The House met at 9 a.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES
The SPEAKER. 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 25 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for 1 minute.

LIBERAL BIAS IN THE MEDIA
Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, several days ago President Bush observed that “a lot of times there's opinion mixed in with news.” The media generally present a liberal bias. For example, the three major television networks all carry more negative stories about President Bush than positive ones. Two of the country’s largest dailies, The New York Times and The Washington Post, have not endorsed a Republican for President since the 1990s. The few media organizations without a liberal slant do not have nearly as many viewers or readers. For instance, Fox News has less than 1 million viewers while the three network stations have 25 million.

In a democracy we cannot afford anything less than fair and accurate news. The American people with the facts, not without a liberal slant do not have do have a direct interest in that two of the managers in the aforementioned series are my constituents in North Carolina's Sixth Congressional District. Manager Jack McKeon of the Florida Marlins calls Alamance County his home while Boston Red Sox skipper Grady Little hangs his hat in Moore County, known to many Americans as America's golf capital.

I am a long-time Cubs fan, Mr. Speaker, but I compromise my Cubs' loyalty in favor of my constituents, Mr. McKEON. And speaking of the Cubs, I hope the Chicago fans will permit the beleaguered left field fan who is now internationally known to become the beneficiary of goodwill in lieu of hostility. Steve Bartman, by his own admission, is a true-blue solid Cubs fan.

An isolated ill-fated attempt to retrieve a foul ball does not a seven-game series make or break. Other circumstances as well contributed to the Cubs' elimination; so cut Steve Bartman some slack.

While my love for the Cubs caused me some anxiety while cheering for the Marlins, I felt no such discomfort while I was supporting Grady Little and his Bosox, since I am not a Yankee fan.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to focus on the World Series. Strike that. Permit me to focus on the 2004 World Series. Not unlike many American baseball fans, it is my hope that the Red Sox and the Cubs will square off in that series. Even then I may be forced again to relegate my Cubs' loyalty to the shelf in favor of Grady Little. Constituency loyalty, Mr. Speaker, runs deeper and closer to the heart than does baseball loyalty.

Finally, I extend my best wishes to Trader Jack McKeon and his Marlins as they attempt to conquer the Yankees. If this series, unfortunately, results in the Yanks prevailing, I will reluctantly tip my hat to them and to my New York colleagues who serve...
here in the people’s House with me. Insufferable fans though they are, on balance they are pretty good folks. Meanwhile, go Marlings.

WAXMAN AMENDMENT ON H.R. 3289

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the company from which Vice President CHENEY, the sitting Vice President of the United States, the company from which he continues to draw $13,000 a month, Halliburton, is back in the headlines.

The latest example of impropriety from the Vice President’s company comes in the form of price-gouging gasoline in Iraq at the expense of American taxpayers. Halliburton is overcharging United States citizens, as reported in The New York Times, as reported in studies, to the tune of $250 million, a ploy that independent experts have termed simply “highway robbery.”

Here is how their scheme works: Halliburton procures gasoline that they generally get from Kuwait, gasoline that can be bought in the Persian Gulf for 71 cents a gallon. It could be transported to Iraq for no more than 25 cents per gallon. It is brought to the United States, to New York Harbor, for under a dollar. So they buy it for 71 cents; they transport it to Iraq for 25 cents. That brings the total to 96 cents a gallon. Halliburton then adds on its profit margin 2 to 7 percent, bringing the price total to $1.03 a gallon. Yet Halliburton charges the Federal Government, us taxpayers, between $1.62 and $1.72, an extra 60 or 70 cents. That brings the total to 96 cents; they transport it to Iraq for 25 cents. Halliburton then adds on its profit margin 2 to 7 percent, bringing the price total to $1.03 a gallon. Halliburton then adds on its profit margin 2 to 7 percent, bringing the price total to $1.03 a gallon.

To add insult to injury, the American taxpayer subsidizes that cost when it is sold to the Iraqi people for between a nickel and 15 cents a gallon.

My constituents in northeast Ohio remember seeing gas prices skyrocket the afternoon of September 11, 2001, as some gas station owners sought to make profit from a national tragedy. It did not work for them when they tried that kind of war profiteering. Unfortunately, it is working for Halliburton, and my constituents are outraged that Halliburton is making money at our taxpayers’ expense ultimately from a national tragedy.

The Bush administration has asked for an additional $2 billion for the Iraqi oil sector. One billion of that would go to buying gasoline, cooking gas, kerosene, and diesel fuel for Iraq; and it costs about $4 million a day. Halliburton will continue to pocket outrageous, some might say corrupt, profits.

All taxpayers bear the burden of unbid contracts, of price hikes, of inadequate supplies for our troops in Iraq. We are spending $1 billion a week in Iraq. That number will go up as Congress just appropriated last week $87 billion more for Iraq, as we had already appropriated $70 billion before that. We are spending $1 billion a week. A third of that money is going to private contractors. A lot of that money goes to Halliburton and Bechtel, companies close to the President. Companies which are major contributors to the President of the United States in those unbid contracts simply are not accountable.

At the same time, this administration has not been able to supply and to provide for our troops. Not enough safe drinking water for our troops. Too many of them have come down with dysentery. Not enough body armor, Kevlar jackets for our troops. One quarter of them do not have body armor. The administration has said by December, even though they knew they were going to war a year ago, they would finally get the body armor to our troops. All of that against the backdrop of $1 billion a week, $300 million of that going to unbid contracts to companies like Halliburton. And, again, understand, Mr. Speaker, Halliburton is still paying $13,000 a month to the Vice President of the United States.

The private contractors seem to have all the money and supplies they want, but our troops do not. Something is wrong with this picture.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) offered an amendment to cure this gasoline gouging problem, this highway robbery problem where Halliburton has taken $250 million extra from U.S. taxpayers. I cannot understand how Members of this body can support Halliburton as it continues to gouge the U.S. taxpayers. In almost a party-line vote, this House of Representatives rejected the amendment that would have stopped the abuses from Halliburton from the Vice President’s company, that would have stopped this highway robbery.

The administration continues to give Halliburton a free hand to exploit American taxpayers for every last dime they could get. Halliburton should be ashamed. This Congress should be ashamed. The administration should be ashamed for that kind of a ripoff of U.S. tax dollars especially in wartime.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.
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AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BASS) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Tom Nelson, Senior Pastor, Denton Bible Church, Denton, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Could we pray. Our Father in Heaven, You created us. Your law, the edict of Thy very nature is our protection and our guide. Your benevolence continually sustains us. Your grace hath protected us always in the defense of the weak. Guide now these men and women to steer a clear path and to guide our Nation amidst the obstacles of our day. Grant them discernment to perceive the true, the courage to stand in it, and mercy to administer it to all.

