be, but I will wait for that study to be produced. The Governor asked for two actions: a, report back in a period of time for the savings to the State, if there are any; and, b, if there are savings, to then open up the health care contracts that the State has for its employees and retirees so they can cover prescription drugs bought in Canada.

That is the same program that the AARP does for its own seniors today. United Health covers 96,000 seniors who buy their medications in Canada and covers it with an insurance policy.

Now, nobody believes that the AARP would risk the health and welfare of our grandparents. Now, if there is an ability for a State government to save $50 million to $60 million, rather than lay off teachers, rather than lay off police officers, rather than close prisons, I think they have an obligation to the taxpayers and to their employees to get them those savings.

We too will face that choice. Just in July, prior to going home for the August recess, a bipartisan majority of the House Members came together and voted across party lines to allow market access, to allow Americans to buy the medications, the name-brand drugs that they need for cholesterol control, blood pressure control, arthritis, other types of medications, either in Canada or in Europe. That passed with an overwhelming majority. This is not a decision of Democrat versus Republican, or right versus left, but of right versus wrong. We can do better for the American people. We can give them the choice and the competition they deserve so that they can get the savings they deserve.

The irony of all of this situation is that Americans pay 50 percent more for the medications that their colleagues in France, Germany, England, Italy, Ireland, and Canada pay.

□ 2000

And yet what is ironic is every cancer drug, every AIDS drug, every major medication in this country was developed by the taxpayer funded research through the tax credit research and development credit or through direct funding by the National Institutes of Health.

The American taxpayers and consumers today are not only underwriting the research in this country, they are underwriting the profits of the American pharmaceutical companies. I have nothing against profits. I think they are a good thing. But they do not need to make up their profits in the United States from our seniors and our consumers when they can actually have the free market operate in the appropriate way so we can get the best price for our consumers and our seniors and for our taxpayers.

As we embark on this largest expansion of an entitlement in over 40 years, thinking of adding $400 billion to Medicare to cover a prescription drug plan, I think we owe the decency and respect to the taxpayers to ensure that we get them the best price, not the most expensive price for that $400 billion.

Now, those medications exist out there. Today you take Tamoxifen, which is a major cancer fighting drug, it costs $360 million here in the United States. In Canada that same medication for the same amount cost $33. In Germany it cost $60. You can go drug by drug and there is a major 40 to 50 percent reduction.

I would call on our colleague and I call on governors and mayors around the country to look at what we did in Illinois and see if you cannot save your taxpayers and your employees the cost that they need so we can plow that back into other health care coverage for the uninsured, to expanding our school, retaining our teachers, doing teacher training, and make sure that our police are on our street making them safe. Those are the right choices we owe to our employees, our consumers, and, most importantly, the taxpayers.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

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

There was no objection.

REJECT IRAQ WAR APPROPRIATION

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, the neo-conservative media machine has been hard

at work lately drumming up support for the $87 billion appropriation to extend the precarious occupation of Iraq. Opposition to this funding, according to the Secretary of Defense, encourages our enemies and hinders the war against terrorism. This is a distortion of the facts and is nothing more than destroying the messenger when one disapproves of the message.

Those within the administration, prior to the war, who warned of the dangers and real costs were fired. Yet it now turns out that they were more right, that it would not be a cakewalk, that it would require a lot more troops, and costs would far exceed original expectations.

The President recently reminded us that we went into Iraq to force Iraq's compliance with U.N. resolutions since the U.N. itself was not up to the task. It was not for national security reasons. Yet we all know that the U.N. never endorsed this occupation.

The question we in the Congress ought to ask is this: What if our efforts to Westernize and democratize Iraq do not work? Who knows? Many believe that our pursuit of nation building in Iraq will actually make things worse in Iraq, in the entire Middle East, through the entire Muslim world, and even here in the United States.

This is a risky venture and this new funding represents an escalation of our efforts to defend a policy that has little chance of working.

Since no weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq, nor any evidence that the army of Saddam Hussein could have threatened the security of any nation, let alone the United States, a new reason is now given for the endless entanglement in a remote area of the world 6,000 miles from our homeland.

We are now told that the need to be in Iraq is to fight the terrorists that attacked us on 9/11. Yet, not one shred of evidence has been produced to show that the Iraqi government had anything to do with 9/11 or the al-Qaeda.

The American people are first told they have to sacrifice to pay for the bombing of Iraq. Now they must accept the fact that they must pay to rebuild it. If they complain, they will be accused of being unpatriotic and not supporting the troops. I wonder what a secret poll of our troops would show on whether or not they thought coming home next week indicated a lack of support for their well-being.

Some believe that not raising taxes to pay for the war is a way to pay for the war on the cheap. It is not. When deficits skyrocket the Federal Government prints the money and the people are taxed by losing value in their savings and in their paychecks. The inflation tax is a sinister and evil way to pay for unpopular wars. It has been done that way for centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I guess we shouldn't worry because we can find a way to pay for it. Already we are charging our wounded soldiers $8.10 a day for food when recuperating in a hospital from war injuries.

We also know that other soldiers are helping out by buying their own night vision goggles, GPSs, short wave radios, backpacks and even shoes. That is sure to help as well.

It does not seem like much of a bother to cut veterans' benefits. Besides, many conservatives for years have argued that deficits do not really matter, only tax rates do. So let us just quit worrying about deficits and this $87 billion supplemental.

Seriously, though, funding for this misadventure should be denied no matter how well-meaning its supporters are. To expect a better world to come from force of arms abroad and confiscatory taxation at home is nothing but a grand illusion. The sooner we face the reality, the better.

While we nation-build in Iraq in the name of defeating terrorism, we ignore our responsibilities to protect our borders at home and we compromise the liberties of our citizens with PATRIOT Act types of legislation.

There are two main reasons we need to reject the foreign policy of the past 50 years that has been used to rationalize our presence in Iraq. First, the practical: We cannot expect to force Western, U.S.-style democracy on a nation that for over 1,000 years learned to live with and accept an Islamic based legal system.

No matter what we say or believe, to the Iraqis they have been invaded by the Christian West, and whether it is the United States, U.N. or European troops that are sent to teach them the ways of the West it will not matter.

Second, we have no constitutional authority to police the world or involve ourselves in nation building, in making the world safe for our style of democracy. Our founders advised against it and the early Presidents followed that advice. If we believe strongly in our ideals, the best way to spread them is to set a good example so that others will voluntarily emulate us. Force will not work. Besides, we do not have the money. The $87 billion appropriations request should be rejected.

PROTECT EMPLOYER-SPONSORED COVERAGE IN MEDICARE CONFERENCE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to highlight a crucial issue that is beginning to take center stage in the Medicare debate, and that is the fate of employer-sponsored health coverage for retirees.

As it currently stands, the House-passed Republican Medicare bill encourages employers who are currently providing retiree health benefits to drop that coverage. Unfortunately, the Republican bill states that any dollar an employer pays for an employee's prescription drug costs would now count towards the employee's out-of-pocket catastrophic cap. This disadvantages seniors with employer-sponsored coverage because it would be almost impossible for them to ever reach the bill's catastrophic cap over which Medicare would pay 100 percent of their drug costs. Without a doubt, many employers will simply stop offering retiree coverage.

The potential loss of this valuable benefit that many unions and employers provide today was reported today in the New York Times. According to the front page lead story by Robert Pear, ''About 12 million of the 40 million Medicare recipients has retiree health benefits, usually including some drug benefits. But the Congressional Budget Office estimates that one-third of the people with such drug coverage could lose it under bills passed in June by the House.''

Mr. Speaker, Republican conferees so far are unwilling to provide a final Medicare agreement that will provide seniors with an affordable, available and guaranteed prescription drug benefit that does not privatize Medicare. With the added threat of employers dropping retiree health benefits if a retiree is eligible for Medicare, we will no doubt have a public health crisis on our hands.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are promising tax credits and subsidies to employers in order to persuade them not to reduce or deny benefits to seniors. But these approaches do not work and the answer is very simple. Employer dollars being provided for retiree coverage should contribute towards the out-of-pocket cap on the Medicare benefit. This system would allow seniors to reach the catastrophic amount earlier in the year, the amount at which point Medicare would pay 100 percent of drug costs, thereby providing relief to employers and providing an incentive for them to continue providing retiree coverage. It is simple.

I just hope, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow when President Bush plans to meet with the Medicare conferees, I would encourage him to ask the conferees to ensure that this important issue is addressed, because if all we do in passing a Medicare drug benefit is manage to basically eliminate employer-retiree coverage for drug benefits in health care, then certainly there is no point in having the Medicare agreement or the Medicare drug coverage at all.

I would hope that this could be addressed. Otherwise, I would say that the Democrats will continue to raise this as an issue while the conferees meet because it is so important. And so many of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, have already talked to me about it and are very concerned about the possible loss of their coverage.

PREVENTING UNDERAGE DRINKING

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I spent roughly 40 years working with young people, and over those 40 years there was a growing concern about drug abuse. Drugs such as cocaine, marijuana, heroin, methamphetamines were unheard of in 1960 and became more and more prevalent as those 40 years moved forward.

My observation was the primary drug problem that we had with young people really revolved around alcohol. Last week the National Academy of Science came out with a report on underage drinking that I think underscored this observation. The findings were as follows:

Number one, underage drinking results in $53 billion of costs to the Nation annually; $19 billion of this is for alcohol-related traffic accidents; 2,339 15- to 20-year-olds were killed in 2000 by alcohol-related traffic accidents.

Number two, availability apparently is no problem. Ninety percent of twelfth graders say obtaining alcohol is easy. Fifty percent of seniors drink each month, and 25 percent of those drink heavily.

Third, underage drinkers drink more than adults do. The report indicates that underage drinkers consume nearly twice as much alcohol on each occasion than adults. In other words, underage drinkers are more likely to drink to get drunk than adults.

Number four, underage drinking is more addictive. Due to psychological and physiological immaturity, alcohol dependency progresses much more rapidly in young people. Sometimes it progresses in a matter of weeks or months, whereas in most adults the disease may progress over a period of years.

It is estimated that there are 3 million teenage alcoholics in our country today, and those that are addicted to other drugs, it could be a fraction of that 3 million, and yet that gets most of the attention.

Number five, the average age of the first drink is decreasing. At the present time the first age of drink is about 14 on the average. Twenty percent of eighth graders use alcohol frequently.

Six, the side effects of adolescent drinking are devastating. Underage drinking leads to violence, suicide, academic failure, date rape, unwanted pregnancy, it can impede brain development, and it is a gateway to other illegal drugs such as cocaine, methamphetamine and heroin, because all of those drugs usually do not start with the drug itself but rather alcohol consumption.

Number seven, a point that I would like to bring out is why has underage drinking become such a huge problem. I would say parental factors have been a major issue. Many parents subscribe to the myth, which is false, that if a young person is using alcohol then they will not use other drugs, when the reverse is absolutely the fact. If you start using alcohol early, you are more apt to be addicted to all kinds of other drugs as well.

Oftentimes parents will purchase alcohol for children. And then, of course, there is the issue of lack of parental involvement. A recent study indicated that parents today spend 40 percent less time with their children than they did a generation ago, and of course that leads to some problems in the alcohol area.

Then of course there has been a problem with media influence. Young people are often targeted by alcohol commercials, and those of you who may watch NCAA football this next Saturday will undoubtedly come across a number of beer commercials, and these commercials will not show you an overweight 50-year-old or an automobile accident or somebody whose wife walked out on him. Rather, they will be young, they will be attractive, they will be athletic and they will be having a good time. And so NCAA sports, which should be aimed at improving things for young people, is, I think, in this case part of the problem. Also, much music targeted to young people glamorizes alcohol.

□ 2015

So some of the solutions provided by this report I think are worth noting.

I think we need to reallocate government resources. Twenty-five times more money is spent on preventing illegal drug use than preventing illegal drinking by young people, and yet if we can keep people from drinking, particularly at an early age, we are going to do a tremendous amount to cut down use of other hard drugs, and our money would be much better spent in that regard.

We need to hold alcohol advertisers accountable for targeting young people. There is no question that many of their advertisements are aimed directly at people, and some of those are underage drinkers. We need to hold the recording industry, the motion picture industry and the television industry accountable for ratings. Many of these ratings are rated G or PG and have heavy alcohol content in them.

We need to enforce regulations banning the sale of liquor to underage drinkers. Many times people who violate these rules just get a slap on the wrist. It has been proposed, also, by the NAS study that we raise the excise tax on alcohol to promote a campaign to reduce underage drinking, much as we have to reduce smoking.

So all of these things I think are worth considering, and I certainly urge the membership to take a hard look at the NAS report.

LETTERS FROM CONSTITUENTS CONCERNING IRAQ

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 165 years ago the U.S. House of Representatives passed a rule to ban discussion, debate, printing of any information or discussion of the issue of slavery. As a result, former President John Quincy Adams, who was elected to the House of Representatives after he was President, came to the House floor night after night, week after week, hoping to change the minds of people and debate the issue of slavery.

Adams, one of the Nation's leading abolitionists, one of the Nation's strongest believers in giant social justice, as a result, because he was prohibited from talking about slavery, came to the floor and read letters that he received from constituents in Massachusetts and constituents around the country. He believed that Congress should discuss slavery and debate slavery, so he allowed citizens to speak through him as the microphone, citizens through using these letters to speak directly to Congress, directly to the American people.

In a similar way, many in this Congress are unhappy that we are failing to investigate what our role in Iraq was. My friend from Texas (Mr. PAUL), Republican from Texas, has joined with many of us in questioning and asking for an independent commission to investigate the Bush administration's distortion of evidence of Iraq's weapons of mass destruction program, saying that we need to know more in order to deal with the problems at hand more, and as a result, I would like to read letters from petitioners from Ohio, from my District most of them, from all of Ohio, received from Ohio literally thousands of letters questioning, asking that Congress investigate, questioning what we are actually doing in Iraq.

From Jay from Richfield, Ohio, While listening to the speech of the President regarding Iraq last Sunday, I was struck by the fact he is asking for $87 billion for Iraqi reconstruction. What is magic about $87 billion, Jay writes. If we assume there are 290 million men, women and children in the U.S., that means that every man, woman and child will be contributing $300 to the reconstruction of a country we will never visit and whose welfare would never have affected us but for the lies of our President.

When the President sold America his enormously wasteful tax cut a few years back, his cornerstone was $300 for every family. He was full of stories regarding what a family could do with an extra $300. Jay of Richfield, Ohio, writes.

Sue of Elyria, Ohio, writes, Rather than admitting the shortcomings of his failed policy and plotting a course to get us out of Iraq, President Bush used the Sunday speech to the Nation to repeat his lies in the hopes that people will believe them if they are said often

enough. There was no mention of weapons of mass destruction. Bush continued to equate Iraq with al Qaeda terrorists even though there is no factual basis for the charge. Then he asked us for another $87 billion to bail him out, and I am sure this is only the beginning. President Bush will be back asking for more.

How much is $87 billion, Sue writes. For that amount of money, America could solve the school budget crisis in every one of our communities and provide health insurance for every uninsured American child for 15 years, provide food for all six million of the children who die from hunger around the world for the next 7 years. Sue from Elyria, Ohio.

Ted from Lorraine, Ohio, where I live, asked about the $87 billion more for the invasion of Iraq. He writes, What happened to the $69 billion he spent already? Was it all given to Halliburton, the ''no bid'' contractor and friend of the President's? Why does not Congress write into the law giving him money that no contracts be let without fair and open bidding? His concern for the people of Iraq is heartwarming, but what of us, Americans who pay him and are suffering from a terrible loss of jobs and income? What of our schools and our roads and our bridges and constitutional rights under the Bill of Rights? Not a word from the President on that.

Jack from North Royalton, Ohio, writes, I believe that we, the American public, were manipulated by misleading statements by President Bush in order to gain support for a war in Iraq. This war is costing the American people billions of dollars. More importantly, it is costing the lives of American military personnel. This war has cost America the friendship and respect of law-abiding Nations. This is a sad period for America and for Americans. The Bush administration should be held accountable. President Clinton's lies were about a personal sexual matter. President Bush's lies are about an international issue.

Matt from Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, writes, The costly war, which has not ended, has cost thousands of civilian lives and hundreds of American military lives. It has not improved national security. It has weakened it. It was evident, Matt writes, as the administration danced around looking for reasons to attack Iraqi men, women and children that there were conflicts of interest between members of the administration and the possible reasons for going to war.

These are five or six of the literally the thousands of letters, hundreds of thousands around the Nation that we are receiving questioning what we are doing in Iraq, wanting a plan on how we are going to get out.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to remind all Members to avoid personally offensive references to the President of the United States.

REPORT ON IRAQ

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I had the privilege of visiting Iraq with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the Committee on Government Reform chairman. I am not a member of that committee, but he kindly let me accompany them.

Mr. Speaker, when I returned to this country I will have to tell my colleagues I wondered if I had gotten off a plane on the wrong planet or if my jet lag was particularly bad. I turned on the evening news and listened to one of the national news anchors, and his comments about Iraq were such that I did not recognize the country that I had just left.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues tonight about what I did see while I was there. It is a good story, and it is a story the American people need to hear, and unfortunately, it is a story the American people are not hearing as we have heard evidence tonight by the comments on the other side.

General Conway of the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force in Babylon told our group that what has happened in Iraq is a vivid success story. The Iraqis are not concerned that we will stay too long; they are more concerned that we will leave too soon.

Mr. Speaker, when we flew into Baghdad that first morning, I was struck by how normal life is in Baghdad. The markets are full. There are cars on the street. In fact, we encountered a couple of traffic jams. Satellite dishes have appeared on the rooftops of the apartments and houses in Baghdad, and Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that 4 or 5 months ago, possession of a satellite dish was punishable by a year in prison, and now 25 to 30 percent of the homes have satellite dishes. These are people who are hungry for knowledge, who are hungry for information.

The schools completed their school year. Agriculture in this country, in spite of the combat phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Just at the end of August, they had completed the wheat harvest up by Tikrit, an area that looks very similar to Kansas for all I could tell. Perhaps the Kansas of 150 years ago, but nevertheless it looked very similar to Kansas.

From a military standpoint, the combat phase of Operation Iraqi Freedom was prosecuted brilliantly, and Mr. Speaker, I would point out probably more humanely than any other military exercise in the history of the world. There is no remaining strategic threat, that is to be sure Iraq is still a dangerous country, but the Iraqi military is not going to reconstitute under Saddam Hussein and attack our forces.

Stabilization is currently the goal of our military operation, to find, contain and kill those who would hurt our troops or harm innocent Iraqi citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out a picture that I took while I was over. This was actually taken in Tikrit in one of Saddam's old palaces. The men and women of the 4th Infantry Division, that is a Fort Hood division out of Texas, had this graphic up there to illustrate how 42 of the 54 most wanted of the former Iraqi regime are no longer a threat to the Iraqi people or the American people: Saddam's regime is gone and will not be back, can you hear me now.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the police force in Iraq is concerned, we are just now 2 years and 5 days after the 9/11 disaster, and many of us got to know Bernard Kerik on our TV screens, the police commissioner from New York City who presided over the New York Police Department during 9/11. He has been a miracle worker in Iraq. He has gone from zero to 35 precinct stations in a mere 14 weeks' time. He has stood up 37,000 Iraqi policemen and expects to have 65,000 more by next May.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up, I would like to just illustrate the 90 days of progress that have happened in Iraq. The schools have completed their academic year and completed testing and indeed will be starting, if they are not already started, a new school year this September. Over 90 percent of the major cities and towns in Iraq have functioning city councils and town councils. Over 500,000 Iraqis are contributing to their own security and border security. Prisons are on the verge of reopening, and the judicial system is up and functioning. Food distribution occurred throughout the combat phase and afterward. No humanitarian crisis grew as a result of the combat in Iraq.

Hospitals remained open and functional. To be sure, they leave a lot to be desired, but nevertheless, they remained open and most importantly to me, four and a quarter million children have been immunized since last May.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out in this 90 days of progress, none of these things were in place in Kosovo a full year after that major military operation ended.

I would like to point out some of the things that I saw within the health care industry in Iraq, which was particularly important to me as a physician. There has been no health care infrastructure improvement in Iraq for over 30 years. Pharmaceuticals manufactured in Iraq were useless, and we juxtapose this with the opulence of the palaces and the poverty of the hospitals. Mr. Speaker, this was a man who needed to be removed and deserved to be removed.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MORRIS ''MOE'' BILLER

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a giant in the labor movement, a giant whose voice was silenced 2 weeks ago, Mr. Morris Biller, affectionately known as Moe. Moe Biller departed this life on September 5 at age 87.

Moe Biller's voice may be silent, but the principles for which he lived and fought for can be heard all around the world. It is often said that success in life can be measured by how many people one is able to touch in a positive way. By all accounts, Moe Biller lived a pretty successful life.

He was one of those individuals who had to swim upstream. His 20 plus years as president of the American Postal Workers Union helped to transform that union and the United States Postal Service. Moe's legacy will perhaps be that of a hero to those workers of the Postal Service who were viewed as mediocre to the mail process. He was a champion for the little people.

In 1970, he led a strike that began in his hometown of New York and spread to 30 cities involving 200,000 workers. Former President Richard Nixon called in the National Guard in an effort to move the mail. That strike led to postal reorganization in 1971 and provided workers with the right to bargain for wages, benefits and improved working conditions.

Even those who did not agree with Moe's style or message respected him for his courage and passion on behalf of the workers at the postal workers' operation.

The Postmaster General has noted that Moe Biller was a forceful, innovative leader who worked tirelessly on behalf of the American Postal Workers Union members and on behalf of the Postal Service. The Postmaster General ordered that flags at postal facilities be flown at half staff until Biller's burial, which took place on Sunday, September 7.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, Moe Biller's imprints on the labor movement, collective bargaining rights, and concern for humanity are attributes to be admired. Moe's work will continue with leaders like the current president of the APWU, Bill Burrus. I was pleased to join Bill Burrus and members of APWU at the Second Annual Moe Biller Postal Conference which took place at the Brookings Institute recently, and Moe's presence could be felt.

We have lost a giant in the movement. The best way we can honor Moe Biller is to keep his spirit alive by rededicating ourselves and redoubling our efforts to improve worker conditions, protect collective bargaining, expand health care to those in need, and provide adequate resources for those who are the everyday workers of our society. I ask that my colleagues, citizens of America, and the 750,000-plus postal workers join with me in extending our heartfelt condolences to the Moe Biller family and our thanks for his great work on behalf of humanity. May Moe Biller's spirit rest in peace and resonate in our actions. He was truly a representative of the working man.

HONORING PROFESSOR EDWARD TELLER

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of the great Americans of the last century, Dr. Edward Teller, who passed away on the 9th of September and said of his own accomplishments, ''What I did, I did because it was necessary, not to be remembered. The little contributions I made in pure science, I am proud of those, and whomever wants to remember that, fine.'' But Dr. Edward Teller deserves to be remembered, and it is important that we remember him because he perhaps more than anyone else in American science believed that we could achieve peace in the world through military strength. He did everything he could to rally a community of scientists, technical people, engineers to back up the political leadership in this country when we were faced with an enormous military adversary in the Soviet Union. And ultimately as the Soviet ambassador said when he left at the end of his tenure upon the collapse of the Soviet Empire, the Reagan Strategic Defense Initiative, which was largely Edward Teller's, hastened the fall of the Soviet Empire by a full half decade.

Dr. Teller died at age 95 of a stroke at his home in Palo Alto where he had worked for the past 28 years as a senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford, a towering source of American intellect and ideals, both literally and figuratively. Just a few days earlier, he had put in his last day of work at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory which he cofounded with his fellow University of California professor, Ernest Lawrence, 51 years ago this month, and where he labored prodigiously for the American cause ever since.

Characteristically on his last Livermore workday, he was reviewing recent technical developments concerning a new source of nuclear energy, an area he was deeply engaged in the past 64 years and upon which topic he coauthored a seminal scientific paper 70 years ago that is still widely referenced today.

But what makes Teller unique among all of the rest of the greats of our time is a vision and courage that he manifested in a most difficult, too-little-remembered era already a half century in our Nation's past when Americans and the other free people in the world came into serious confrontation with the empire led by the Soviet Union.

In the late 1930s, Teller and many others, more than a few being fellow refugees from Hitler's tyranny, had answered President Franklin Roosevelt's call to commit their technical talents to the defense of freedom against the clear and present danger of fascism with historic consequences known to us all. A decade later in the late 1940s when the world's free peoples faced another grave, but less clearly perceived, totalitarian threat, Teller rallied and led American scientists and engineers in providing American political leaders with the key technical means for withstanding the Soviet challenge. He continued his exemplary leadership for the following quarter century until one of our greatest Presidents, Ronald Reagan, sounded the call for the conclusive campaign of the Cold War. Then already at an age when most are content to rest, Edward Teller again rallied and marshaled his professional colleagues from all over America to create the technical core of the interlock set of philosophical, political, economic, and military challenges that Reagan launched at the Soviet Empire, resulting in its unexpectedly swift, bloodless, and utter collapse.

Mr. Speaker, Teller's technical genius and near solitary perseverance gave the United States crucial first access to the most fearsome weaponry, and the vision that he shared with Ernest Lawrence in founding the second laboratory concerned with nuclear weaponry that has endured and ensured America's weaponry excellence through its brilliantly conceived, supremely effective appeal to innate American competitiveness, and as we will do very well to remember this Teller-Lawrence lesson regarding the surpassing importance of competition-based technical preeminence in all crucial national security programs, very specifically including nuclear weaponry, for every bit as long as it takes to undergird America's national security.

It was Edward Teller's Churchillian-quality vision, his simple eloquence, and his unwaivering moral courage, and not just once but twice facing down multitudes of those less committed to the effective defense of traditional Western values, and yes to the triumph of the American cause, that we should most honor and longest remember. To be sure, Edward Teller made mistakes, and he acknowledged and regretted them; but they dwindle into complete insignificance when viewed against his monumental accomplishments on behalf of all Americans and indeed all freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded when Dr. Teller talked about going to meet Albert Einstein in 1939 and asking a little girl skipping rope if she knew where

Dr. Einstein lived. She said no as she was skipping the rope. He finally asked about the guy with the big fuzzy white hair, and she directed him to the correct door. He went in with two other physicists and together with Albert Einstein they wrote the letter to FDR that changed the world. Edward Teller was a great scientist. He was also a great American.

CALIFORNIA RECALL DECISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with the decision made yesterday by the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that declared the use of older voting machines would again lead to the disenfranchisement of minority voters. I applaud the court for deciding to assure voters that the basic fundamental requirements of equal treatment and fairness are carried out. Underlying this, I quote from Justice Kennedy who wrote: ''Voting is one of the most fundamental and cherished liberties in our democratic system of government.'' To me, the California decision highlights a painful lesson our country learned from the 2000 elections, that it is not possible to hold a fair democratic election if voters are not guaranteed their votes will be fairly counted.

I read in the paper and have heard on the news a lot of talk about hanging chads and other technical problems that led to the Supreme Court selecting George W. Bush as the President in the 2000 Presidential election; but let me tell Members that in my district, Florida's third, 27,000 votes were thrown out and never counted. Let me repeat, 27,000 votes from precincts 7, 8, 9 and 10 tossed out, never counted from minority neighborhoods that vote 98 percent Democratic.

In California, the voting machines that 44 percent of the voters were going to use in the October 7 recall election were so questionable that California's Secretary of State, a Republican, was not planning to allow this equipment to be used in future elections. And take note, the comparison he drew for the dire situation was that California should not wait for a Florida-style election problem before going ahead to replace their out-of-date voting machines.

In the court decision, the 9th Circuit stated that 40,000 citizens of California would have their votes uncounted because of old machines they were planning to use. I repeat, 40,000 votes. In addition, a quarter of the State polling places are not yet functioning because election officials did not have enough time to prepare for the recall. To me, the situation in California clearly shows that we still have quite a ways to go in reforming our voting system. And to make matters worse, even though just last year we passed an election reform bill, the Republicans have blocked full funding. Up to this moment, we still need another $2 billion before the end of the year to ensure that we do not repeat the 2000 election. Yet if we fail to provide the States with this badly needed funding, we may be headed right down the same path, to face this terrible situation that we were in just 3 years ago.

Here we are, 3 years later, the leader of the free world and at the same time the laughingstock of the free world telling other nations that we do not support them or we are going to sanction them because we consider their elections to be unfair; yet here at home we cannot get our own elections right.

I completely support the circuit court's decision and hope to see the election postponed until they get better equipment in place. We must never, ever repeat what happened in Florida. We certainly do not want to witness a repeat of the 2000 Presidential election. In closing, I think the recount in Florida, the redistricting problem in Texas, and the recall of California's Governor is part of a right wing conspiracy to politically enslave the American people.

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

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

REMEMBERING ROBERT LLOYD KELLEY

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in honor and remembrance of Robert Lloyd Kelley, who tragically passed away on March 15, 2003, at the age of 57. Robert Kelley, known as Bobby, was not only an outstanding father and beloved husband, he was also a great community leader and mentor who gave freely of his time and energy.

Those who knew Bobby knew that he loved life, especially his family, his church, the Texas Aggies, his job, and his community. He was devoted to his aging parents and took care of their physical and emotional needs. Bobby was kind and generous to many in the community, but his rewards are now being reaped in the splendor of heaven.

Bobby was born on February 4, 1946, in San Antonio, Texas, to Dr. E. Lloyd Kelley and the late Mary Yvonne McGarry Kelley. He is preceded in death by his mother as well as his son, Timothy Lloyd Kelley.

Bobby played an active role in his community of Hondo, Texas, serving both on the board of directors and as president of the Hondo Area Chamber of Commerce, as well as president of the Hondo Owl Band Booster Club.

During his life, he received numerous service awards and recognitions, including Volunteer of the Year for the Hondo Volunteer Fire Department, 1986; Community EMS Service Award, 1986 to 1990; Medina County Peace Officers Association Citizen of the Year; Hondo Area Chamber of Commerce Citizen of the Year; Outstanding Band Booster Service Award; and special recognition from the San Antonio Area Chapter of the Red Cross, as well as the Boy Scouts. He was an active member of the Hondo Church of Christ. He was the chief of the Medina County Juvenile Probation Department where he worked with the troubled youth of the area, a job which he found most rewarding, and through his department he helped a faith-based program called Angels Crossing.

□ 2045

Bobby was always willing to volunteer and work on any project that was ''for the kids.'' He always said, ''If you can't do something for kids, what's the point? Kids are our future.''

He also served as a Texas Department of Criminal Justice religious volunteer for approximately 8 years. He loved to sing and served as a song leader at church services held at the Joe Ney Unit in Medina County. Through his work at the Joe Ney Unit he was able to secure funds to have a chapel built, and now with his passing, a formal request has been made that the chapel to be constructed as the unit be named the R.L. Kelley Chapel. It will be dedicated to helping men find God and change their life just as he dedicated his life to helping people.

I extend my deepest condolences to Bobby's wife of 35 years, Jill, who is a seventh grade Texas history teacher at McDowell Middle School in Hondo, and his daughter, Lisa, who works for me on the House Agriculture Committee. Although he will be deeply missed, Bobby's spirit will live on in the hearts and memories of everyone he loved and inspired, especially his family and closest friends, today and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honor and remembrance of Robert L. Kelley. Medina County, Texas, was indeed fortunate to have such a dynamic and dedicated community leader who willingly and unselfishly gave his time and talents to make his community a better place in which to live, to work, to call home and to raise a family.

ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening while we were voting on the House floor on a number of issues and as conversations develop among colleagues here, I had an interesting

conversation that I would like to recount. A colleague of mine as we were walking across the street from our office building over here, the Longworth Office Building, said to me, you know, I know that you have had a lot of involvement with immigration-related issues and therefore I just wanted to talk to you a minute or two about some of the concerns I have. This particular individual happens to be a chairman of a committee that has oversight in a particularly important area of concern for us all and has some responsibilities that I would say overlap into the immigration area. He asked me what I thought we needed to do because he recognized the particular problem we were in, the peculiar problem we were in, I guess, in that we have a huge number of Americans who are concerned about this issue, about immigration, immigration reform, and we have a great deal of pressure developing, political pressure, I guess we could say, to do something about our porous borders and do something about the problems that exist as a result of the fact that today unfortunately even 2 years after 9/11, the event that transformed America in many ways and changed the world in many ways, we have still not been able to come to grips with one aspect of this problem and the fact is that we all know this, people in this body know this, and yet we seem paralyzed to do anything about it.

I said, well, okay, I have some ideas about this. Of course we went on to talk in-depth about what we thought should be done. Underline the word ''should'' be done. There was general agreement between the two of us, I guess, that much stronger action needed to be taken, that our borders are porous and that something had to be done in order to control the number of people coming across our borders, north and south, into the United States without our permission, for reasons sometimes benign, sometimes not so benign. We talked about the things that should be in place. Once again I emphasize the word ''should'' be in place. Some of the protections that any country would take, some of the undertakings that we as Americans should simply say we should look at as being the most basic kinds of precautions, that any government would undertake in order to protect their own citizens. We talked about the need for internal security. We talked about the need for Americans to devote more resources to trying to identify those people who are in this country, illegally for the most part, and who are here for purposes of doing us great harm. And we went through the number of problems that we have because, of course, there are many interests that are involved here, many political interests that develop that complicate the issue of simply securing our own borders.

It became apparent after a short time, after we talked about the amount of drugs that are being brought into this country, illegal drugs that are being brought into the country as a result of the fact that cartels, especially in Mexico, have realized that their ability to transport illegal drugs into this country is great and the profits are enormous and that the harm that is being done as a result of that kind of activity is well documented. And we talked about the fact that there are national security problems involved with porous borders and that terrorists, potential terrorists, are able to come into the United States, able to work within the United States because, of course, there are so many millions of people who are living here illegally, that they can blend into the society, they blend into that community, it makes it incredibly difficult for us, the Department of Justice, the Department of Homeland Security, to identify, to monitor and to interdict these people. And then we talked about, of course, just the abuse of our own laws, the fact that we recognize that our immigration policies are being constructed by States and by localities, by cities and counties throughout the United States that are developing policies and laws that actually aid and abet the criminal activity we call illegal immigration.

And all of this devolved into one common theme. Our borders are porous and we need to do something about that. As amazing as that sounds, it is still a difficult concept for many people in this body and in the administration, apparently, to get. But our borders are porous and there are consequences as a result of this situation.

I tell you about this and I relate this conversation because of the way it ended. There was, as I say, agreement between the two of us as to what the problem actually is. There was also an agreement between the two of us as to why we cannot solve that problem and that is what is amazing to me and I guess why I want to start off my discussion this evening with telling you about this conversation, because at one point this gentleman said to me, you know, we do not have the political will to secure our own borders. That is, of course, something I have said many times on this floor. It is something I have said in speeches I have given all over this Nation. But hearing this from another Member, a Member who is, I might say, not identified as being part of our Immigration Reform Caucus or someone who is very high profile but nonetheless a very respected Member of this body. As I say, a committee chairman. He said, and I want to say it again, we do not have the political will to secure the border. What a statement. And in an absolutely truthful statement, a statement we all know in our heart of hearts is accurate but a statement that we do not want exploited, a statement that we do not want to be made public. But it is public knowledge, Mr. Speaker. We may think we are the only ones here that know this dirty little secret, but I assure you that Americans know and understand that there is this problem. Many millions of Americans understand that there is a problem but perhaps they do not know why and they ask me all of the time. I get I do not know how many letters and e-mails and calls to my office. Over and over again the question is, why can't we do something about this? Day after day, week after week, month after month, year after year we talk about the problem. There are countless news reports about the fact that we cannot control our own borders, about the fact that people are coming across and that we choose to do little if anything about it. People say to me, why is this happening, Congressman? I can only tell them what my colleague said to me. We do not have the political will to secure our borders. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, we have the technical ability to do so. We have the resources. We have the technological attributes necessary, combined with human resources to secure our borders. We can do it. It is a fallacy, it is a canard to stand up in front of any group and say it is impossible, we must figure out a different way to defend America rather than defending our borders. When people say that, Mr. Speaker, what they are saying is this: I choose not to defend and secure our border, because there are political ramifications that I fear. This is what we should read into any statement given by any politician, whether they be Members of this body or the other body or running for any position, elected position in the State, in any State of the Nation, because this issue has reached that point where it is now a State and local issue, because we have States in the Nation that are trying to develop their own immigration policy, sometimes because they are attempting to fill the vacuum created by the lack of involvement by the Federal Government and sometimes because they are trying to pander to political constituencies that they believe will help them retain or obtain power, political power.

Recently we have seen something happen that points this up in a way I guess I could never have thought of. The old issue about truth being stranger than fiction, it really works here, because what if I had come to this floor, say, 3 or 4 years ago and said, Mr. Speaker and Members, I can envision a time when States will actually be doing things like giving driver's licenses which in many respects, and many times referred to as the keys to the kingdom in America, a driver's license, what if I had said, I think there are going to be States in this Nation that actually are going to give illegal aliens driver's licenses?

Of course there would have been derision, there would have been a response we all can identify with, those of us who are concerned about this issue, because we have faced that kind of reaction by the press and by even our colleagues in the past. They would have said, you are such a radical on this issue, you are so off base, you are anti-

immigrant, you are racist, all of those epithets that they throw out every time we talk about immigration and immigration policy. Never could this happen that any State in the Nation would give illegal immigrants the keys to the kingdom. Yet, of course, that is exactly what is happening. Several States in this Nation have, and now the most recent, the State of California.

□ 2100

A Governor so desperate to try to retain power that he signs a bill that he had twice vetoed and vetoed with a message that said something like this: It is crazy to give people who are here illegally a driver's license because we do not know anything about them. We cannot determine their background. We do not know who they are. We do not know anything about them, and when we give a driver's license like to somebody like that, they can use it for nefarious purposes. But he forgot all of those veto messages because he is in the process of being recalled by the people of the State of California. And he says, oh, this is a great idea. Why did I not think of it before? It is absolutely necessary for us to give illegal immigrants into this country the ''keys to the kingdom.''

There is only one reason he did that, of course, and that was to gain the votes he hopes he will obtain in order to be retained in office. This is amazing to all of us. I mean, most Americans look at this and understand it for exactly what it is: political pandering in its worst form, and yet it has happened. And I hope that we can look at this little visual example of the problem: A California driver's license for a gentleman named Osama bin Laden, 525 Main Street, Los Angeles, California; date of issuance: 9–11. This is a dramatic, perhaps some would say overly dramatic, statement we are trying to make here, but this is what it takes perhaps to bring some people to their senses. Can we keep this from happening?

Illegal immigration poses a threat to the United States in many, many ways, certainly in a national security sense. In a recent article by Steve Brown and Chris Coon, they say, ''Governor Gray Davis has opened a significant breach in the Nation's homeland security by signing a bill allowing illegal immigrants to obtain driver's licenses that bear the official seal and full governmental authority of the State of California.'' These driver's licenses allow people to open bank accounts, make certain purchases, and obtain jobs. ''Driver's licenses also serve as the sole ID needed to travel abroad to Mexico, Canada, and some Caribbean countries. They allow easy access to air travel and car rentals. It is a requirement for obtaining a firearm. Through the convenience of the Motor/Voter Act, obtaining a driver's license even grants the right to vote, a fundamental right for which generations of American blood has been shed and the one sacrosanct facet of citizenship. But increasingly, even in the post-9/11 atmosphere of heightened security, States are giving away the keys to our country to those who aren't even citizens and are, in fact, here illegally.

''A recent Federation for American Immigration Reform report highlights how States are undermining immigration enforcement and throwing the door open wide to terrorist infiltration. Along with Sanctuary policies mandating noncooperation between local and Federal enforcement, Federation for American Immigration Reform cites the issuance of driver's licenses to illegals as one of the key breakdowns in homeland security, a conclusion shared by both the FBI and the Department of Homeland Security.

''All 19 of the 9/11 terrorists possessed one or more of State driver's licenses, which they used to blend in, rent apartments, open bank accounts, and, ultimately, to board the airplanes they intended to crash,' the report notes. 'The decision by 13 State legislatures and Governors to give driver's licenses to people in this country''' who are here '''illegally, people about whom we know nothing, directly hinders Federal efforts to address the homeland security threat.'

''Gun Owners of America Communications Director Erich Pratt told'' this magazine ''that obtaining a driver's license would 'absolutely' make it easier for illegal aliens to purchase firearms throughout the country. 'The background check only bounces names against real bad guys . . . so yes, if they have what would seem to be proof that they are a legal resident,' '' the driver's license, '''obviously, there would be nothing on the driver's license to indicate that''' they were here illegally. '''Then this really greases the skids of being able to purchase firearms from gun stores,' Pratt explained.''

I am a Representative of the State of Colorado, specifically the 6th Congressional District. An incident occurred in my district that is often referred to as just the ''Columbine incident.'' Columbine High School is in my district, not more than a mile or so from my own home, and we all know the tragic consequences of those children who took guns into a school and killed 13 students and died at their own hands, the two perpetrators. And there was an outcry throughout this Nation, and there was a concern raised about the availability of guns to these two individuals who committed this heinous act. We had to work through that in this body, and we had to work through it as a Nation, and time and again I have heard people come to this floor to protest against the availability of firearms. Here we have a situation now in several States where we have made it enormously easy for someone who is here illegally to obtain a firearm. What does that mean? It means that we have nothing against which to bounce off this information, as the statement here I read a minute ago indicates.

Someone presents a driver's license. They may have a criminal record in other countries. They may have obtained that driver's license illegally. They may have used a false identification to obtain the driver's license. They may have gone to the Mexican Consulate, let us say, and obtained a matricula consular. This is a document that is handed out by the Mexican Government to those Mexican nationals living in the United States illegally. In California, as a result of the bill that was signed by Governor Gray Davis, a person who has obtained one of these matricula consular, that is the name of the card, can then go and get a driver's license. So even if one is, in fact, a citizen of the United States but a felon who has a long, long history of transgressions, they can obtain this matricula consular in a different name and become a different person just like that. And then they take their card to the motor vehicle division in California, and they get their driver's license, and then they go buy a gun, and there is nothing, there is no record, of course, of who they are, who they really are, and therefore, they can obtain this weapon. Why have we not heard from the antigun lobby? Why have we not heard from all those people who raised such hell when we talk about the possession of firearms in America, and they even try to restrict the possession of firearms to law-abiding citizens? But they do not say a word about the fact that we have just opened the door to millions of people who are here illegally and to potentially millions of people who would do harm to the Nation and to others if they were able to obtain a firearm because they are now able to get a driver's license in one of several States, the most important of which, of course, is California.

Not too long ago, last week, as a matter of fact, I held a press conference here, and I had with me several family members of people who were killed in the terrorist attacks on our country on 9/11. ''Families for a Secure America'' convened on Washington, D.C., to air their grievances over the continued lax immigration policies supported by lawmakers concerned only about their careers and lobbyists with specious ulterior motives.

''It is clear,'' they say, ''that the lawyers, lobbyists, ethnic power brokers, ideologues, business profiteers, and misguided do-gooders who don't care about the security of their fellow Americans will never stop working to keep America's borders open. Beyond any doubt, since the murder of . . . 3,000 innocent people on 9/11, these people have shown by their actions that they will never sacrifice their power, profits, and ideology for the safety of the American people as a whole.''

This was a quote by Tom Meehan at this press conference that we held. And he went on to say: ''And we 9/11 families have learned since the murder of our loved ones that this President and most Members of Congress will not do

the right thing unless they are forced to do so by the 70 to 90 percent of Americans that polls show want drastic and immediate immigration reform.''

Lynn Faulkner, who lost his wife in the World Trade Center, pointed to politicians ''both liberal and conservative, Republican and Democrat'' that continue to push for open borders and loose immigration standards.

''Though the specifics of the 9/11 attacks may have been unknown to the politicians listed above,'' and prior to this he listed the Members that he was concerned about, ''and Bill Clinton and President Bush, they had to know that additional attacks would follow and that the only way to keep terrorists . . . out of our country was to screen the people who seek to enter,'' Faulkner said. ''Therefore, we say without any reservation that the Members of Congress, the current President, and his two predecessors contributed to the murder of our family members and the thousands of other victims of September 11.''

In a callous attempt to save his political career from recall, Democrat, California Governor Gray Davis, recently signed legislation allowing approximately two million illegals to obtain driver's licenses, legislation he has twice vetoed, as I said earlier.

With the stroke of his pen, while blatantly pandering to the Latino vote, Davis quashed his State's border with Mexico. Far from a single-handed act, he was aided and abetted by the Democrat-dominated California legislature, particularly by bill author, Senator Gil Cedillo. Cedillo has been pushing this legislation for years under the thin premise that new licenses will have increased incentive to obtain auto insurance coverage, in turn improving highway safety. An ardent member of the taxpayer funded MEChA, which is a ''racist Latino student movement demanding annexation of all southwestern States,'' and MEChA, by the way, is as close to a Hispanic KKK as I can possibly imagine and something, by the way, that the aspiring Governor in California Mr. Bustamante belongs to. Cedillo once said, illegals have a right to stay because ''they were here first.'' Illegal aliens, he says, have a right to stay because they were here first. Given the illegal constituency's interests, there is little doubt who they will pull the lever for in the upcoming elections at both the State and national level.

''I'd like to thank Governor Davis because up until last week, how many people in this country knew that illegal immigrants were getting driver's licenses?'' the Families of Survivors member Grace Gottschalk, whose son was murdered in the World Trade Center, asked.

□ 2115

''Here and there you would see something in the press occasionally, but when Governor Davis used this as a political tool, passing a bill that he had turned down many times because he is now in jeopardy, it shows you how political this is and how immigrants are being used.''

This move has not gone unnoticed by those tasked with securing our Nation from the threat of terrorism at home. Asa Hutchinson, Under Secretary of Border and Transportation Security, recently said, ''Certainly we have to review our policy among inspectors on the border and their reliance upon driver's licenses. If you do not have integrity in the driver's licenses that are issued, the integrity of those documents, the securities of those documents, then it really undermines the whole premise of allowing U.S. citizens to travel abroad and come back with limited proof of U.S. citizenship without a passport. More than 160,000 people cross the border in San Diego daily here simply flashing a State license allows them to be waved through. It promises to be a focal issue in the upcoming California gubernatorial recall election.''

Republican State Senator Tom McClintock, a recall candidate, said the only reason for issuing state-approved identification to illegals is ''to undermine our immigration laws.''

''What Gray Davis has done by signing this bill is put politics before the people of the State of California,'' Assemblyman Tony Strickland said.

''The California legislature failed the people of California. Governor Gray Davis has failed the people of California when he signed the bill into law. He said he didn't care about California, but he cares about his job in Sacramento. It is about a last-ditch effort to save his career,'' said Assemblyman Dennis Mountjoy.

The California Republican Assembly has issued a call for the referendum to stop the new driver's license ordinance. They hope to obtain 373,816 signatures of registered voters within the next 90 days to make the March 2004 ballot.

California Republican Assembly President Mike Spence commented, ''To lower the standard for getting a driver's license in this era of al Qaeda and the era of identity theft is an attack on every citizen of California.''

The California Republican Assembly has started a Web site to support the petition drive.

Mr. Speaker, it is, again, incredible for us today to think that this is happening in California and it is happening in other States. It is incredible to think about the fact that many States now give all kinds of opportunities and benefits to people who are living here illegally, those benefits that have heretofore been given only to people who we call citizens, or at least legal residents, of the United States, the benefit of citizenship, like having the State taxpayers pay to subsidize your child's education, both in K–12 and higher education. Now many States say let us do that for illegal immigrants, the benefits of social services, the benefits of health care, and, yes, even the benefits of voting.