And in so doing, may You be pleased and may You lift up the light of Thy countenance upon us. For Your pleasure is our solitary good and our confidence. May evil be winnowed at this our gate and may the sun of Thy favor rise upon us. For it is in Thy saving name that we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey 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.

WELCOMING THE REVEREND TOM NELSON, GUEST CHAPLAIN

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, today is a special day for me and a special day for this House to have our deliberations blessed by the Reverend Tom Nelson.

Born in 1950 in Waco, Texas, Tom grew up in a family of four boys. For higher education, he chose the University of North Texas, my alma mater, where he graduated in 1973.
Reverend Nelson received his calling to the Ministry early and entered Dallas Theological Seminary from 1977 to 1982 while he was Associate Pastor at Denton Bible Church. He has been pastoring at Denton Bible Church for 25 years and is presently the Senior Pastor.

Some of his outreach has included being a national speaker for the Fellowship of National Athletes and active leader for Campus Crusade for Christ and the Navigator.

In the past 5 years, Tom has built Denton Bible Church into one of the largest congregations in north Texas. Besides the four Sunday services at Denton Bible Church, Tom discipled 30 plus young men each year. The program includes ministry, evangelism, and service and meets four times a week. Tom also teaches two men's bible studies, one on Tuesdays in Lewisville at Lakeland Baptist Church and one on Wednesday at Denton Bible Church. At home in Highland Village, I have attended his Tuesday bible study. His messages are powerful and prepare us well to go out into the playing field of life.

He has authored three books, “The Big Picture,” “The Book of Romance,” and “The Problem of Life With God,” a commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes. He is also the teacher for three video series and his taped messages travel throughout the world.

His wife, Teresa, is his best friend and secretary. Their older son, Benjamin, and his wife Amanda, live in Lewisville, Texas, and have just made them the proud grandparents of a baby boy, Thomas Clark. Their other son, John Clark, played baseball for the University of Kansas Jayhawks, and has gone on to play professional baseball with the St. Louis Cardinals.

I am honored the Reverend Tom Nelson could be with us here today. I know his book has made it in our deliberations, and more accountable for our decisions.

STARVATION IS AN INHUMANE WAY TO DIE

(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, death by dehydration is a painful, agonizing, and arduous process that takes 10 to 14 days. In addition to feeling the pangs of hunger and thirst, the skin, lips, and tongue crack, the nose bleeds because of the drying of the mucus membranes, heaving and vomiting may ensue because of the drying out of the stomach lining, and the victim may experience seizures.

Compared to starvation and dehydration, death by hanging, firing squad, or lethal injection, and the victim may experience convulsions.

On one of the most disabled in our midst.

Terri Schiavo is not on a respirator or any artificial life support equipment. Any reasonable person who sees this woman reacting to her parents care will realize she is not in a coma or, as is sometimes called, a persistent vegetative state.

Have we, as a Nation, become so callous that we have bought into the “quality of life” argument that some people simply are not worth the effort to protect and rehabilitate? I hope not.

SUPPORT BILL TO ELIMINATE TAX SHELTERS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the members of the other chamber for bipartisan legislation to shut down abusive accounting tax shelters costing U.S. taxpayers over $18 billion every year and leaving middle-class Americans to pick up the tab.

Fairness and economic growth should be synonymous with the tax code. That is why I will introduce companion legislation to eliminate the way firms market tax shelters to their audit clients. This bill will eliminate tax shelters created by the accounting firms serving as shadow brokers directly to publicly traded companies whose books they regularly audit. As today’s hearing on tax shelters in the other body will show, this process makes a mockery of auditor independence and creates irreconcilable conflicts of interest for auditors.

Mr. Speaker, the economic principle of transparency and the American value of accountability are essential to economic growth. These abusive accounting schemes do nothing but burden the middle class and slow down our economic recovery. I am proud to support this real reform to get real results.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: AN OLD AMERICAN TRADITION

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

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a steady assault on public religious expression undermines Americans’ constitutional right to worship.

The Supreme Court announced it will hear a case alleging the phrase “under God” in the Pledge of Allegiance establishes a religion. Not at all. Acknowledging the Creator, in public, is an American tradition, not a religion.

The Declaration of Independence declares that all men were given rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness by their Creator. The Declaration ends with “A firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence.”

Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg expressed his fervent hope that “This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom.”

Mr. Speaker, the question before the Supreme Court is whether America’s tradition of free expression of religion will continue or be further undermined by a new creed of hostility towards religiosity.

I echo Benjamin Franklin, who requested that prayer begin the Constitutional Convention, and every session of Congress since then, because, as he acknowledged, “God governs in the affairs of men.”

PLIGHT OF TERRI SCHINDLER SCHIAVO

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

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, last week Army Lieutenant General William Boyken was embroiled in controversy over testimony that in our struggle against the regime of Saddam Hussein, that God was on our side. One commentator on the Fox News Network said, and I am quoting now, “That it is ‘folly’ to argue that God takes sides on battlefields.”

It may be wise to ask ourselves if President Lincoln famously said, it is more relevant to ask whether we are on God’s side, rather than whether God is on ours.

GOD IS ON OUR SIDE

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, last week Army Lieutenant General William Boyken was embroiled in controversy over testimony that in our struggle against the regime of Saddam Hussein, that God was on our side. One commentator on the Fox News Network said, and I am quoting now, “That it is ‘folly’ to argue that God takes sides on battlefields.”

It may be wise to ask ourselves if President Lincoln famously said, it is more relevant to ask whether we are on God’s side, rather than whether God is on ours.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored the Reverend Tom Nelson could be with us here today. I know his book has made it in our deliberations, and more accountable for our decisions.
But to the General's point, that in our struggle against the tyranny of the murderous regime of Saddam Hussein, I say the General was right. It is written that "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." And therefore, in the struggle against tyranny, all of its forms, Mr. Speaker, God is not neutral in this cause in the struggle between freedom and tyranny, between dictatorship and human dignity. Let it be said that in this Congress, God is on our side. And may it ever be so.

PRIME MINISTER MUHAMMAD MAHATHIR OF MALAYSIA SHOULD NOT BE WELCOME IN THE U.S.

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in international diplomacy when we set aside diplomatic language and speak the truth from the heart.

Last week, Malaysia's Prime Minister Muhammad Mahathir took the coward's way out to blame his misrule on Jews. He said, and I quote, "The Europeans killed 6 million Jews out of 12 million, but today the Jews rule this world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them. They survived 2,000 years of pogroms not by hitting back but by thinking. They invented and promoted human rights and democracy so that perpetuating them would appear to be wrong, so that they may enjoy equal rights with others."

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Malaysia is an anti-Semite, a racist, and a bigot. He should not be welcome again in the United States. By following the path of Hitler and Stalin, the international community should work against Malaysian exports until this prime minister steps down.

COALITION REVITALIZING EDUCATION OF IRAQ'S CHILDREN

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

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that last week the Iraq Education Reform Act was signed into law. The Act provides $1 billion in aid to education in Iraq. Under Saddam Hussein and the Ba'ath Socialist Party's rule, schools fell into disrepair and teaching materials were scarce, distorted as propaganda, and outdated. Today, after the American military's success in Operation Iraqi Freedom, schools are being renovated. Textbooks have been rewritten, distributed, and used. Students and principles are being introduced to the most current standards of education.

As an example of the real difference we are making in children's lives, I have here a sample of the bookbags that we have given out. It includes essential items for education, pens, pencils, calculators, and notebooks without propaganda. 15 million of these student kits will be given out during the school year.

We are making meaningful progress in the war on terror and making a real difference in the quality of life for Iraq's and their children in order to protect the American people.

In conclusion, God bless our troops.

FOUR OUTSTANDING SENIORS FROM PLANO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, Texas is home to great schools, great teachers, and great students, and today I want to highlight four outstanding seniors from the Plano Independent School District who made perfect scores on their college entrance exams; four of them.

Greg Bussell of Plano East, Jennifer Wu of Plano West, and Brian Young of Plano Senior High all scored 1600 on their SATs, while J effrey Lin of Plano West received a perfect score.

In addition to smarts and savvy, they all shine outside the classroom. Both Jennifer and Jeffrey play the violin in the orchestra, Greg stars in a school play, and Brian is on the school's academic decathlon team.

These students are shining examples of the best and brightest in Texas and in America, and they deserve a Lone Star-size applause. I want to congratulate them and tell them that we are proud of them.

CONSERVATIVES NOT WELCOME ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in last Friday's New York Times, columnist Thomas Friedman quoted some advice that President Bush and Secretary Rice have given to incoming freshmen: "Above all," Dean Brodhead told the students, "do not limit your associations to people who agree with you."

Yet as David Brooks pointed out in the September issue of the Atlantic Monthly magazine, the place where there is the least diversity today is on college campuses. Conservatives simply are not welcome, except for a few tokens in some places. As Mr. Brooks wrote, "No group of people sings the diversity anthem more frequently than administrators at our elite universities, but elite universities are amazingly undiverse in their values, politics, and mores. Professors, in particular, are drawn from a narrow segment of the population." Mr. Brooks pointed out that great students and professors may be one of the groups most discriminated in this country today.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our elite universities will strive for true diversity and not just marginal freedom. At least a few conservatives to teach in their classrooms and speak on their campuses.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR PRESTON SMITH

(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. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and salute one of our fallen heroes in Texas, Governor Preston Smith, who lived a life of service from the 1940s into the 1990s when he served the State as Governor. I want to emphasize his commitment to education, as we battle in this House on the issue of Leave No Child Behind, as we find out that many of our educational leaders across the Nation are looking to us to give them and to provide them with a partnership to educate the Nation's children.

I believe that his work in education helped the State of Texas reach its mission, or attempt to reach its mission, of lifting all boats.

One of the issues that he championed was the idea of teacher compensation and to ensure that the teachers in our classrooms were paid a respectable salary so that they in fact could teach our children.

He loved the State and he served in the State senate. He was certainly someone who this State will miss because he loved us all. We say to his family our deepest sympathy; but more importantly, we are gratified for the opportunity he had to serve. And when he served, he promoted the people who needed him most, and those are the people whose voices could not be heard.

Mr. Speaker, we thank him for his service and know that his spirit will remain because he was truly a tall Texan, as he worked for all of us during the time he served the State of Texas; and we know that he will be considered a great Texan and a great American.

THREAT OF SADDAM HUSSEIN ELIMINATED

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in the press regarding weapons of mass destruction and the former Iraqi regime. I think it is important to note that both the Clinton
and Bush administrations realized the powerful capacity for terror that Sadd- 
dam Hussein openly wielded. In 1998, President Clinton said, “If 
Saddam rejects peace and we have to use force, our purpose is clear. We 
want to stop Saddam from renewing the threat posed by Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction 
program.” In this statement, it is clear 
that the Clinton administration ac-
knowledged weapons of mass destruc-
tion and was prepared to end Saddam 
Hussein’s control of them. Even former 
Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld 
admitted an Iraq capable of using “nu-
clear, chemical or biological weapons against us or our allies is the greatest 
security threat we face.” The threat of 
Saddam Hussein has been clear for 
deCADES. Finally, that threat has been 
eliminated.

STOP ARAB BASHING
(Mr. McDermott asked and was 
given permission to address the House 
for 1 minute and to revise and extend 
his remarks)
Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, some 
of these later speakers have 
taken to religious bigotry, and I 
think one of the things that if we care 
about what is going on in Iraq, they will 
stop the Arab bashing. The Presi-
dent was smart enough when he used 
the word “crusade” to realize that was 
a serious mistake because it raises 
issues from thousands of years ago.

On the one hand I agree with con-
demning Prime Minister Mahathir of 
Malaysia for his anti-Semitic remarks, 
but one has to use the same standard 
on the general who starts talking 
about “our God.” In Ireland, where my 
family came from, God was on both 
sides. I do not know if the Catholics 
had him or the Protestants had him. 
Who is right?

When Members inject that into this 
debate, they simply inflame those 
people in the Shiite community and the 
Sunní community who see us as occup-
iers and destroyers of their religion. 
That means more people attack our 
people. That creates al Qaeda vol-
nunteers. Those are the people shooting 
our troops. Stop it.

HONORING FORMER GOVERNOR 
PRESTON SMITH
(Mr. Neugebauer asked and was 
given permission to address the House 
for 1 minute and to revise and extend 
his remarks)
Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I 
rise today to remember a great Amer-
ican and a great man in Texas politics. 
Former Governor Preston Smith 
passed away Saturday at the age of 91. 
His impact on the State of Texas, es-
specially in the area of education, is im-
measurable. One of his many focuses 
during his years in politics was on 
opening educational opportunities in 
Texas. He was responsible for opening 
more colleges and universities than any other Governor 
in our State. Known as the people’s 
Governor, it was not surprising to call 
his office and have him answer his own 
phone.

Just a few of his accomplishments 
during his tenure include the creation 
of four new State schools, a new Uni-
versity of Texas Medical School in 
Houston, the Texas Tech Medical 
School in Lubbock, Texas, the Univer-
sity of Texas dental school and a 
nurses training school in San Antonio, 
a new undergraduate nursing school in 
El Paso, and an expansion of the Uni-
versity of Texas medical branch at Gal-
veston.

Governor Smith was married 63 years to 
his loving wife, Ima, also a Texas 
Tech graduate, who died in 1998. A 
classy, caring soul, as her health de-
clined, the Governor would walk into 
her bedroom each morning with a 
fresh-cut flower and a note.