What is left? What is left to define the idea or the concept of citizenship? What does it mean? Has it any value whatsoever? If everyone in this country, regardless of their legal status, can obtain all of the benefits afforded to those people who are here legally, then what does it mean to be a citizen of this country?

The distinction is erased, and that is the hope and desire of many of the people who actually push these kinds of issues. It is to eventually come to a place where borders are eliminated, where people who are here can obtain all of the benefits of citizenship by simply being a resident.

There are cities in this Nation that provide people who are here illegally with the benefit of voting. College Park, Maryland, comes to mind immediately, not too far from here. They call themselves sanctuary cities, and you can vote if you can prove you are a resident of the city. The Mayor of the District of Columbia not too long ago proposed such a thing for residents of the District of Columbia; and of course Gray Davis has done exactly the same thing by giving residents of the State of California a driver's license, because under motor-voter, they now can vote.

So, what does it matter then when we use the word ''citizenship''? There is a recent flap that has developed over the fact that the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement has come up with a new oath of citizenship. I think they recalled it because there was such a response on the part of many people. They were re-writing the oath of citizenship.

But let me suggest to you that the concern about the actual words that are used in that oath, that concern is misplaced, I think, because, of course, the oath will eventually mean nothing, because citizenship, the concept of it, the reality of it, will mean nothing.

When we talk about immigration and immigration reform, many people think that we are just talking in terms of jobs, the loss of jobs, which, of course, is a real concern. Many people are just talking about the fear that we have as a result of our Nation being balkanized, being divided up into all kinds of sub-groups, of victimized groups, that refuse to become part of the American mainstream, that do not even wish to integrate into our society.

But this debate about illegal immigration is even broader than that. I believe with all of my heart, Mr. Speaker, that massive immigration into the country, both legal and illegal, combined with this cult of multiculturalism that permeates our society and tells people that they should not immigrate into the American mainstream and they should keep their own language and their own political relationship and political affiliation to country of origin, this is a dagger pointed at the heart of America.

It is as dangerous as al Qaeda; it is as dangerous as any terrorist out there

who is plotting to do something terrible to this country. Because, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you now that if we do not know who we are as a Nation, if we are divided up into all these camps, into these groups, victimized sub-groups in America, then we will have no strong desire to save our civilization and our way of life, because we do not know what it is, we do not know who we are, we do not know what holds us together, we do not know what binds us together as a Nation.

We can all revel in and enjoy the differences that we have in this country, the cultural distinctions that give us such a rich texture as a Nation. We can enjoy it. I certainly do. But that is a far cry from disassociating oneself from this country and actually seeking only the economic benefits that it can provide, while simultaneously trying to connect oneself, or, I should say, retain one's connections to countries of origin, which, if they were so great, if those countries of origin are so wonderful, one wonders why millions of people have sought to leave them.

In a recent Los Angeles Times article, September 15, 2 days ago, by Claire Luna, she states that ''painted on the cheeks of children waiving grandly from a balcony and planted in women's hairdos, Mexican flags were on display everywhere Sunday in Santa Ana as tens of thousands of people showed pride for their home country.''

Showed pride for their home country. What does that mean? What is their home country? Do they not live here? Do they not obtain the benefits of living in this land? Do they not call themselves Americans? Do they not think of themselves as Americans?

Mr. Speaker, if I asked you what is your home country, if I asked anybody in this body what is their home country, if I asked any American citizen out there, what is their home country, how many would answer to me some country other than the United States of America?

Now, I am only a third-generation American. My grandparents came here from Italy. But never, ever, ever, have I thought of myself as anything but an American. Never have I thought of my home country as anything but America.

''The Fiesta de las Americas parade commemorating Mexican Independence Day drew the largest crowd in its 15-year history,'' police said. For 2 hours, spectators cheered for their home states,'' home states, ''in Mexico, as girls in traditional dress pranced among marching bands, government dignitaries and mariachi floats. It is so important that all Mexican remember how their liberty was won.''

Their liberty, if they are living here, was won by people who sacrificed their lives in the fight against Great Britain. That is how their liberty was won.

''The parade helps reaffirm our pride in our love of Mexico.''

Well, Mexico is a wonderful country. I do not dispute that, and I do not suggest for a moment that anyone should, if they are from Mexico, should forget about it or not understand that they have that heritage. But there is something happening here, Mr. Speaker, that deserves our attention, because this is what I am talking about, about a country being divided into all of these sub-groups, being balkanized.

This article goes on to say that, ''Corona, the vending machine stocker, was watching the parade with his brother-in-law Roberto Mundo, 38, and Mundo's two children. To shield his eyes from the sun, Corona shoved a piece of cardboard over his head and was reduced to wordless glee when passing Orange County Sheriff Mike Carona gave his headgear a thumbs-up. His power of speech returned when a dozen folks and women passed by on a Budweiser beer float. 'You are beautiful,' he screamed happily in Spanish, and when they threw him a poster. 'People used to be too scared of being deported to come to something as public as this,' Mundo said, 'but times have changed. Now people aren't scared to show their pride.' ''

So what he is saying here is, of course, that many, many of the people who were on the street were here illegally, but they do not care anymore about the fact that they are here illegally. They are not afraid, they are not concerned, because they know that this government does not have the will to enforce our own immigration policy.

There is a book, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I would certainly suggest should be mandatory reading for every American citizen. It is called ''Mexifornia: A State of Becoming,'' by Victor Davis Hanson. I will just read something from the cover:

''Cutting through the lies of race-hacks, multi-cult commissars and their guilty white enablers, fifth generation Californian Victor Davis Hanson tells the brutal truth about Mexican immigration to California. Combining social-science fact with the personal experience of living in the San Joaquin Valley, immigration's ground zero, Hanson shows that discarding the old paradigm of immigrant assimilation in favor of the fantasies of identity politics victimhood has seriously compromised the process of turning into Americans the millions of hard-working Mexicans who desperately want the freedom and prosperity underwritten by the very values that the multi-cult industry disparages. No one concerned with immigration and its impact on America can afford to miss this tough and brilliant book.''

And I certainly agree. ''Mexifornia: A State of Becoming.''

California is a State I guess that represents what we are all, every State in the Nation, in some stage of becoming, somewhat transformed. To some, even in this body, that is a good idea. That is something to which they look forward, a Nation that no longer understands its roots, a Nation that is divided, a Nation that is balkanized, a Nation that is just a place of residents and not of citizens.

□ 2130

Mr. Speaker, that is where we are going. That is where we are headed. And most Americans know it. And they ask their representatives in this government to do something about it. And yet I have to tell them when they ask me why we cannot and why we ignore this, I have to tell them that there is no political will to secure our own borders.

It is a shameful fact, Mr. Speaker. It is one I wish I did not have to express and did not have to state. But it is the truth. I hope it will soon change.

THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin on something we can all agree on and that is what President Bush said in August at an August fundraiser. He said, ''I ran for office to solve problems, not to pass them on to future Presidents and future generations.''

We can all agree on that, but, unfortunately, the reality is that instead of paying off the public debt by 2011, as we had projected in 2001, this administration will leave the future generations with a debt of almost $7 trillion as of 2011.

Now, rather than get into rhetoric and everything, let us just use a chart so we know exactly what numbers we are talking about. This shows the deficit year by year from the Johnson administration, Nixon, Ford, Carter, the deficits that were run up in the Reagan and Bush years, and also shows the surplus that was generated by the time President Clinton left office.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993 we passed a budget without any Republican votes. The Republicans, after those votes were cast, campaigned against that budget that was passed, and picked up 50 seats in the House and control of the Senate as a result.

In 1995 after the 1994 election, the Republicans, with control of Congress, passed a budget with trillions of dollars in tax cuts. President Clinton vetoed that budget. They threatened to close down the government. He vetoed the next budget. They closed down the government, and he vetoed the budget again.

Because he vetoed those budgets, this trend went up until we had a surplus of almost $100 billion projected for 2001. And that is on budget. That is without touching the Social Security or Medicare surplus.

As soon as President Bush came in, he signed the trillion dollar tax cuts. And, wait a minute, this has $500 billion in deficits. This is the February

projection. This has been updated. It is no longer $500 billion. The latest figure is almost $700 billion in deficit that we will be running up.

Now, it is important to put $700 billion in perspective because if you look at the Federal budget and look on the line item revenue, individual income tax, what we get from the individual income tax in the Federal budget, it is less than $800 billion. We are running deficits now of almost $700 billion.

Now, when we run up deficits like this as far as the eye can see, one can understand how we got from where we were in 2001 to where we are now. In January 2001, we expected by 2011 to have run up a surplus of $5.6 trillion, enough to have paid off the national debt. By August of 2001, we had lost over $2 trillion of that surplus, and the surplus was projected to be $3.4 trillion. Now, most of this is Social Security and Medicare, because in August of 2001, we had actually spent all of the cash surplus and most of the Medicare surplus, and were headed into Social Security by August of 2001, before September 11; by January of 2002, the projected surplus, $1.6 trillion, almost all Social Security and Medicare surplus, or what was left of it, after we have dipped into it significantly.

By August of 2002, there is almost no surplus at all, that is, we have spent the entire Social Security, the entire Medicare surplus for the entire 10 years. By March of 2003, we are down to an actual deficit where we have spent all of the Social Security, all of the Medicare, and then $377 billion. By August of this year, we have gotten into so much deficit spending that the projected deficit, not surplus, deficit is over $2 trillion in that same 10-year period.

And what is the solution? The Republican agenda will run this up to $3.3 trillion unless that agenda is stopped. Mr. Speaker, a $5.6 trillion surplus projected when this administration came in. If their policies are followed in the next couple of months, $3.3 trillion in deficit, an almost $9 trillion difference. That $9 trillion, remember, less than $800 billion a year comes in under individual income tax; $9 trillion is $900 billion a year on average that we have deteriorated in our budget situation.

Now, as bad as that is, it is actually going to get worse, because those projections do not include some things that we expect to happen, like the tax cuts have been sunsetted; the President is expecting us to remove the sunset so that those tax cuts can continue. Protecting the middle-class families from the alternative minimum tax, that is the tax where if you have tax preference, tax cuts for the upper, very high income, high income, about a couple of percent, about 3 percent of the public pays the alternative minimum tax. That is, you cannot reduce your tax that you need to pay but by so much before you have to pay an alternative minimum tax. The effect of not protecting middle-class families from this alternative minimum tax will mean that they will lose the benefit of their child tax credit and many other tax benefits that they enjoy now. So if we protect them from that, that will cost even more, going right to the bottom line.

Providing a Medicare prescription drug benefit, all of those numbers, as bad as they look, do not include the prescription drug benefit that everybody is promising. It also assumes that we are not going to have any hurricanes or disasters or floods or earthquakes in the next few years. So it is going to get worse before it gets better. When we run up all of those deficits, we run up debt, and we have to pay interest on that national debt. Here is the interest on the national debt that we have projected to pay going down towards zero by 2011 or 2013, because there would be no debt; it would be paid off. Instead, this is the interest on the national debt that we are projected to pay. And if we look at the difference between what we have to pay and what we are going to end up paying, by 2010, that will be $1.6 trillion of additional interest on the national debt that we are going to have to spend because we have messed up the budget.

Put another way, these green bars represent the interest on the national debt that we were going to pay going down towards zero. These red bars, interest on the national debt that we are going to have to pay because we have messed up the budget and we have been running up deficits. This blue bar puts it in perspective. This is the defense budget. We are going to be spending by 2013 almost as much money in interest on the national debt as we are going to be paying for national defense. We get nothing for interest on the national debt. We do not get a single school book, we do not get a rifle for the military, we get nothing for interest on the national debt. And instead of zero, we are going to be spending almost as much on interest on the national debt as we do for national defense.

Now, to show how the interest on the national debt is affected, right now, if we take the entire interest on the national debt, divide it by the population and multiply by 4, we will see that the family of four's proportional share of interest on the national debt is now about $4,400. As the interest on the national debt goes up, by 2013, almost $8,500, a family of four's proportional share of interest on the national debt.

Now, how did we get there? We got there with tax cuts. And who got the tax cuts? This is divided up by quintiles, the bottom 20 percent and what they got out of the tax cuts. The next 20 percent, the middle 20 percent, what they got. The share of the fourth percentile, the top 20 percent, this is what they got. Half of the tax cuts went to the upper 1 percent.

To put it another way, if you are a millionaire, you got about $89,000 out of the 2003 tax cut. If you made $500,000 to $1 million, you get a little less than $20,000, and you can see what you got. Half the people get less than $100 a year out of the 2003 tax cut.

Now, we were told that we needed to cut taxes to create jobs. The millionaires got their tax cut; we ran the budget into a deficit in order to create jobs. And here is the job creation math. Mr. Speaker, $374 billion in tax cuts through 2003 only, and we are expected, if the plan works, to create 1.5 million maximum new jobs. That is the Treasury Department's estimates. We pass all of this stuff, give $374 billion in tax cuts, we can create 1.5 million jobs. That divides out to almost $250,000 for every job that they are trying to create. Mr. Speaker, $250,000 they have to work with to create jobs, if it works.

This chart shows the jobs created by administrations going back to the Truman administration, and it shows that it did not work. This actually needs to be updated because it says 2.5 million jobs lost. It is actually closer to 3 million now. If we go back to the Truman administration, every President is creating jobs. Eisenhower lost 200,000 jobs in his second administration, but he gained 1.9 million in his first administration. So every President since Truman, more jobs when they leave office after each administration than when they came in, except after this administration's budget was adopted.

Now, as we talk about 9–11, let us remember that back to the Truman administration includes the Korean War, it includes the Vietnam War, jobs are being created; hostages in Iran, jobs are being created; Somalia, the entire Cold War, Kosovo, everybody is creating jobs until this tax plan is adopted.

Now, actually, we should have known, because the Joint Committee on Taxation evaluated the 2003 tax cut and showed that if you cut those taxes, now some taxes stimulate the economy better than others. Some tax cuts stimulate the economy better than others. According to their analysis, the taxes cut in 2003 would show a short-term spike in jobs; but depending on which economic model we use, at best, we are going to end up right back where we started.

□ 2145

You will probably end up with fewer jobs than you started off with. This analysis was presented by the Joint Committee on Taxation. It has a Republican majority. And so we knew when we voted for the 2003 and 2001 tax cuts that we were killing jobs.

Now, when you have all of these deficits and you look at this chart, and the deficits that are going by, the deficits are the worst that we have had in American history. Now, there is one thing that the Social Security crisis is in front of us, and we need to make sure that we have money for the baby boomers when they retire for Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), who has

been a stalwart on fighting for fiscal sanity.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for yielding to me. I thank him for a very excellent presentation of the facts.

I know as often we have stood in this floor that I will get calls from some that have been watching and they will have various different opinions of what has been said and what the facts are, but let us relate it to what we are facing tonight, at least many of our fellow citizens somewhere in the North Carolina area as Hurricane Isabel bears down on the United States, and we still hope and pray that something will cause it to veer back out into the ocean. But in the meantime folks are preparing because they know the devastation that can occur when a hurricane hits.

In my opinion, we have the makings of the perfect storm in this country today, 500, now $600 billion deficit as far as the eye can see and we are ignoring it, $500 billion trade deficit as far as the eye can see and going up and we are ignoring it.

The baby boomers are set to begin retiring in 2011, and everyone admits that that will put one of the biggest strains on the economy of the United States in our history. The gentleman's chart shows it today and no one argues with that, no one. From the AARP up and down all admit we have got a problem. And what have we done about that problem? Zero. Talk about it. But nothing. The makings of the perfect storm. And every time I make this speech somebody will say, and I have heard this said, people will stand up and say if only Congress would control spending.