Thousands of Texas students each day 
walk past a 9-foot bronze statue of 
Smith that stands in front of the ad-
ministration building. He will continue 
to watch over Texas and Texas Tech 
for years to come. Texas, West Texas, 
andodd Texas, andodd Texas, 
because of the distinguished service of 
Governor Preston Smith.

MORATORIUM ON DEHYDRATION 
CASES IN FLORIDA
(Mr. Weldon of Florida asked and 
given permission to address the House 
for 1 minute and to revise and extend 
his remarks)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, 
Terry Schiavo had her feeding tubes 
removed last Wednesday, and she might 
needlessly die tonight. I spoke with 
Governor Jeb Bush about Terry, and he 
assured me that he and the Florida leg-
islature are moving expeditiously to 
give him the powers to intervene to 
save her life and fulfill the wishes of 
Terry’s parents. Terry’s parents are in 
a last-minute battle to save her.

Governor Bush and the Florida legis-
lature are taking the necessary steps. 
Three years ago, the circuit court or-
dered Terry’s feeding tubes to be with-
drawn; and despite the objections of 
Terry’s parents and request to take 
custody and care for her, all court 
cases have failed. Terry is not uncon-
scious. Terry is not on life support. She 
is not dying of an underlying disease, 
and she is responsive to human inter-
action.

This is a grave injustice. Yesterday, 
Governor Bush called for a special ses-
sion to pass a moratorium on all dehy-
dration cases in Florida. The Florida 
House passed this bill with Governor 
Bush’s support, and the Florida senate 
will take it up today. Support the leg-
islature and support Governor Bush in 
this effort to save this young lady’s 
life.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 73, FURTHER CON-
INUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004
Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direc-
tion of the Committee on Rules, I call 
up House Resolution 407 and ask for its 
immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as fol-
lows:

H. RES. 407

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this 
resolution it shall be in order without inter-
vening motion except: (1) to dispose of 
the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 73) 
making further continuing appropriations for the 
fiscal year 2004, and for other pur-
poses. The joint resolution shall be consid-
ered as read for amendment. The previous 
question shall be considered as ordered on 
the joint resolution to final passage without 
intervening motion except: (1) the hour of 
debate on the joint resolution equally di-
vided and controlled by the chairman and 
ranking minority member of the Committee 
on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to re-
commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. 
BASS). The gentleman from Georgia 
(Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the pur-
purpose of debate only, I introduce the 
customary 30 minutes to the gentleman 
from Texas (Mr. Frost), pending which I 
yield myself such time as I may con-
sume. During consideration of this res-
olution, all time yielded is for the pur-
pose of debate only.

Mr. LINDER asked and was given 
permission to revise and extend his 
remarks.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 
407 is a closed rule providing for the 
consideration of H.J. Res. 73, which is a 
resolution that makes fur-
ther appropriations for fiscal year 2004. 
The rule provides for 1 hour of debate in 
the House, equally divided and con-
trolled by the chairman and ranking 
minority member of the Committee on 
Appropriations. The rule waives all 
points of order against consideration of 
the joint resolution, and provides 
for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this joint resolution 
provides an additional week of funding 
for government agencies because the 
fiscal year 2004 appropriations bills 
have not yet been enacted into law. 
Specifically, this resolution extends 
until November 7, 2003, the provisions 
of the previous continuing appropri-
ations resolution that were to expire on 
October 31, 2003. In addition, this reso-
lution conjoins the six fiscal year 2004 
appropriations bills that have passed 
the House, but have not yet been con-
sidered by the other body.

Mr. Speaker, we are approaching 
the completion of the first session of this 
108th Congress, and I urge my col-
leagues to join me in supporting this 
rule so we may proceed to the conside-
ration of the underlying continuing res-
poRes. The resolution provides 
for one motion to recommit.
work on the remaining appropriations bills. I am hopeful that the continuing resolution covered by this rule will give us the time we need to complete the appropriations process in a thoughtful and orderly manner.

The House hopes to complete the appropriations process as soon as possible, and this resolution provides the time to resolve the issues that remain outstanding.

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

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

Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the new deficit numbers came out yesterday, and they confirm what we already know: this Republican government has given America the biggest government deficit in our history, nearly $400 billion in fiscal year 2003, the year just concluded, plus an additional $500 billion in fiscal year 2004, the year we just started, according to the Bush administration.

Mark my words, these Republican deficits will end up raising taxes, and worse, taking our children’s taxes. The Republican leaders are going to do everything in their power to hide their abominable record of fiscal mismanagement.

I just listened to the Bush administration’s Treasury Secretary in today’s New York Times. He predicts that this jobless recovery will somehow magically add 2 million new jobs before next year’s elections. He is saying this economy, which has lost nearly 3 million jobs since President Bush took office, the economy since Herbert Hoover and the Great Depression, is now going to create 200,000 new jobs a month. Perhaps the Bush administration still believes in Santa Claus, and perhaps they really believe that 2 million jobs will magically appear under the election Christmas tree next year; but the American people know a snow job when they see one. And make no mistake, they are seeing one today on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, this so-called continuing resolution is a procedural shell game to hide Republican mismanagement of the government. This is not trick or treat, Mr. Speaker, just tricks. This entire process today makes clear that the Republican Congress is not a government of the people, by the people and for the people. It is a government of the Republican Party, by the Republican Party and for the Republican Party. The Republican Congress keeps Americans in the dark and shortchanges the American people.

Mr. Speaker, time and again Republican leaders have proven their willingness to use their power over the government to get more power for the Republican Party. As the Washington Post suggested last week, Republicans are creating an almost Soviet-style system. They treat the people’s government as just another arm of the Republican Party.

Republican leaders have moved heaven and earth to give corporate tax dodgers, but they will not give military and working families the same tax credit that they gave to the wealthiest. Just last week, House Republican leaders twisted enough arms to block a Democratic pay raise for the military, which would have given soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan a $1,500 bonus, but they cannot be bothered to do anything about high health care costs. And earlier this year Tom DeLay’s office used Federal resources to track down his legislative opposition in Texas, and even urged the FBI to arrest the Democratic State legislators who dared to stand up to him. But now House Republican leaders will not use the Federal resources of the Congress to help the millions of Americans who need unemployment insurance in the midst of President Bush’s jobless recovery.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a government of the people, the people and for the people. It is a government of the Republican Party, the Republican Party and for the Republican Party. And if the Republican Party wants this Republican government to raise the debt tax on Americans, while at the same time shortchanging education and veterans and then they should at least have the courage to be honest with the public about it.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule. Do not help the Republican leaders keep Americans in the dark this year.

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

Mr. LINDER. 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. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me share with my colleagues my initial thoughts as I was beginning to read the continuing resolution. I was standing on the floor of the House. I read it with disbelief. I was reading and thought maybe that there had been a misprint. And so I come to oppose this rule, because I happen to come from the school of thought that this House and this body, this Congress, has to do work on behalf of the American people.

I join in acknowledging that we are now facing the largest deficit that we have had in the last decade, or at least last 5 years, since 1993, and I am not one to underestimate that deficit in 1993 with House Democrats, not one single Republican vote, on that budget resolution that provided us in the spring of
Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to vote on the rule.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, every year this House has an opportunity to pass the 13 appropriation bills that fund the activities of the Federal Government. Once the House passes those bills, the United States Senate is supposed to pass them. After that, the House and the Senate get together and a conference committee is supposed to resolve the differences between the two versions. Those final bills are passed and then sent to the President for his signature. This is all supposed to happen before the fiscal year ends on September 30.

I think it is important to review this material from the perspective of a ninth grade civics class because the Republican leadership seems to have forgotten it. Despite the fact that they control the Senate, they control the White House, they even control the courts, they cannot seem to get their act together and do the people's work. So we are forced once again to pass a continuing resolution.

It used to be that the Republicans blamed President Clinton for all the delays in legislation. They really got good at blaming him for everything. In fact, I think they kind of miss him. I know I do because the economy was so good and the budget was in surplus.

Now, the economy under their leadership is lousy, and we have record deficits. In fact, we have the largest deficit in the history of the United States of America. Then the Republicans used to blame the Democratic Senate for everything. That excuse is gone now, too. We are here for one simple reason. The majority of this House has failed. They have not done their job. They do not want to do their job. And the American people deserve to know that. What is really amazing is that the House is in session for a day and a half this week. It is Tuesday and this is the last day of business scheduled for this week. I am not sure about other parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, but in Massachusetts, a workweek is generally 5 days and sometimes it is longer, given that in this economy, people have to work overtime. Does the Speaker not know that firefighters or steelworkers or teachers or accountants in my district are working overtime and the economy is not growing.

This process is broken. The American people need to understand that the Republican leadership in this House is not doing its job. The Republicans wanted power. It appears they wanted power just for the sake of power. The fact of the matter is they cannot even get along with each other. This is a disgrace that we are at this moment. I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Oeť), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, once again we are being asked to pass a resolution that keeps the government open because Congress has not finished its work on appropriation bills. That is not unprecedented. Many times in the past we have faced this situation. But I do think that it is harder to understand when we have one party in control of all of the tools of government. When one party is in control of the Presidency and both the House and the Senate, it ought to be somewhat easier to get the work done on time. Over the past 34 years, one party has been in control of all three of those power centers, the Presidency, the Senate and the House, 6 years. The average number of days that the appropriation bills that had been passed by the time the fiscal year ended in those 6 years was twice as high as it is today. Today we have only three appropriation bills passed. That, in my view, is no reflection whatsoever on the majority leadership of the Appropriations Committee. I think if things were left to the committee, we would be much further along the road. The reason that we have not completed our work is largely because the majority leadership has determined that they only want to pass appropriation bills on the majority party's side of the aisle.

The majority party has a right to define itself and lay out what its first priorities are. A minority party has a similar right and obligation. But when both parties, in the end, are supposed to seek a way to resolve those differences. I recognize, being a member of the minority, that the majority party leadership in this House has a similar right and obligation. But when both parties, in the end, are supposed to seek a way to resolve those differences. I recognize, being a member of the minority, that the majority party leadership in this House has a similar right and obligation. But when both parties, in the end, are supposed to seek a way to resolve those differences. I recognize, being a member of the minority, that the majority party leadership in this House has a similar right and obligation. But when both parties, in the end, are supposed to seek a way to resolve those differences.
are some occasions where the issues are so tight that you can use a little help across the aisle.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all going to vote for this CR; but I think as we consider it, it is appropriate for us to reflect on the allegations of mismanagement that were made over the years about how the Democrats ran this House, to reflect on that and relate it to present performance and look at how well the appropriations process has been managed since the Republicans took over in 1995. I want to look at the facts here. It is now October 21, 21 days since the start of the fiscal year, 2004, and this Congress has passed and President Bush has signed only three of the 13 annual spending bills into law: defense, homeland security, and legislative branch appropriation bill. The Members will notice in addition that the military construction bill, one of the least controversial bills considered by this House every single year, is still in deferred conference, although I would observe it is getting closer to maybe the distinction of being the only real conference that we have had in some period of time. If that is not indicative of this Congress's mismanagement, then I am not sure what it is.

The fact of the matter is since the majority party regained the House majority, this Congress has had to pass an omnibus appropriation bill in 7 out of 9 years. That is right. In only 2 years since consideration of the fiscal 1996 spending bill did this Congress pass stand-alone legislation for all 13 appropriation bills. By comparison, and I hope everybody on my side of the aisle will note this, and the other side of the aisle, of course, will discount it and not believe it, over a 2 year period of time, in fiscal year 1994, that is 1993, and fiscal year 1995, that is 1994, when we had a Democratic President, Bill Clinton, and a Democratic Congress, we passed every single spending bill as a stand-alone piece of legislation, every one, which meant that we could fully debate and not hide anything in those bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of our side of the aisle can hardly wait to hear what excuse is now used by our colleague security and regular crime funding.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that we voted to get out of here on November 1. It is obvious we are going to be very lucky, Mr. Speaker, to get out of here by Thanksgiving. I regret that because I think the longer the Congress is in session, the more damage it does to the American people.

But because of these disagreements we will be here next week with another continuing resolution. The Members can bet on it. I just hope that sooner or later the majority party recognizes that in the minority they have a willing partner passing some of these if they are willing to compromise in the slightest on some of these issues before us.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Rules for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, we are all going to vote for this CR; but I think as we consider it, it is appropriate for us to reflect on the allegations of mismanagement that were made over the years about how the Democrats ran this House, to reflect on that and relate it to present performance and look at how well the appropriations process has been managed since the Republicans took over in 1995. I want to look at the facts here. It is now October 21, 21 days since the start of the fiscal year, 2004, and this Congress has passed and President Bush has signed only three of the 13 annual spending bills into law: defense, homeland security, and legislative branch appropriation bill. The Members will notice in addition that the military construction bill, one of the least controversial bills considered by this House every single year, is still in deferred conference, although I would observe it is getting closer to maybe the distinction of being the only real conference that we have had in some period of time. If that is not indicative of this Congress's mismanagement, then I am not sure what it is.