Well, the first thing I like to do is remind the American people that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been in charge for the last 8 years. I make no bones about it. I opposed this administration's economic game plan when they put it in place in 2001. I stood on the floor, I stood with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) standing, looked at my friends on the other side and say, I hope you are right. I hope I am wrong. But I do not believe it has a chance of working. And in 2002 we said the same thing. In 2003 we say the same thing. But have we had a change in the economic direction for this country? No. The hole gets deeper and what do we do? We take another shovel and start digging. That makes no sense.

Let me put it in proper perspective. Those who say if only we would control spending, let me give another fact, if we take defense, military construction off-budget, which we are, exempt from cuts, because we cannot cut in those areas when we are at war on three fronts, and we will not cut, and we should not cut. We have got young men and women's lives at stake tonight and, therefore, we do not wish to jeopardize them further. Interest on the national debt, we cannot cut that.

The gentleman's chart shows the debt tax that is going up as the interest rates continue to spiral. We cannot cut the interest. So if you take defense and interest off-budget or off-cut it, we can cut 100 percent of the other 11 appropriations bills, 100 percent, not waste, fraud and abuse, not 1 percent here, cut it all out, zero for the rest of the government, and we would still run $160 billion deficit next year.

Now, that is the truth. That is how deeply we have dug the ditch for the American economy. Now, if it were working, as the gentleman shows the jobs charts, we have lost 2.7 million jobs. Nothing is working according to plan, and yet we have those who absolutely refuse to even consider changing the plan. In fact, they will stand on this floor and argue over the next several weeks, as they have for the last several weeks, that we just got to do more of it.

The makings of the perfect storm. Anybody that ignores the power of a hurricane, anybody that ignores the power of the perfect storm of $500 billion deficit, this next year I will predict based on the administration's own numbers, the deficit for this country will be closer to $1 trillion than it will $500 billion, and nobody cares. Nobody cares that is in charge. It is just more of the same.

I am worried about that. I wish some others would get worried about that. I thank the gentleman for taking the time tonight. I appreciate the opportunity to share in it. And I hope that this chart that the gentleman has right behind him tonight, I hope people will take a look at that because we can talk about the fiscal deficit, we can talk about the trade deficit, and they are all real. This one is too. And our grandchildren will not hold us in very high stead because this Congress and this administration have refused to address the very real problem that is facing us. Instead, we keep on with some of the economic bunk that I saw in the Washington Post by the fellow that is running, running the economic policy for this country, Mr. Grover Norquist, the expert, it is his plan and he wants more of it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). This is the chart he was referring to. We are enjoying surpluses in Social Security and Medicare, $165 billion projected next year in surpluses. But by 2017, 2018, that surplus is going to end. The baby boomers are going to retire, and instead of enjoying a big fat surplus, in a few years, just a couple of decades, we will have $300 billion deficit in the Social Security Trust Fund. We will be having to pay out $300 billion more than we are bringing in.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, remember in the last couple of years how many times we have stood on this floor and voted to put those numbers in a lock box, and that was laughed at. But if we would have just done it, and we did for a couple of years, but we need to be doing it today because those are obligated funds, those are obligated to the retirees beginning in 2011, our military retirees, our civil service retirees, this is money that is obligated that we are again spending on current operating expenses. And it was a valid criticism and it is still an accurate statement when our friends on the other side of the aisle will stand up and say, well, you Democrats did it for 40 years. Well, that may be true but that is not a reason for us to continue to do it, because 2011 is a lot closer today than it was 40 years ago, and that is the problem we face.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would want to point out as challenging as this chart looks, we are running up a little surplus, but we will shortly be into great deficit. And to put some of these other numbers into perspective, as we indicated, in 2001 we passed a tax cut that the top 1 percent got half of the value of that tax cut. Instead of giving the top 1 percent a tax cut, if we had directed that income flow into the Social Security Trust Fund, just what the top 1 percent got, not what everybody else got, we would have had enough money to pay Social Security benefits without reducing benefits at all for 75 years, or the top 1 percent can get a tax cut.

Guess what the majority in Congress voted for? They voted to leave this problem for another day and voted for a tax cut for the upper 1 percent. Those are the kinds of decisions that are being made and the kind of decisions that have to be changed.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am delighted to recognize our friend from Hawaii who has been a stalwart new Member coming in fighting for budget sanity, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE).

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me some time to talk tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to serve in this great House for about 10 months now and I am thankful that as each day passes that is one day more of experience that I have under my belt to serve my constituents and to listen to people that have been through this for so many years such as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and so many others.

But I have to state that the more time that goes by in terms of my service in Congress, the more I live in fear that in each one of those days I am taken a little bit farther away from what the person in my district thinks. When people sit around their kitchen table at night, not when they sit here in this Chamber among all of us in this closed atmosphere, but when they are back in my district of Hawaii, when they are back in Honoka'a and Ele'ele and Kahului, and when they look over those 5,000 miles of what is happening here in Washington, D.C. what do they

think? And I live in fear that I am falling out of touch with them the more time that I spend here. And that is really how I feel right now as I listen to this debate. Because I came into this Congress 10 months ago thinking, perhaps naively, that there were certain truths that our Federal Government played by, certain truths about how we handle the people's money, not just today but down the road. I thought we cared about decisions that had an impact, not just now, but down the road. I thought that despite great debate in this Chamber, we actually did care about being good stewards of the people's money. I thought we were all in this together, all of us, all of America, all trying to do the right thing.

It did not occur to me that we were here just to do the bidding of some. And now as I have listened to my colleagues talk about taxes and the Federal budget and the deficit for these 10 months, colleagues on all sides of the aisle, people in the administration, great thinkers, I see indisputable evidence that what was once on the way to being a surplus is now a deficit this year in excess of $500 billion, including the Social Security surplus. We applied that $200 billion already.

Now, I see public debt climbing through the roof, 3.6 and rising. And as I come to the very slow realization that there is no way whatsoever under this approach that we will be able to meet those obligations to Social Security and Medicare when my generation needs it, I have to ask myself what is going on here? What is really going on? How do I explain this? How do I go back into Hawaii and say to them this is what is going on.

I can take disagreement, I can take policy disagreements as long as I know and understand it. I can go back and say, well, there is a dispute between us in Congress and they think this and we think that and this is why. And I can certainly go back and say this is the issue. We all agree and this is why. But this is the worst situation of all, not understanding why something is being pursued.

A few months after we passed hundreds of millions of dollars of tax cuts, we get an obviously underestimated second bill for Iraq and Afghanistan, and there is no adjustment necessary from the administration's perspective, $87 billion on top of $60 billion just a few months ago. But we do not have to adjust our policy on tax cuts. In fact, we want to add more.

The same week we get the bill I read, I hear that all of the sudden we have worked out another deal. This time we are going to cut corporate taxes for corporations that do their work overseas, overseas corporations. What is going on here?

□ 2200

I have been wracking my brain for the possibilities. I have heard that these tax cuts will regenerate the economy, and I think tax cuts can regenerate the economy under some degree if targeted, but across-the-board deep tax cuts that deny us the basic ability to fund the core functions of government upon which an economy is based, do not help economies.

I have heard the economy is picking up. I have heard in a couple of days we are all going to be told good news, the economy is picking up. Guess what? That is already in these figures. We have already assumed 3 percent growth, and by the way, what economy would not pick up if you gave it a steroid infusion of hundreds of millions of dollars in government spending on war and domestically and in tax cuts? The question is not what is going to happen to the economy next week, the question is what is going to happen to the economy down the road when we most need it to balance the books on this terrible deficit?

I have heard we have to reduce government. Of course, we have to reduce government, but by the way, this budget assumes a certain restriction on government. We are already putting it in, and to reduce government to the degree that would be necessary to balance the budget, under this scenario, would mean essentially wiping out all Federal spending other than military, defense-related, and I have heard the deficits do not matter. They are here to stay, let us just get used to them. Does anybody really believe that? People sitting around that kitchen table sure do not believe it, and I do not believe it.

So what is going on here? Why are we doing what we are doing? I am forced to conclude what I do not want to. This is not subject to explanation anywhere in the realm of reasoned thought. There is no reasonable explanation for this policy, and we have got to cross a bridge. There is no reasoned explanation. We expect Congress to be reasoned. This is not reasonable. This is haphazard. This is reckless. This is not about fiscal responsibility. It is not about economic theory, and it is not about taking care of the next generation. This is about helping part of our country now and the heck with the rest of us and the heck with the future.

It reminds me, just in conclusion, somehow I was thinking about this steroids thing, and I was remembering that back in the 1960s, when the Olympic movement suffered from an incredible abuse of substances and people would inject themselves with all kinds of stuff, and they knew at the time that by injecting themselves with these steroids and other substances they knew two things. They knew, number one, it would enhance their performance for the next 1 or 2 years, and they knew that down the road it would harm them and they would die early from these steroids, and some did it and some did not, and why did those people that do it do it? Because they wanted the gold medal next year, and they did not care and that is how I feel. That is what I think we are doing right now. Some people here just want to get through one next year, and they do not care what happens down the road, and that is wrong.

We are all responsible. We can sit here and talk about partisan politics. We can talk about Republicans versus Dems. We can talk about executive versus legislative branch. We can talk about the States, the local counties, and by the way, I think that is a useful exercise because I have heard some State Governors and some local executives who want to defend these policies say, hey, this will help, and by the way, they turn around the next day and criticize the fact that we do not have enough Federal moneys. They are at a loss to figure out how they are going to balance their State budget, and they say, well, everything is okay and then they turn around and say on the other hand, it is not okay, we need your help.

We cannot have it both ways, and I am telling people out there, this problem is all of ours. We cannot do this alone. We have sat here on this floor saying all of this for months now, and the Representative from Texas asked who is listening. I think people are listening, but it is going to take more than listening. It is going to take the people of this country saying this is wrong. It is going to take the people of this country saying, yes, we know, we cannot have it all.

I wish our President would say one thing to me: We need another $87 billion to get ourselves through the next couple of months in Iraq. We are in a pickle. We have got to get out of that pickle. I need your help but we all have to kick in. We cannot afford this next round of tax cuts. We have got to be able to provide for our foreign policy right now. We cannot have it both ways.

I would believe him and I would support him, but I cannot buy the current approach of this administration, designed only to get through another 15 short months, through one more election. That is wrong. People need to wake up and start speaking out against it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question since the gentleman brought up the issue of the $87 billion for Iraq. I remember back in the Persian Gulf War where the total cost of the war was about $60 billion, but because we had international cooperation, we only had to spend less than $10 billion, $7.4 billion out of that.

We have already had one supplemental already that was supposed to cover the cost of the war. Now, we are coming back with $87 billion. If we had had the international cooperation, instead of 87 would we not be talking closer to 10, and that is a direct result of this foreign policy?

Mr. CASE. There is no question about it. Certainly, when we did these budget assumptions just some short months ago, when the administration

said that the cost would be $60 billion, maybe a little bit more, the assumption was international cooperation. The assumption was contribution, military assistance, international monetary policy, all of those aspects. Those assumptions were shaky. Those assumptions are part of this $87 billion today and the $87 billion is too low, and the $87 billion is not in these figures that we are talking about. We are assuming more for the $87 billion. We are not even factoring in what might come in the future. This is all part of one ball of wax.

When you run a family budget, you do not take the lowest estimate. When I project my expenses in my family, yeah, there is a temptation, sure, there is a tremendous temptation to take the lowest possible estimate. We all know that that is not responsible. You take a responsible estimate, you add yourselves a little safety factor, and then you go on into the future feeling that you have at least covered reasonable exigencies.

We are not doing that in this budget. We are not doing it, and yet we are still in trouble. That is the dilemma here. We cannot have it both ways. We all know it. We just have to wake up to it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for fighting for fiscal sanity.

At this point, I would yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) who has been a stalwart, helping other Members every Wednesday morning, helps us with the seminar on budgeting and other important issues. The gentleman from North Carolina has been working diligently on fiscal sanity, helping us to learn about the budget, bringing in speakers from the outside and I am delight to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our colleague from Virginia for taking out this special order and for focusing attention again this evening, as he has so often in the past, on our country's economy and our fiscal meltdown which so threatens that economy in the future.

I also want to commend the gentleman from Hawaii, who talked very persuasively about the need to wake up and to speak out and to confront the situation that we face.

I am sure that I am not alone in the experience I had during the August work period in the town meetings I held in my District, and these meetings were held in some blue collar areas. They were held in some upscale, very affluent suburbs. They were held all over the 4th District of North Carolina, and I was struck at every one of those meetings, it was the economy that was the number one item on people's minds, and so many of those people were unemployed, and they often had very good training but they talked about having 100 or 200 people applying for every job they went after, and they talked about friends and family members and neighbors who are nearing desperation as they seek for work in this economy.

They ask why are we not doing more to turn this economy around? Is that not why we count on government to have a sound fiscal policy and to intervene when the economy needs a boost?

I said to my constituents, I don't have a single, simple answer to the economy's challenges, but I do know that this economy is in trouble, and I also know that we could be and should be doing a great deal more than we are doing to get this economy turned around.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I would ask the gentleman if he noticed that there is a problem, is the gentleman concerned that this administration does not even recognize that there is a problem?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned that the administration does not recognize the problem, but when we look at the administration's record, we would think the economy would be agenda item number one with them as well.

The private sector has shed 3.3 million jobs since January 2001 when President Bush took office. That is the worst record for any President since the Great Depression. Our long-term unemployment has almost tripled in this country. Real GDP growth, the growth of the economy has averaged 1.6 percent. That is the worst performance since World War II. Real business investment has fallen 10 percent since the President was inaugurated. That is the worst economic record for any President since World War II. Our trade gap has increased to almost $100 billion. Do we need anymore indications that this economy is in trouble?

We are also running record deficits. The gentleman from Virginia and others tonight have talked in alarming terms, properly alarming terms, about the fiscal reversal we have suffered with a $5.6 trillion surplus in view when the President took office, now going way over $2 trillion in further debt. That is an almost $9 trillion reversal now, the largest in our country's history.

We might ask ourself is there any justification for the kind of deficits that we are running, and I think the answer is no, but we could at least take some comfort if we thought that we were getting some economic stimulus for all that deficit spending and for those huge deficits and the mounting debt, and yet who can say that this medicine is working. In fact, the evidence is pretty clear that it is not working.

In fact, the President has picked some of the measures that are least likely to stimulate the economy, such as the tax cut on dividends, for example. That produces a grand total of 11 cents for every dollar in lost revenue in terms of economic stimulus, and he has turned his back on some of the most effective measures such as the kind of extension of unemployment benefits that we have typically done in situations like this. This gives us $1.76 for every dollar we spend in terms of economic stimulus, and yet he turns his back on that. He champions these upper-bracket tax cuts. Yet all the analyses show that is one of the poorest ways to stimulate the economy. So we have the worst of both worlds.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by that the gentleman means for every dollar in lost revenue, what effect does that have on the GDP, and whether or not you actually stimulated the economy, and what did you say for, if you extend unemployment compensation, for those that lost their jobs, as we usually do in a recession, end of 26 weeks, we extend it another 13 weeks just routinely, how much of a stimulus is that to the economy?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The figure I recall is about $1.76. That is because people who are in those straits are trying to support their families and tide themselves over until they can get work. So they are going to turn around and spend that money immediately.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. For every dollar in lost revenue, you stimulate the economy about a dollar seventy?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. That is right.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what did you say about stimulating the economy by reducing the tax on dividends?

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Eleven cents. Eleven cents. That is the stimulus you get for every dollar of lost revenue.

So there must be some other reason, do you not think, for that tax cut on dividends and for those tax cuts on the wealthiest people in this country. For people making over $1 million, tax cuts that average about $88,000 a year, and yet that money is largely not going to be used as an economic stimulus.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. When you fund the tax cuts with borrowed money, you have to pay interest on the national debt which is a drag to the economy.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Absolutely. That is money down a rat hole as the gentleman very convincingly, maybe did not use quite those elegant terms, but that is what the gentleman said earlier. That is money anybody in this body could think of better public and private uses for than simply interest on the national debt.

So the economy is in sad shape, and we are getting the worst of both worlds. We are not getting an economic stimulus that is anything like what we should be getting, and yet we are over the cliff fiscally. We are undergoing a fiscal reversal that will take us and our children decades to grow out of.