The fact of the matter is since the majority party regained the House majority, this Congress has had to pass an omnibus appropriation bill in 7 out of 9 years. That is right. In only 2 years since consideration of the fiscal 1996 spending bill did this Congress pass stand-alone legislation for all 13 appropriation bills. By comparison, and I hope everybody on my side of the aisle will note this, and the other side of the aisle, of course, will discount it and not believe it, over a 2 year period of time, in fiscal year 1994, that is 1993, and fiscal year 1995, that is 1994, when we had a Democratic President, Bill Clinton, and a Democratic Congress, we passed every single spending bill as a stand-alone piece of legislation, every one, which meant that we could fully debate and not hide anything in those bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of our side of the aisle can hardly wait to hear what excuse is now used by our colleague security and regular crime funding.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that we voted to get out of here on November 1. It is obvious we are going to be very lucky, Mr. Speaker, to get out of here by Thanksgiving. I regret that because I think the longer the Congress is in session, the more damage it does to the American people.

But because of these disagreements we will be here next week with another continuing resolution. The Members can bet on it. I just hope that sooner or later the majority party recognizes that in the minority they have a willing partner passing some of these if they are willing to compromise in the slightest on some of these issues before us.
FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 407, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was none.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 407, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was none.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 407, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was none.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 407, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was none.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. R. 73) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKE
move this legislation through the Senate so the government can continue to operate smoothly and efficiently so that we can come closer to finishing our regular appropriations bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think Members need to understand where this CR fits in the scheme of things. As the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), has indicated, this continuing resolution when it moves to the Senate will become the vehicle by which the committee deals with the omnibus appropriations bills or the bills that will be included in the omnibus bill. That will mean that the real CR will have to be brought up next week. And at that time we will see a continuing resolution that keeps the government open to a date somewhere between November 5 and Thanksgiving. I presume I sincerely hope that by Thanksgiving there will be no need for additional CRs, but I am very skeptical that that will be the case. I am afraid that it is beginning to look a lot like Christmas. I hope that that is not true, but I suspect it may be.

So having already said everything that needs to be said on the CR, I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obe) and the committee for all of the support and the cooperation that we have had. As I have said numerous times on the floor, with the cooperation of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obe) we have managed all of our bills well on time to have concluded by the end of the year. But we are only one House of the Congress.

We will work with our partners in the Senate to conclude this business of appropriations as early as we possibly can.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to observe, as I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Hooyer) indicated this morning, that last year when we had so many appropriation bills not passed until the next session of Congress, the cry we frequently heard on the majority side of the aisle was that “The Senate made me do it.” And they were all too eager to blame the Senate for the fact that most appropriation bills had gone nowhere.

As the saying goes, this year they do not have Senator Daschle to kick around anymore with the Democrats being in the minority. And so I think it will be interesting to see whether or not the majority sooner or later can either end its debate with itself or else on several of these bills reach across the aisle and try to work out a more bipartisan solution.

I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young) has certainly tried, and I believe I have tried; but sometimes things are settled at a level above our pay grade. That is the way life is, and that is the way this institution is.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge that we pass this CR and get the process moving, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered read for amendment, and pursuant to House Resolution 407 the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and voted on.

The question is ordered.

The Clerk reads as follows:

The Clerk reads as follows:

H. R. 3076
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.--This Act may be cited as the “Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act of 2003.”

(b) REFERENCES.--Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the section or other provision considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. JAVITS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) INTERRUPTIONS OF STUDY.--Section 701(c) (20 U.S.C. 1134(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of other exceptional circumstances, such as active duty military service or personal or family member illness, the institution of higher education may also permit the fellowship recipient to interrupt periods of study for the duration of the tour of duty (in the case of military service) or not more than 12 months (in any other case), but without payment of the stipend.”

(b) ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIPS.--Section 702(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1134a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “from diverse geographic regions” after “higher education”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall also assure that at least one representative appointed to the Board represents an institution that is eligible for a grant under title III or V of this Act.”

SEC. 3. GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 2003.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 702) to amend title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure graduate opportunities in postsecondary education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk reads as follows:

H. R. 702

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.--This Act may be cited as the “Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act of 2003.”

(b) REFERENCES.--Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the section or other provision considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. JAVITS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) INTERRUPTIONS OF STUDY.--Section 701(c) (20 U.S.C. 1134(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of other exceptional circumstances, such as active duty military service or personal or family member illness, the institution of higher education may also permit the fellowship recipient to interrupt periods of study for the duration of the tour of duty (in the case of military service) or not more than 12 months (in any other case), but without payment of the stipend.”

(b) ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIPS.--Section 702(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1134a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “from diverse geographic regions” after “higher education”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall also assure that at least one representative appointed to the Board represents an institution that is eligible for a grant under title III or V of this Act.”

SEC. 3. GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 2003.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 702) to amend title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure graduate opportunities in postsecondary education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk reads as follows:

H. R. 702

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

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.--This Act may be cited as the “Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act of 2003.”

(b) REFERENCES.--Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the section or other provision considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

SEC. 2. JAVITS FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) INTERRUPTIONS OF STUDY.--Section 701(c) (20 U.S.C. 1134(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: “In the case of other exceptional circumstances, such as active duty military service or personal or family member illness, the institution of higher education may also permit the fellowship recipient to interrupt periods of study for the duration of the tour of duty (in the case of military service) or not more than 12 months (in any other case), but without payment of the stipend.”

(b) ALLOCATION OF FELLOWSHIPS.--Section 702(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1134a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting “from diverse geographic regions” after “higher education”;

and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: “The Secretary shall also assure that at least one representative appointed to the Board represents an institution that is eligible for a grant under title III or V of this Act.”

SEC. 3. GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 2003.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 702) to amend title VII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure graduate opportunities in postsecondary education, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk reads as follows:

H. R. 702

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
“(c) PRIORITY.—The Secretary shall establish a priority for grants in order to prepare individuals for the professorate who will train highly-qualified elementary and secondary school teachers of math, science, and special education, and teachers who provide instruction for limited English proficient individuals. Such grants shall offer program assistance and graduate fellowships for individuals. Such grants shall offer program assistance and graduate fellowships for:

“(1) post-baccalaureate study related to teacher preparation and pedagogy in math and science for students who have completed a master or science for students who have completed a master

“(2) post-baccalaureate study related to teacher preparation and pedagogy in special education and English language acquisition and science for students who have completed a master

“(3) support of dissertation research in the fields of math, science, special education, or second language pedagogy and second language acquisition.”.

(b) COLLABORATION REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—Section 713(b) (20 U.S.C. 1135b) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (9);

(2) by redesigning paragraph (10) as paragraph (11); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

“(10) in a case an application for a grant by a department, program, or unit in education or teacher preparation, contain assurances that such department, program, or unit collaborates with departments, programs, or units in all content areas to assure a successful combination of training in both teaching and such content; and”.

(c) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 714(b) (20 U.S.C. 1135c(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking “1999-2000” and inserting “2004-2005”;

(2) by striking “shall be set” and inserting “may be set”;

and

(3) by striking “Foundation graduate fellowships and inserting “Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program”.

(d) ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 715(a)(1) (20 U.S.C. 1136d(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “1999-2000” and inserting “2004-2005”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (11); and

(3) by striking “Support for planning, applied research, training, and distance learning and inserting “Support for planning, applied research, training, and distance learning transfer, the delivery of services, or other activities to aid the purpose of which is to design and implement programs to enhance the education to work with private and civic organizations to assist communities to meet and address their pressing and significant problems including the economic development, community infrastructure and housing, crime prevention, education, healthcare, self sufficiency, and workforce preparation.”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 721(d)(1)D (20 U.S.C. 1136d(1)(D)) is amended by adding “in analytical skills and study methods to enhance their success and academic proficiency for future each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years”.

(d) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—Subsection (e) of section 721 (20 U.S.C. 1137(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 5. FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION.

(a) CONTRACT AND GRANT PURPOSES.—Section 741(a) (20 U.S.C. 1138a(a)) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) the enhancement of the reform and improvement of, and innovation in, postsecondary education and the provision of educational opportunity for all, especially for the non-traditional student populations;

(2) in paragraph (4) before the semicolon at the end the following: “for postsecondary students, especially those that provide academic credit for programs”;

(3) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) the establishment of institutions and programs based on the technology of communications, including delivery by distance education;”;

and

(4) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) the introduction of institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and reentering postsecondary institutions and pursuing programs of postsecondary study tailored to individual needs;”.

(b) AREAS OF NATIONAL NEED.—Section 744(c) (20 U.S.C. 1138c(c)) is amended by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) international cooperation, partnerships, or student exchange among postsecondary educational institutions in the United States and abroad.”

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 745 (20 U.S.C. 1138d) is amended by striking “$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1999 and each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years” and inserting “$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years”.

SEC. 6. URBAN COMMUNITY SERVICE.

(a) SERVING ALL STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES.—Section 762(a) (20 U.S.C. 1140a(a)) is amended by striking “students with learning disabilities” and inserting “students with disabilities”.

(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 762(b)(2) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “in order to improve retention and completion” after “disabilities”;

(B) by redesigning subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (E), respectively;

and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following new subparagraph:

“(B) EFFECTIVE TRANSITION PRACTICE.—The development of innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and strategies to ensure the smooth transition of students with disabilities from high school to postsecondary education.”;

and

(D) by redesigning subparagraph (C) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B) of this paragraph) in the following new paragraph:

“(D) DISTANCE LEARNING.—The development of innovative, effective, and efficient teaching methods and strategies to provide faculty and administrators with the ability to provide accessible distance education programs or classes that would enhance access of students with disabilities to higher education, including the use of electronic communication for instruction and advice.”.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 762(b)(3) is amended by striking “subparagraphs (A) through (C)” and inserting “subparagraphs (A) through (E)”.

(d) AMENDMENT.—Section 763 (20 U.S.C. 1140b) is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (1) to read as follows:

“(1) a description of how such institution plans to address the activities allowed under this part;”;

(2) by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (2); and

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; and”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) a description of the extent to which an institution will work to replicate the best practices of institutions of higher education amended by the following new subparagraph:

“(D) FISCAL YEAR 1999 AND EACH OF THE 4 SUCCEEDING FISCAL YEARS.—In addition to the amounts described in subparagraph (C), for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, the institution shall be awarded such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.”.

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).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. 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 H. R. 3076.
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, today in support of H.R. 3076, the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act, a bill that will not only build upon the successes of our graduate education programs, but will also help fulfill areas of critical National need which will help trigger improvement at all levels of education, including K-12.

I would like to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, particularly the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), who again, we have been very able to work very well together, and his cooperation has been able to bring these bills together in a bipartisan way.

We all recognize the importance of graduate education, particularly as we work to meet the challenges of the No Child Left Behind Act and place a highly-qualified teacher in every public school classroom by the 2005-2006 school year. In order to achieve this before us today will help our States and schools as they strive to achieve that important goal.

The Federal Government has long been involved with graduate-level education, providing fellowships to assist students who excel in their chosen fields to complete education beyond the baccalaureate level. These programs have been tremendously successful, encouraging in-depth study and creating knowledgeable experts, particularly in subject areas facing national need.

Graduate education authorized under Title VII of the Higher Education Act produces immeasurable benefits for our Nation. Not only do these programs enrich our schools, but they also nurture discovery and innovation that will some day lead to medical and technological advancements. Graduate programs train the next generation of teachers, researchers, engineers, doctors, lawyers, poets and professors. These individuals will be vitally important in preparing the United States to meet the challenges of the future.

Title VII of the Higher Education Act authorizes three graduate fellowship programs: the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program, the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship program, and the Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity program.

Collectively, they encourage students to advance their knowledge in scientific and technical fields, the arts and humanities, and legal studies by providing financial assistance as well as support services to those displaying academic excellence in their field of study.

Each year, Congress appropriates nearly $45 million to assist these students in pursuing their goals. The Graduate Opportunities and Higher Education Act seeks to build upon the success of these programs by targeting fellowships in subject areas facing national need, not only at the graduate level, but also by encouraging study of subject areas where there are shortages in K-12 education as well. This will help to expand the number of educators prepared to train the teachers of tomorrow in critical subject areas such as math, science, and special education.

By placing a priority on these three subject areas, the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act also recognizes the rapidly-growing need for teachers prepared to meet the needs of students with limited English proficiency. The Graduate Opportunities and Higher Education Act provides an essential piece of our higher-education reform efforts. By strengthening graduate education and targeting the Federal investment towards those areas facing demonstrated need, we cannot only improve graduate education, but education at all levels in this Nation.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this important piece of legislation and help make our already successful graduate education programs even better.

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 support of H.R. 3076, the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act. I would like to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA); the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER); and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for the way they have managed this process, enabling us to bring this bipartisan measure to the House floor today.

This bill reauthorizes Title VII of the Higher Education Act. Although it only represents a small percentage of the Federal investment in higher education, it is a critical investment. This education legislation reaffirms the Federal interest in promoting access to advanced and professional degrees, as well as assisting colleges and universities in meeting the needs of the growing number of students with disabilities who aspire to earn college degrees.

This legislation make important improvements to our graduate education programs. For, if it is our goal of ensuring that there is a highly-qualified teacher in every classroom, we must address our teacher preparation pipeline in its entirety.

In No Child Left Behind we addressed the need for professional development and mentoring for teachers already in our schools. In the Ready to Teach Act, we worked on improving the preparation of new teachers. And now, in the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act, we are going to address faculty shortages in higher education, especially in the fields of math, science, special education, and teaching of limited English proficiency students to ensure that our teacher colleges have the well-prepared faculty to train the next generation of teachers.