The unemployment numbers are graphically demonstrated here. The unemployment rate now from a very, very low figure in early 2001, now up in the range of 6 percent, hovering here

for months now, and there are a few scattered economic indicators that are looking somewhat better, but the term ''jobless recovery'' has entered the lexicon because there certainly are not many jobs being produced.

What I heard at my district at every meeting I had in August was that this is not just an abstract economist estimate. This is something that is affecting the real lives of real people. They are nearing desperation, and this actually underestimates the problem because there are many, many people who have good training, good experience, and yet they are taking lower-end jobs now that really cut their standard of living. So it is a tremendous challenge for our country, and one that I believe this administration barely senses.

□ 2215

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman points out, economists are trying to pull this apart to understand how this perfect storm occurred. This will be the subject of economic studies for years to come, but one thing that is already apparent and will be apparent is this is not something that just happened to America; this was something that was created. It was created by the budget resolutions of 2001 and 2002 and 2003 and the appropriations and the tax bills that fulfilled those budget resolutions.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We have had an economic downturn that was more severe than expected, and 9–11 and homeland security expenses and expenses associated with the war on terrorism. Those demands needed to be met, and they will continue to be met. But the large tax cuts aimed mainly at the upper-bracket taxpayers, I think that counts as self-inflicted damage. It was justified 2 years ago because we had surplus money, supposedly, and now it is being repackaged as a stimulus even though it has very little stimulative effect. It mocks the idea of self-sacrifice, and that is the centerpiece of this President's economic policy.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I think the deficit has now become the centerpiece of his economic policy.

If we look at the administration's projection over the next 6 and 7 years, on the deficit going out to the year 2011, they actually borrow money every year consistently regardless of how big or how small the deficit will be from the Social Security surplus. Every year that is done. To mask the size of the deficit, they must borrow from the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. They borrow the Social Security surplus and the Medicare surplus. And depending on which projections are used, they are spending substantially more money than that every year, creating huge deficits and a $9 trillion turnaround, paying off the entire national deficit, to massive deficits and new debt and new interest on the national debt for years to come.

Mr. EMANUEL. And the irony is as these deficits mount, tuition costs are rising 11 to 15 percent annually, and the ability of college assistance like the Pell grants, which once represented two-thirds of college cost, today represents less than a third with no ability to increase that. Health care inflation is running at an average of 15 to 25 percent, and there are no resources to deal with the two most important factors driving health care costs up, that is, we now have a record uninsured of 45 million, and we have prescription drug costs running 15 to 70 percent increases. Those are contributing factors to the increase in health care inflation. Those two factors in my view are creating tremendous pressure on the middle class of this country. We do not have the resources or the means nor a plan to deal with them. The deficit will tie our hands and tie the Nation's ability to address the very things that are squeezing on the middle class family's budget.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the deficit ties our hands not in some theoretical way. This is very real money borrowed, mostly borrowed from other countries, from other governments and individuals overseas.

I was talking with someone from my district who was proudly telling me about how much money he is saving for his children's college education. But what he was not thinking about was how quickly his share of the national debt was growing. In fact, it turns out it is growing faster than what he is saving for his children's college education. So in a very real sense, these self-inflicted wounds, as you described the budget policies of the past 3 years, are taking this family's college savings away from them.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, to add to that point, we have 45 million uninsured folks in this country with no health insurance. The bulk of them work. We have a pension crisis and retirement plan crisis where there are $330 billion in arrears in private retirement plans. We have college education where families face a choice, take a second mortgage on their home, or the child is guaranteed to graduate $30,000 to $40,000 in the hole because they borrowed to go to college. And then we have the Nation's deficit on top of that which ties our hands and our ability to meet the needs of middle class families, whether their parents are retiring, health care needs to their own families and children, as well as the education of their children.

I believe that the deficit if we look at how it grows over a period of time is actually a ticking time bomb underneath Social Security and Medicare. In the immediate time, we are not able to afford the basic services and needs that our government provides in helping families meet the dreams that they have for their children, providing health care and education so they too can do what their parents have done and build a better future for their children.

So the deficit, although sometimes we want to ridicule it and people call it an abstract thing, people understand the consequences of the deficit as they try to do what they try to do for their own family and children. They cannot afford their health care and college education; and they are scared out of their wits when they come to retire, neither Social Security nor the plan they thought they had through their employer will be there. I think people understand that the deficit is in fact damaging the ability of both their government today and their own plans for tomorrow to be met.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. And people certainly understand when the claim is made that the deficit spending is for economic recovery. They are very quick to see the hollowness of that promise because it clearly is not having that effect. In fact, it is deepening our problems. It has an impact on long-term interest rates.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in 2½ years, we have added $2.5 trillion to the Nation's debt and 2.5 million Americans have lost their jobs. As Ronald Reagan used to say, facts are a stubborn thing, quoting former President John Adams. In the short order of 2½ years, 2.5 million Americans have lost their jobs, 45 million Americans are without health insurance. $1 trillion worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on, and 2 million Americans have come out of the middle class to poverty, and we have added $2.5 trillion to the Nation's deficit. A record like that is starting to give mismanagement a bad name.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, a newspaper article put this in perspective for me. The writer pointed out when the President went before the American public a week ago to say that he would be asking for $87 billion this year to pay for rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan, and that would require some sacrifice, the writer pointed out that those who are being asked to make the sacrifice did not hear the President because they had already been put to bed by their parents. It is those children who will bear that burden, who will be asked to make that sacrifice and not just for rebuilding Iraq and Afghanistan; it is for this multi-trillion tax cut to one segment of our society.

Mr. EMANUEL. It is interesting that the President's request for rebuilding Iraq has a $2 billion request for Iraq's electric grid, and it was America with the blackout. In our energy bill, we say we do not have the money to invest in our own electric grid.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, this did not have to be. There are historical examples of other kinds of leadership. This chart indicates where we have been with the deficit and for a brief couple of years the surplus in this country as a result of some courageous decisions that were taken

in this body and by the first President Bush who displayed leadership qualities which unfortunately seem to be missing at the White House right now.

There was a budget agreement in 1990 concluded on bipartisan terms, and then a budget passed entirely with Democratic votes in 1993; the economy responded positively to that discipline and it thrived in the 1990s, and we got out of deficit spending and ran $400 billion in surpluses and paid off a chunk of that national debt. Just think what would be the case if we could have continued on that path.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the projection was by 2011 and 2013, we would have paid off the entire national debt and had no interest on the national debt to pay year after year.

Mr. HOLT. I seem to recall standing here on the floor with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) 3 years ago saying that the majority should not be so quick to spend this surplus. They began salivating at the sight of this projected surplus. I recall my friends here saying number one, it is projected; number two, things happen. We should not spend it all down. We should not give it all back in tax cuts; there might be some unforeseen events. Well, indeed there were. It happened on September 11; it happened with a stock market bubble popping. We were caught unprepared because the budget allowed absolutely no leeway. It was built on the most optimistic of circumstances and predictions, as well as, I would say, the greediest of ingredients.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Just to add to the gentleman's thought, we got off of a disciplined path toward debt reduction. Whatever else we did in the way of new investments or tax cuts, we certainly should have reserved a certain amount of that anticipated revenue to protect Social Security in the future and to protect ourselves against exactly the kind of eventuality we are now facing.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for a helpful discussion. As we face this $87 billion supplemental appropriations request, of course, we will do the right thing by our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and meet our international obligations, but we will and we should ask some tough questions of this administration for an accounting of where we have been thus far and where we are going, and above all, how we are going to pay for this and how this fits in with the overall fiscal health of the country we love.

Mr. HOLT. The gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) said it very well, it would be easier for us to deal with this with the $87 billion, with all of the economic problems facing us, if the leadership here and the leadership down the avenue would level with the American people about how this happened. I think that is what the American people ask, is that their leaders level with them and not just go on as we go further into debt have the leadership say and now we need tax cuts more than ever. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for this very useful discussion.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to end with this chart that reminds people of the hole that we have dug ourselves into. And when people ask what is the Democratic plan, I just point to the green because that was done without any Republican assistance, and here we are right now. As we look at how dire this situation is, we have to look forward to the Social Security situation where we will not enjoy a nice surplus year after year. We are going to have a challenge of deficits in the Social Security plan that we could have covered with just what the 1 percent got in the 2001, not the 2003, not what everybody got, but the top 1 percent got in 2001 would have been more than enough to cover all of this deficit. But we have a challenge with Social Security, and we are going in the wrong direction. I thank all Members that participated tonight because we have to remind people how bad a situation it is.

□ 2230

We can change directions as we did in 1993 and go back to fiscal sanity, go back and do a surplus, pay off the national debt, or we can continue in the direction we are going now. We will make those decisions in the upcoming weeks. I thank the gentlemen for participating.

IRAQ WATCH

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

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to start another of the Iraq Watches that we have been conducting for the past 2 months or so. The first night of each week that we are in session, a group of us come to the floor to talk about Iraq, to talk about the fortunes of our fighting forces and our relief workers who are toiling in that country. We talk about the problems that we see, we suggest changes in our national policy, we ask questions of the administration and seek answers, both for the Congress and for the American people. I have been joined each week, and I will be as well tonight, by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL). We have often been joined by other Members. We would welcome all Members of the House to participate tonight or in future Iraq Watches. Democrats and Republicans are welcome to participate during this hour of discussion.

Mr. Speaker, recently the President has sought $87 billion for fiscal year 2004 to pay for our military operation and reconstruction activities in Iraq. That number is larger than rumored a couple of weeks ago, caught most Members of Congress by surprise, although we knew a big request was coming certainly, on top of the $79 billion requested and approved last April for fiscal year 2003. Many of us feel that we need more information from the administration at this point before dealing with this supplemental request for $87 billion for activities in Iraq. No one in this Congress wants to do anything that hurts the troops in the field. Of all the things going on regarding Iraq, the diplomacy, the reconstruction, the comments about weapons of mass destruction, the comments about our allies, the activities of the Ambassador, Mr. Bremer, of all the things happening in Iraq, the only truly good thing is the behavior of the troops. Our young men and women in uniform have performed brilliantly during the period of time when active warfare was under way and during the period of time after victory was declared by the President but the guerrilla war has continued and over 100 Americans have been attacked and assassinated by those guerrilla warfare tactics in Iraq, the men and women of the Armed Services have really performed brilliantly and have done all Americans proud. So the issue is not whether we support the troops in the field. We all do. Of course we do. And we also want to make sure that we live up to our commitments, that we see this challenge through. Some of us who engage in Iraq Watch, such as myself, voted in favor of the military authority sought by the President last fall. Some of us voted no. But all of us understand, now that the military activity has occurred, we have an obligation to see this process through. We cannot cut and run. We cannot leave Iraq with no functioning government. We cannot leave a vacuum, a power vacuum that would allow the bandits and the bad guys to resume power using the weapons that they have and once again subjugate innocent Iraqi civilians. But in the face of this very large request for $87 billion, about two-thirds of which would go to our military operations and about one-third of which would go to reconstruction costs, many of us in Congress feel that we need more information from the administration.

I would put into three categories the questions that we have and the information we are seeking: The first is simply more information on the cost of our activities, the length of time that the military operations would be expected to continue, the length of time that the reconstruction would last, accurate information regarding the whereabouts of the weapons of mass destruction, the casualty lists of American soldiers wounded and otherwise incapacitated in Iraq. We need more good information about what is happening over there, and we need the full truth about the problems and the bad information that is happening there. The administration has not been as

forthcoming as most of us would like it to be over the past 6 months. And now that an $87 billion request has been made for the upcoming fiscal year, this is the time surely for President Bush to come clean with Congress, to level with the American people, to provide answers to these questions, to provide as much information as possible regarding not only the current activity in Iraq but what he foresees coming down the pike in terms of cost, timetable, manpower needed, resources needed, what the prospects are for being joined by allies and friends. We need more information.

Secondly, related to that but I think a second category, we need a specific plan for what will be happening in Iraq, really in two parts. One for the internationalization, if you will, of the activity there and the second half of the plan would be how to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq. In order to internationalize the operations, we need to turn to our traditional friends and allies, to international organizations such as the United Nations, perhaps NATO, to seek their support, to seek their manpower, to seek their dollars and their resources to help rebuild Iraq, to help empower the people of that country economically and to bring a new government and a new freedom and democracy to the Iraqi people. I do not believe America should try to do that alone. I do not believe we have got the resources to adequately do that when we are facing the huge budget deficits that we already face in this country. We need our friends and allies to be involved. Of course we all remember the virtual stiff-arm that the President gave to our friends and allies in the run-up to the military activity in Iraq. There was an arrogant unilateral approach to our diplomacy, what I called at the time a cowboy diplomacy that indicated to our friends and allies that we did not need their help, that we could go it alone, that they should get out of the way, particularly the old Europe, as the Secretary of Defense characterized it, and allow us to do our thing without a lot of hassle from our pesky allies. Of course it is those ''pesky allies'' that we are going to now, that the President is seeking support from, that the President is hoping by going to the United Nations that he can attract into what seems to be a quagmire in Iraq.

So we need a plan here. We need more than the President saying, we're going to go to the U.N. and seek their support. We need to know how that support will be put together, how much of it we need, how much of it we have a realistic chance of securing, what it will take to get the United Nations fully engaged. It seems to me that one thing it will take is to allow the United Nations to do its job as a peacekeeper and a reconstructor and a redeveloper of nations, as a nation-builder, if you will. Because that is what the United Nations is there for, to nation-build, a concept that was disparaged by the President when he was running for office but a concept that he now embraces, although not by name, as he is urging that America, virtually alone, undertake nation-building in Iraq. Most of us would like to see this process internationalized. We need to see a plan from the President to figure out how to do it, how long it will take and how much it will cost.

The second part of the plan we need is to determine how to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq. It will not be easy to do that. Iraq does not have a tradition of self-government. It does not have a tradition of democracy. I believe that all people in the world are capable of self-government. I think all Members of the Congress believe that, but those that do not have a tradition of it, those that have dealt with powerful elites in their country that have abused average citizens, recognize that they need assistance. They need assistance building the institutions of liberty and democracy, institutions like a free press, institutions like a free and corruption-free court system, institutions such as a civil society, documents like a Constitution, a written Constitution that all members of a country, all groups within a country have a stake in and have a role in determining. All these things have to be accomplished in Iraq and we need to know how to do that, how to build these institutions of liberty.

We need to know a timetable: How long is it likely to take to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq? What will it cost? How much support do we need? How much training must there be? How much do we need to expand the existing interim governing committee that has been created? Who else needs to be involved in establishing that group, to give it more credibility and a greater representation from all segments of Iraq? So we clearly need, after we get more information from the President of the United States and after he develops and gives us a plan for both the internationalization of the reconstruction and how to get Iraqis back in charge of Iraq, the third thing that we need is an exit strategy, when can we leave, how long must we stay and how much will it cost us to do the things that are needed?

As I said at the outset, all of us, whether we voted for or against the war in Iraq, understand now that we have conquered the nation. In a rather crude phrase, we now own the nation. We cannot walk away. We have a moral obligation to see this situation through, to make sure that there is a stable and representative and hopefully democratic government in Iraq before we leave or the Western powers leave. But we also need to know from the President before we vote this $87 billion what that exit strategy is and how long he thinks it will take and what standards we want to accomplish in achieving the status that would allow us to leave. And how will we measure our progress toward that date when we can leave? We have to know where we are going in order to get started. At least I would recommend that. It seems like an awful lot of what has happened in Iraq got started without knowing where we are going and we should not allow that to continue any further. Keep in mind, this war was waged at a time of our choosing and it would seem to me that the American military and the administration would have done a better job with the planning for both the war and the postwar activities. One thing Congress has not done well regarding Iraq in the last year is require that information to be divulged and the plans to be articulated and the exit strategy to be set forth. The one great power Congress has, the one great constitutional power is the power of the purse. We control the pursestrings. We determine how much money is spent. That power ultimately, slowly but ultimately brought the Vietnam War to a close a generation ago. We must exercise that power of the purse now, responsibly, in a way that is true to American ideals, that keeps our commitments to the people of Iraq but nonetheless that clearly sets forth our constitutional requirements and obligations to control the pursestrings, to make sure we know how American taxpayer dollars will be spent and make sure that those dollars are spent pursuant to full information from the White House, a plan from the White House on how to internationalize the reconstruction and how to put Iraqis back in charge of Iraq, and, finally, spending money pursuant to an exit strategy.

□ 2245

When will it end and how will we know that it has ended? I call upon the President to give that information to the Congress in order for us to cast an educated vote on his request for $87 billion.

At this point I have been joined by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), my colleague and senior member from the House Committee on International Relations and an eloquent member of the Iraq Watch. I welcome the gentleman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, good evening, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) again for being the driving force behind our weekly efforts to raise questions that we believe have to be answered to educate the American people and to educate Members of Congress as to what direction prospectively we should undertake.

I think for a moment, though, we should go back and review our earlier call to the President to agree to an independent commission to examine the intelligence that was the basis for American military intervention into Iraq because there continue to be questions raised by senior members of the administration, and if the gentleman will remember, our insistence on an independent commission was to depoliticize such an effort. I think we

had discussed here one evening the possibility of the commission that was chaired by two former Senators, one a highly-respected Republican from New Hampshire, Warren Rudman, and another former Democratic Senator from Colorado, Gary Hart. They chaired a commission which tragically foretold almost in a way that eerily predicted the tragedy that beset America on September 11 and the need to address it.

I think it is important to note that that particular commission filed its report some 8 or 9 months before September 11. In fact, I think the exact date was on February 15, and unfortunately no action was taken on that particular report. I do not mean to suggest that it would have in any way forestalled September 11, but I guess the answer to that rhetorical question is that we will never know if we had acted earlier, both Congress and the Bush-Cheney Administration.

But in any event, that independent commission, for example, would address such questions as to the purported links between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. I believe that most Americans that are conversant with the intelligence have reached the conclusion that there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that would link al Qaeda to Saddam Hussein and that Saddam Hussein had anything to do with September 11. Was he an evil tyrant, a despot that wreaked havoc on his people? Of course. I think there is unanimity among the American people and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle that, yes, the world is better off by having Saddam Hussein out of power. But I think it is important not to just simply accept the fact that there is linkage between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein because, again, most intelligence reports and intelligence analysts have been very clear that no such intelligence exists.

However, this past weekend, I do not know whether the gentleman had an opportunity to hear the Vice President again suggest, not directly but suggest, that somehow Saddam Hussein was behind September 11. He raised the issue, for example, of the ring leader, the operational ring leader of al Qaeda and its attack on September 11, an individual by the name of Mohamed Atta as having met a senior Iraqi intelligence agent in Prague, Czechoslovakia, when our own FBI has indicated that there are documents that establish that Mohamed Atta was, in fact, in the United States during the time involved. And what I found particularly disturbing is that that senior Iraqi intelligence officer whom it was alleged that Mohammed Atta of al Qaeda met with in Prague, Czechoslovakia in April of 2001, 4 or 5 months before September 11, he has been captured. He has been captured by the American military, and media reports indicate that he refuted the claim, that he was very clear, he never met with Mohamed Atta. And all intelligence analysts that have spoken on this particular issue or have had conversations with Members of Congress indicate that there is no basis in fact for that allegation, and yet the Vice President, when interviewed by Mr. Tim Russert on Meet the Press, raises that issue again. I am sure there is confusion among the American people when they read well-respected journals, when they listen to thoughtful programs on these particular issues, and while not without some equivocation, the Vice President of the United States continues to use the Mohamed Atta meeting in Prague as a basis to establish a link between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Certainly.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that there is very little confusion among the American people about that. Unfortunately, the polls show that two thirds of Americans believe that Hussein was behind 9/11, even though as the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly pointed out there is not a shred of evidence that Saddam Hussein, as evil as he is, there is no evidence that he was behind 9/11. But the administration has repeatedly suggested it. The Vice President's television appearance on Sunday was one of a long series of such suggestions. The President himself in his speech of a week ago wanted people to believe that stopping the terrorists in Iraq was part of dealing with the people that have led to 9/11, and it is a repeated theme of the administration, and it is a shame. I can only conclude that it is not only a misleading effort to make a false connection, but it is an intentionally misleading effort, and this is a tough situation. It is tough enough to try to find out what happened. It is very unfortunate that the American people have been fooled in that way. Hussein is bad enough. We should deal with him for his own evil record, and we do not need to fool people or to draw false conclusions, and I commend the gentleman for pointing out in great detail this problem.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there was a report today, a front-page story in my hometown newspaper, the Boston Globe, and just let me read an excerpt. ''Multiple intelligence officials said that the Prague meeting, purported to be between Atta and a senior Iraqi intelligence officer by the name of Ahmed Khalil Ibrahim Samir al-Ani, was dismissed almost immediately after it was reported by Czech officials in the aftermath of September 11 and has since been discredited further. The CIA reported to Congress last year that it could not substantiate the claim while American records indicate Atta was in Virginia Beach, Virginia at the time, the officials said yesterday. Indeed, two intelligence officials said yesterday that Ani himself,'' this senior Iraqi intelligence official, ''now in U.S. custody, has also refuted the report. The Czech Government has also distanced itself from its original claim.

''A senior defense official'' in this particular administration ''with access to high-level intelligence reports expressed confusion yesterday.'' A senior defense official within the administration himself expressed confusion ''over the Vice President's decision to reair charges that have been dropped by almost everyone else.'' He said, ''There isn't any new intelligence that would precipitate anything like this,' the official said, speaking on condition he not be named.''

But this underscores the need to have this independent commission. Again, the prototype is there, the Rudman-Hart Commission that did such an outstanding job in terms of depicting the threat of a terrorist attack against the United States months before September 11, statements like that that were made on Meet the Press create confusion. Let us be clear, there is no one, it would appear, in the administration other than the Vice President that would not agree that this piece of evidence has been discredited. Why create confusion? Let the case for the military intervention rise and fall on the facts. That is all we ask. And as we have said consistently among ourselves during the hour that we spend here, some of us supported the President in terms of the request for a resolution authorizing the military intervention. Others of us disagreed. But let us eliminate the confusion. Let us just get to the truth, the truth with no political overtones, the truth so that the American people can have confidence in the integrity of our intelligence. Let us not continue to reair, as the report in the Globe indicated, a piece of evidence that, yes, this administration relied on substantially as establishing a link that somehow Saddam Hussein was behind 9/11. I mean it is not right, and it is not fair to the American people. I mean prominent antiterrorism experts such as Vincent Cannistraro that many of us have observed on CNN and other news shows and is well-respected among his colleagues, he is a former CIA agent and I am quoting him, said that Cheney's ''willingness to use speculation and conjecture as facts in public presentations is appalling. It's astounding.''

□ 2300

Well, I do not know, but I do know this: this underscores the need to depoliticize as we go into a Presidential campaign a review of the intelligence in the information that led this administration to launch a war. And that received considerable support from Congress.

Because today at a hearing in the Committee on International Relations, a subcommittee hearing on the Middle East, Undersecretary John Bolton stated that, relative to Syria, all options were on the table, including regime change. And that was the position of the President and the administration. He was testifying relative to Syria and its weapons of mass destruction. So I

presume that includes a military option.

Is this administration going to have any credibility if it goes before the international community and indicates that we will exercise that military option in the case of Syria? And what about North Korea? What about Iran?

We have got to sustain our credibility. And the best way to do it is to have an independent commission comprised of prominent Americans whose credibility is unimpeached, who are not, as we all are, impacted or influenced by the politics of an election campaign, whether we be Democrat or whether we be Republican. The American people have a right to the unvarnished truth.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, before we introduce some colleagues that have joined us, I want to echo the gentleman's comments and join his call for an independent commission to review the intelligence that was collected and analyzed before we went to war and to review the use that that intelligence was put to.

I can tell this House that I attended a briefing with about 20 Members of the House, a bipartisan group on October 2, 2002, at the White House in the Roosevelt Room where George Tenet and Condoleezza Rice briefed this bipartisan group of Members.

And the representations were made by those two leading members of the administration that with complete certainty they were sure that Saddam Hussein had an active weapons of mass destruction program, that he had an active biological weapon component, an active chemical weapons component, that he was restarting a nuclear component, that he was quite likely to be giving these weapons to terrorists and the rest. And there was no uncertainty expressed whatsoever.

We have now learned, as reports have been declassified, that the White House was being told in a September, 2002, Defense Intelligence Agency report and in an October, 2002, National Intelligence Estimate that there was great uncertainty among the intelligence agencies, including Mr. Tenet's CIA.

The parts that had been declassified have been reported in the press, phrases such as ''no credible evidence existing of an Iraqi chemical weapons program.''

I have read those reports that the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has made available to Members that have not yet been declassified.

While none of us are free to quote what we have seen, we can talk about our conclusions. And just as the published reports have indicated, what I read was full of uncertainties, expressed hesitations, ''we are not sure about this,'' ''we are not sure about that.'' But that is not at all what the administration figures were telling Congress in private briefings or to the American people in public statements, repeated as recently as Sunday, as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) said, the Vice President repeated.

So we need a bipartisan, independent commission to study the intelligence and its usage before the fighting started in Iraq, because it is hard to conclude anything other than the Congress and the American people were not told the full truth; that we were told things existed with complete certainty, that the administration was telling them that, when in fact when they were making those claims there was great uncertainty.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) to share a few words.

Mr. STRICKLAND. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I was standing here listening to the gentleman, and I am thinking to myself, these are very serious accusations; that this administration, this President, his staff, were not fully candid with the American people, and consequently we find ourselves in a situation where today the polls tell us that a vast majority of the American people believe that Saddam Hussein was in some way responsible for what happened on September 11, 2001. There is no credible evidence to support that conclusion. The President needs to say so.

I watched Vice President CHENEY on television this past Sunday. I was stunned that even at this time, after the evidence is so crystal clear, he is still holding on to these, what I would consider, fabrications. The American people I think can be trusted with the truth. But without the truth, the American people simply do not know where to go for the truth or who to believe.

Now, I was listening to the two of you earlier in my apartment, and I wanted to come over and share something that I think is relevant to this discussion, at least in a tangential way.

Earlier today, I was over on the Senate side participating in a House-Senate joint committee meeting of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The national commander of the American Legion gave testimony to us today, and he told us what we all know, that we are underfunding VA health care by $1.8 billion.

Now, I think it is relevant, because the President has recently come to us and he has asked for $87 billion additional, on top of what has already been appropriated for fiscal year 2003. $87 billion.

As the gentleman has said and we all believe, we will do whatever we must do to care for our troops, to make sure they have adequate equipment and protection, and I understand $300 million to $400 million of that request from the President is to perhaps purchase body armor for our soldiers, armor that I think they should have had a long time ago, because, as I shared not many nights ago on this floor, I got a letter from a young soldier in Baghdad saying that the men in his group were concerned that they had cheap armor that was incapable of stopping bullets; and they wondered why they could not have the best protection possible under the circumstances.

But, anyway, of this $87 billion, a large part of it will go to providing for our troops, and we want to support that; but approximately $20 billion, my understanding is, approximately $20 billion is for the reconstruction of Iraq.

The question that I think the American people should be asking the President and this Congress is what are your priorities? Why is it so easy to ask for multiple billions of dollars for Iraq and for the rebuilding of Iraq, when we are underfunding our most basic needs here at home, veterans health care, by $1.8 billion?

If there are veterans listening, they may think STRICKLAND can't be telling the truth. This President would certainly not take such a position with VA health care. I would just encourage them perhaps to contact their veterans service organizations, the VFW, the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Vietnam Vets. All of these groups know what is happening to VA health care.

□ 2310

It just troubles me that we seem so willing to ask for so much for Iraq and for other places around this world and yet we are neglecting the most basic needs at home. And surely, if we are going to set priorities, we should put the American needs first and other needs second or third or fourth.

So I just wanted to point that out. I think it is appropriate that we ask the administration these questions: what are you going to do with that money? And one more thing before I stop. Mr. Speaker, before this last request for $87 billion, a lot of money had already been spent in Iraq, and my understanding is the Halliburton Corporation, the former employer of Vice President CHENEY, received an unbid contract in the range of $1.7 billion. I think it is appropriate that we ask the President to commit to us that if we approve this funding that he has asked for, that none of it, absolutely not a dollar of it will go to corporations, Halliburton or any other corporation under an unbid process. The American people need to know that the tax dollars they pay and the money that is appropriated for these needs are spent wisely, and we ought to have an open, transparent process. No more of this unbid contract stuff that leaves us wondering, at least I am wondering, whether or not there was some deal, whether or not there was some sweetheart arrangement that enabled this company or some other company to get access to large amounts of American tax dollars without having to go through a competitive bidding process.

I think that is the least the administration can do, is to make that commitment to us.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues allowing me to participate tonight. I will stick around and listen to what else is going to be said here. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, as always. We have been joined by our colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here. I just want to relate to my colleagues a couple of communications that I was very impressed with that I got in the last 2 days. The first was from a letter from a marine who is from Colfax, Washington, who was very early in the operation in Iraq, who is now recovering in Colfax after he was involved in an incident where a tank basically slid off a road and came down and crushed and killed the Marine standing right next to him and totally crushed this Marine's leg. They thought they were going to have to take it off. He has kept it, and he is now trying to get some weight back on it and he is recovering. It was a remarkable letter I got from him because he talked with great pride about his service. He talked about his feeling for the Iraqi people, and he talked about the importance of the prayers and condolences he has received from all over the country. He got letters from all over the country helping him get through this time of crisis. And it was really heartening just trying to read this letter in the midst of what we have been talking about, about substantial controversy about what happened in Iraq, to read a letter from somebody who felt so proud of his service and is still in the recovery mode. Our prayers and thoughts are with him. And I will not mention his name because he is a humble person, so I will not mention his name tonight.

The second communication was on absolutely the opposite end of the spectrum of at least how I viewed the communication, and that was a communication from the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, who went to Iraq a few weeks ago and toured Iraq. He was asked in Iraq, Mr. Secretary, what did you find about the weapons of mass destruction upon which you based a war, upon which you sent thousands of Americans, hundreds of whom are never going to come home and many, many are going to come home to a disability they are never going to recover from. And his answer was stunning to me. He said, you know what? I was just too busy. I did not ask about that.

Here is an official of the administration who sent our sons and daughters to war based on a premise which has obviously turned out to be false from the information we have today, who went to Iraq and who was apparently so embarrassed about this failure, this massive failure of intelligence that this administration was responsible for on multiple occasions, and he said he was too busy to ask about our search for weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. In fact, we have 1,500 people at least who have been scouring Iraq for months now to try to find evidence of weapons of mass destruction and have not turned up a gram of weapons of mass destruction.

To me, this administration has some answering to do to the American people, and this body of the U.S. Congress has an obligation to get to the bottom of why this false information led us into a war. That is why I am proud to say I am one of the Members calling for a bipartisan, bicameral investigation, led by a prominent Republican, to find out why our sons and daughters were sent into war based on this faulty information. We have an obligation to get to the bottom of that, not only for our soldiers and sailors who are at risk, but for the future of our future security efforts.

When we deal with Iran, when we face the challenge in Iran, which is a real nuclear threat, with a real nuclear program; in North Korea, which is a real nuclear threat with a real nuclear program, we cannot go to the international community under this cloud of suspicion. We must peel it away, we must get light, we must remove this wound to our Nation's credibility, and we need this commission to get that done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell my colleagues I am just astounded by what I heard this weekend from the Vice President, realizing that it is a tough job that we are in. But I was just shocked and I want to quote what I am told he said. I did not see the interview, but I am told he said in part, he said, ''So what we do on the ground in Iraq, our capabilities here are being tested in no small measure. But this is the place where we want to take on the terrorists,'' meaning Iraq. ''This is the place where we want to take on those elements that have come against the United States.''

After we have had 1,500 people scouring Iraq for months, and the intelligence service that reported to us that the two highest al Qaeda people we had in captivity told us they did not have anything to do with Saddam Hussein, because they did not trust him because he is a seculist and they are fundamentalist Islamists; the Vice President of the United States stands for the American people and said we are just going to go after al Qaeda in Iraq. Where is the shame? We have to get to the bottom of this.

I want to make one more comment about what we are in right now. This is history, but it is something that we have to peel back to find out what happened, and that is where we go from here. I think there is some responsibility now. No matter how we got into this, there is a mess in Iraq. But I want to point out that the difficulty we face in mobilizing support for this is in part because of the administration's failure to level with the American people at the beginning about what this project was going to cost.

I was just at a charity event and I ran into a gentleman who works for the American Society of Civil Engineers. He showed me this report card that the Society of Civil Engineers just did about the status of American infrastructure in this country, and they basically gave a grade to all of our infrastructure: our bridges, our roads; wastewater had a D, drinking water had a D, dams a D, solid waste, C plus, hazardous waste, D plus, energy, D plus. Basically, America's infrastructure, GPA, D plus, with a backlog of investment needs of $1.6 trillion, $1.6 trillion to fix our electrical system and our roads and our bridges and our schools. But this President cannot afford to do it when he wants the taxpayers to shell out $20 billion for the infrastructure of Iraq, because he will not give up the tax cuts that have jeopardized our ability to move forward in this country. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, the estimates that we as Members of Congress were provided by the administration. If my colleagues remember, the head of the office of OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, which is an arm of the White House, informed us that the cost of the war was going to be $50 billion. Well, the truth, and this is what the American people have to understand, we are already at $166 billion, and that is the down payment.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman remember that Lawrence Lindsey of the White House Budget Office lost his job when he suggested that the war in Iraq would cost between $100 and $200 billion? And as the gentleman says, that is exactly what it has cost to date, yet he got fired for telling the truth.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But I would say to the gentleman, the truth is, that is a down payment.

Mr. HOEFFEL. That is right.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We are on our way, folks, we are on our way to $1 trillion.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I will yield on that, to my good friend from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE) and a member of Iraq Watch.

Mr. HOEFFEL. The occasionally late, but always eloquent and passionate member from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Well, that is because we are bringing the hammer of inquiry down on the anvil of truth here, or the anvil of inquiry for sure.

□ 2320

The anvil of inquiry for sure. Part of what we are being asked to do and what you have been discussing tonight has to do with the new payment, the latest, I should say, the latest payment. But think about what happens when the Secretary of Defense says, oh, we are making progress, when the delegation from the Congress of which I

was a part was the first to enter, actually enter Baghdad after the attack on Baghdad was over.

Remember, they had a group went in and stayed at the Baghdad airport. They came in. We drove in. We came down that long road from the airport into Baghdad. The last delegation that just went had to be flown from the airport into the compound where Mr. Bremer is and where the troops are because they cannot go on that road any more. I remember coming in this road. I said, We are going to have to have 10,000 troops just to guard the road in from the Baghdad airport because you have the road and you have desert and that means you can come in. Remember, I called upon Thomas Edwards Lawrence, T.E. Lawrence, where is your spirit? Where are you now that we need you? Because you cannot guard that road. All it takes is a cell phone and a trigger mechanism to be able to attack these vehicles.

So when you talk $66 billion or however you want to break this down, and I hope that we are going to break this down before we vote any money for this, we have to take into account you will need thousands and thousands of troops, longer and longer time at greater expense than even has been mentioned here tonight just to guard the road.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if you saw ''Meet the Press'' this last Sunday, but again the Vice President refuted the need that was expressed by the Army Chief of Staff, General Shinseki, that several hundred thousand troops were necessary to bring stability. We have what would appear to be a position that is intransigent, that is in denial, if you will.

If I can for just one moment bring something up that I found particularly ironic, Secretary of State Colin Powell this past week visited Halabja, which is where some 5,000 Kurdish Iraqis lost their lives because of the use of chemical weapons by Saddam Hussein. The Secretary asserted that in this little farming town nestled in Iraq's barren northern mountains, this was ample evidence that former President Saddam Hussein's government possessed weapons of mass destruction and justified, and justified the U.S. decision to go to war. That occurred in 1988 and it was despicable. And what should have occurred was the international community should have responded at that point in time, convened a war crimes tribunal, affected the arrest of Saddam Hussein and brought him to justice for that.

The President at that time was this President Bush's father, or rather in 1988 it was President Reagan. The now-Secretary of State was the then-National Security Advisor to President Reagan.

I find such irony in that because it was many of the same individuals who approached Saddam Hussein to indicate that they were tilting towards the Saddam Hussein regime in its war against Iran. It is the now-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld who is the special envoy who went and shook the hand of that thug Saddam Hussein in 1982. He was then taken off the terrorist list; Saddam Hussein was taken off the terrorist lists, and that opened up opportunities for the Iraqi regime.

In 1984 full diplomatic relationships were opened between the United States and Iraq. In 1986, in 1986 we installed an embassy in Baghdad. The American people should know that. In 1988, in 1988 this heinous crime was committed against the Iraqi Kurds in the town of Halabja, and here we are some 15 years later hearing the Secretary of State suggest that this was the evidence, the predicate, if you will, to our intervention.

Now, the story does not end there. The story does not end there. Because it was the President's father, the Bush administration according to a Congressional Research Report that blocked congressional action, that blocked congressional action to impose sanctions on Iraq for committing that crime against the Iraqi people.

Let me read because I think it is important that the American people hear this. I have never heard it stated. This is our own Congressional Research Service, an independent body: ''In late 1988 after reports that Iraq had used chemical weapons against the Kurds, the Senate on September 9 passed by voice vote to impose financial and trade sanctions and severe restrictions on the transfer of technology to Iraq. On September 27, the House passed a bill by a vote of 388 to 16; but the bill was not taken up by the Senate. The bill would have prohibited sales to Iraq of any munitions-listed items and called on the President to place import and export restrictions on Iraq, end credit and loan guarantees, and oppose multi-lateral assistance to that country if Iraq did not stop using chemical weapons and agree to international inspections.''

Similarly, in May through July of 1990, just before the first Gulf War, the administration helped block action or defeat several measures in both Houses that would have restricted U.S. sales credits, loan guarantees, insurance support in international lending institutions, and trade preferences for Iraq.

The administration helped block action. Of course we knew that he used chemical weapons. In 1990 we knew. And what did we do about it then? We blocked congressional action, the then-administration blocked congressional action.

So the irony of the Secretary of State being in Halabja and suggesting that that was the predicate for military intervention, what irony.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I want to posit a reason why the administration is trying to reach back for this, for a justification for this war. And the reason is they refused to recognize that they used false information to lead this Nation into a war, and they have two options at this point. One is to stonewall and search for any justification they have, and now they are focusing on something that happened in 1988 during the previous Bush administration or shortly before that administration.

What they should be doing is embracing our approach, which is to find out why this happened. We think the President should be looking for the people in the administration and holding them accountable for why when they find out why this happened.

□ 2330

He ought to be on our side trying to find out why the administration let down the American people, but no, no. Instead, they want to stonewall this. Stonewalling is not an answer to help this country move forward into how we are going to solve this problem, but it is an indication of what problem the administration has.

This administration has always wanted to sugarcoat this war for the American people and think it was going to be roses and tax cuts for the whole way. It is about time the administration started talking the truth.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I think our time is probably at an end.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening. The Iraq Watch will be back next week.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STENHOLM, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, September 17 and 18.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. CHOCOLA, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today and September 17 and 18.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and September 17 and 18.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and September 17.

Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 17, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4278. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) of the Base Support Services of Naval Surface Warfare/Weapons Centers in Carderock, MD and Philadelphia, PA; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4279. A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of a decision to implement performance by the Most Efficient Organization (MEO) of the Naval Air Systems Command Headquarters Administrative Support and Patuxent Administrative Support in Mechanicsville, MD; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4280. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting appropriations reports containing OMB cost estimates for P.L. 108-69; to the Committee on the Budget.

4281. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting an annual report to the President and to the Congress on the audit of the Telecommunications Development Fund, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. 614; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4282. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4283. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), 50 U.S.C. 1730(c) and 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4284. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report detailing payments made to Cuba as a result of the provision of telecommunications services pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses, and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6); to the Committee on International Relations.

4285. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 17-03 which informs you of our intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Concerning the Development of the Future Fire Control System (FFCS) for Multiple Launch Rocket System (MLRS) Upgrades between the United States and the United Kingdom as pursuant to Executive Order 11958, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

4286. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States be transmitted to the Congress within a sixty day period after the execution thereof as specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4287. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's Commercial Activities Inventory and Inherently Governmental Inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4288. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the budget request for the Office of Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, for fiscal year 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4289. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a report of activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1997f; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4290. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter concerning grants made under the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act of 2000 (Pub L. 106-561) to improve forensic science services, pursuant to Public Law 106-561, section2806(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4291. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Twenty-Fifth Annual Report to Congress and the activities during Fiscal Year 2002 as pursuant to section 7A of the Clayton Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 18a(j); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4292. A letter from the chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's Fiscal Year 2005 Budget Estimates Request to OMB, pursuant to Public Law 93-633; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations.

4293. A letter from the Secretaries, Departments of Defense and Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the evaluation of the Medicare Subvention Demonstration Project for Military Retirees entitled ''Evaluation of the Medicare-DoD Subvention Demonstration: Final Report,'' pursuant to Public Law 105-33, section 4015; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 or rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–270, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2152. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 5 years the special immigrant religious worker program (Rept. 108–271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1945. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide financial assistance to the States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Idaho for salmon habitat restoration projects in coastal waters and upland drainages, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108–272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 370. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 7) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for charitable contributions by individuals and businesses, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–273). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Education and the Workforce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 7 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 or rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 7. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than September 16, 2003.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 3084. A bill to amend the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 to extend the deadline for filing a claim to December 31, 2004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LEE, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. CARDOZA):

H.R. 3085. A bill to improve graduation rates by authorizing the Secretary of Education to make grants to improve adolescent literacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H.R. 3086. A bill to increase penalties for obstruction of justice and false statements in terrorism cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3087. A bill to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of

the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, the Budget, Ways and Means, and Science, 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. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BAKER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GRAVES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUINN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MICA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BURNS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. NEY, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 3088. A bill to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, the Budget, Ways and Means, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3089. A bill to establish a program to assist States and local governments for the conduct of electronic governance transactions at libraries and elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for eligibility for coverage of home health services under the Medicare Program on the basis of a need for occupational therapy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3091. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to restore child's insurance benefits in the case of children who are 18 through 22 years of age and attend postsecondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NUNES, Mr. KIND, Mr. OSE, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CASE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3092. A bill to provide grants for law enforcement training and equipment to combat methamphetamine labs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire):

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish a national uniform multiple air pollutant regulatory program for the electric generating sector; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. FROST, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. RENZI, Mr. COLE, Mr. MICA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish standards of access to care for veterans seeking health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE:

H.R. 3095. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to make sure the rules of etiquette for flying the flag of the United States do not preclude the flying of flags at half mast when ordered by city and local officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EHLERS:

H.R. 3096. A bill to provide for the establishment of the position of Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend the Federal Education Right to Privacy Act to improve the access of the victims of crimes to information concerning the outcome of disciplinary proceedings by institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3099. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to establish a pilot program for lending to small, nonprofit child care businesses; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3100. A bill to provide health benefits for workers and their families; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Government Reform, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 3101. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a precious metals investment option in the Thrift Savings Fund; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3102. A bill to utilize the expertise of New Mexico State University, the University of Arizona, and Northern Arizona University in conducting studies under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 in connection with the grazing allotments and range and continuing range analysis for National Forest System lands in New Mexico and Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RYUN of Kansas (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. LYNCH):

H.R. 3103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for the purchase of hearing aids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. REYES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3104. A bill to provide for the establishment of campaign medals to be awarded to members of the Armed Forces who participate in Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself and Mr. PETRI):

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution recognizing the National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association for reaching its 100th Anniversary, and for the many vital contributions of its members to the Nation's economy and to improving the quality of life through the constantly expanding roles stone, sand, and gravel serve in the Nation's everyday life; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution urging observance of Global Family Day; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. ROSS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FORD, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. WAMP):

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution honoring the life of Johnny Cash; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mr. SHIMKUS):

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution honoring the commitment of the individuals participating in the Free Our People March and Rally; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MUSGRAVE (for herself, Mr. BELL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SOUDER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. WEXLER):

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the

United States should actively support Taiwan's membership in the United Nations and other international organizations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MANZULLO (for himself, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H. Res. 368. A resolution honoring the Small Business Administration on the occasion of its 50th anniversary; to the Committee on Small Business. Considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BUYER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HILL, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. CHOCOLA):

H. Res. 369. A resolution expressing the profound sorrow of the House of Representatives for the death of Indiana Governor Frank O'Bannon and extending thoughts, prayers, and condolences to his family, friends, and loved ones; to the Committee on Government Reform. Cconsidered and agreed to.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 371. A resolution commending the people and the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for their political reform efforts and wishing them continued success in their democratization efforts; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. GUTIERREZ introduced a bill (H.R. 3105) for the relief of Elvira Arellano; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 102: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 106: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 121: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 284: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BELL, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 299: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 303: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 316: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 339: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 348: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 384: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 432: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 571: Mr. HAYES, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 574: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.
H.R. 652: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 713: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 714: Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 728: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 792: Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 804: Mr. CARDOZA.
H.R. 852: Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 854: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 857: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 869: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 918: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 920: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 968: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 980: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1179: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 1229: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 1231: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 1285: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1294: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1310: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1336: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. BOEHNER.
H.R. 1345: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1381: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1385: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1394: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1414: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1508: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 1547: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1563: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1622: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1639: Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 1653: Mr. HONDA and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1660: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1662: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
H.R. 1690: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1692: Mr. PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 1695: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1731: Mr. CASE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1738: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 1813: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1819: Mr. WAMP, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1828: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1900: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FARR, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. WU, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HILL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KIND, Mr. OBEY, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BERRY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 1906: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1939: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1964: Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 1993: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2008: Mr. BASS.
H.R. 2032: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 2034: Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 2047: Mr. CARDIN.
H.R. 2094: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2096: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GERLACH, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2133: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2157: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. MAJETTE, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2173: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2181: Mr. VISCLOSKY and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 2198: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2201: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 2224: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 2232: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2269: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
H.R. 2347: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2353: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2361: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2365: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2404: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 2426: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 2455: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2459: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2490: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2504: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MICHAUD.
H.R. 2527: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 2582: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 2625: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 2626: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 2665: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2677: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2685: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2708: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2709: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 2711: Mr. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2720: Mr. EVANS, Mr. CASE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2727: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2732: Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2735: Mr. BAKER, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2743: Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 2770: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 2781: Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 2787: Ms. BALDWIN and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 2788: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2821: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 2849: Mr. UPTON and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 2850: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 2851: Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 2891: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2898: Mr. WAXMAN and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2900: Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 2905: Mr. FEENEY and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
H.R. 2906: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2908: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2915: Mr. COOPER, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 2929: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 2932: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2934: Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GERLACH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. COLE, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DOOLITTLE,

Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. AKIN, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BONNER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2956: Mr. KIRK, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2998: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GORDON, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. REGULA, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LEACH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PUTNAM, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 3004: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3011: Ms. WATERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. LEE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HALL, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 3012: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3022: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3034: Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3049: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3052: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.

H.R. 3057: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3058: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. HART, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 3063: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 3077: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 3080: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.J. Res. 62: Mr. MICHAUD.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 202: Ms. BORDALLO.

H. Con. Res. 213: Mr. GORDON.

H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H. Con. Res. 247: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mrs. MUSGRAVE.

H. Con. Res. 265: Mr. HOLT and Mr. PLATTS.

H. Res. 103: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H. Res. 157: Mr. WALSH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 320: Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 342: Mr. TAUZIN.

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. 2038: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 2225: Mr. GONZALEZ.