This is an important addition to the Higher Education Act, and I thank the chairman for working with us to inclute in this bill.

I am also pleased that this bill reauthorizes and makes improvements to the Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program, demonstrates projects, and suggests that students with disabilities receive a quality higher education and the funds for the improvement of postsecondary education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the staff on both sides of the aisle on a job well-done in preparing this legislation. In particular, I would like to recognize the work of Alison Ream for the majority, and I would like to recognize Mr. Ricardo Martinez for this side of the aisle.

Again, thank the chairman for working to bring forward a bill that we can all support.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for shepherding this legislation through the committee in a truly bipartisan fashion. I think it is well-written and well-received by everyone concerned, so I would like to express my support for H.R. 3076.

H.R. 1, better known as No Child Left Behind, certainly raises the bar regarding teacher qualifications. And so to do this, we will need to improve our teacher training programs at the postsecondary level.

We are currently experiencing a teacher shortage crisis of tremendous magnitude across the country, especially in the areas of science, special ed, and bilingual language teachers. My daughter, actually, is an English-as-a-second-language teacher, and I realize how scarce these teachers are. This bill will especially improve teacher training in these underserved areas.

Another area of the legislation that really appeals to me is that it provides for some competitive grant programs to encourage innovation and reform in higher education. As colleges in our teachers’ colleges, we see things done the same way they were done 20 years ago, and so I think this is badly needed, to have some innovative creative
ideas. So these grants, I think, will serve us well.

So I think this is an excellent piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker. I endorse it wholeheartedly, as I think everyone on the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I thank the chairman for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I commend both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for their work on the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act. I also thank the committee staff for working to address my concerns surrounding the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program, better known as the GAANN program.

I also commend the Secretary of Education for identifying as the current areas of national need biology, chemistry, computer and information sciences, engineering, geological and related sciences, and math and physics. There is good reason for him to do so. It is estimated that more than half of the economic growth of the United States today results directly from research and development in science and technology. The effectiveness of the United States in promoting economic growth is determined by the intellectual capital of the United States. Education is critical in developing this resource.

Currently, a shortage exists of scientists, engineers and other technology-proficient workers. It is hard to believe that when we have an economy, as we have right now, with massive unemployment, but there are an estimated 200,000 open positions for scientists, engineers, and technology professionals. This is in addition to an approximately 200,000 H-1B visa recipients who are currently in the United States filling other technical positions.

Unfortunately, the United States enrollment in both undergraduate and graduate mathematics, science and engineering majors is lower than enrollment in most other majors, and enrollment has been on the decline over the past decade. Especially worrisome is the fact that enrollments in undergraduate engineering which is trained for a key specialty that we need in our manufacturing work, has declined steadily for 20 years. Graduate enrollment in engineering, however, has increased. How can that be? The difference is students from other countries coming in to do graduate work in our country because we are not producing enough students at the undergraduate level to fill the available graduate spaces. That is not good for the long-term health of our economy and our military.

This declining enrollment affects the education of our prospective elementary and secondary mathematics and science teachers as well. Teachers provide the essential connection between students and the content they are learning. Student performance on the recent Third International Mathematics and Science Study highlights the differences in K–12 education. For example, we spend more on science and mathematics education in the United States, particularly when compared to other countries. We must expect more from our Nation’s educators and students if we are to build on the accomplishments of previous generations.

New methods of teaching mathematics and science are required, as well as better curricula and improved training of teachers. Just to illustrate that, the TIMSS study I mentioned showed that we are near the bottom of all developed nations in the accomplishments of our high school students in science in general. We are even lower in the performance of our students in mathematics, and we are dead last in our students’ performance in the performance of our high school physics students. Clearly, we need improvements if we are going to continue discoveries and the growth of our economic engine.

To address the improved training of teachers, this legislation establishes a priority for grants under the GAANN program in order to prepare individuals for the professoriate who are committed to training highly-qualified elementary and secondary school teachers of mathematics and science. I encourage the secretary to provide priority to departments that engage in such activities, and encourage the secretary to regard departments of mathematics and science, as well as departments of engineering, as departments that may provide such activities. Already, departments of engineering have demonstrated a focus on preparing highly-qualified elementary and secondary mathematics and science teachers. We should add a focus in the K–12 system. If we do not, we are not going to solve the problem, and we will continue to be short on trained technical personnel, we will continue to suffer in our economy.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to once again, thank my colleague for working with us. I think we have developed a great partnership on this subcommittee. We had a great hearing down in the gentleman’s district, a couple of weeks ago, in Texas. We had a very, very good hearing, a very, very good roundtable, and a delicious dinner together with great hospitality. And I just want to publicly express my appreciation for the cooperation in that process and also the continued partnership on the legislation coming through this committee.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.
qualified teachers is extremely important, the many other benefits of graduate education cannot be overlooked. As we enter the 21st Century, the need for advanced education is becoming increasingly vital to successfully maintaining our place in the technologically-advanced economy. Now, more than ever, our citizens need advanced graduate degrees in order to gain more expertise in their field of study. This bill will help ensure the continued availability of such graduate study opportunities for students.

I’d like to thank members of my staff for their hard work, and we’re bringing this bill forward today; particularly Krisann Pearce, Alison Ream, Kathleen Smith, Alexa Marrero, and Rebecca Hunt with Mr. HOEKSTRA’s staff. Additionally, I would like to thank the Democratic staff, including Ricardo Martinez; Alex Nock, Elyynne Bannon and Moira Lenahan with Mr. HINOJOSA’s staff. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman HOEKSTRA, the bipartisan cooperation from members on both sides of the aisle, and the hard work of our staff, we have before us today a bill that will allow for the continued success of our graduate fellowship programs, which enable students to pursue graduate degrees in areas where they want to work.

As we move forward with the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, we must continue to build on the success of these valuable programs as we enter the next generation of scholars. Graduate education is essential to maintaining our economic leadership, as well as ensuring the success of education reform in classrooms across America. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill, and the continued success of our graduate education programs.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 3076, the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act.

The bill authorizes a total of $120 million for Title VII graduate education programs, including Jacob K. Javits Fellowships, Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, and Thurgood Marshall Legal Education Opportunity Programs and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman BOEHNER for his work on this bill and for accepting my amendment in committee.

Under the graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need program, the Higher Education Act provides grants to colleges and universities to address subject areas where America doesn’t have enough people with advanced degrees—including education, where new teachers are trained.

My amendment would require that any schools of education that apply for GAANN grants collaborate with a department, program, or center, or other appropriate content area to assure a successful combination of training in both teaching and relevant content. This should go almost without comment. Most graduate schools already do this.

With the enactment of the historic No Child Left Behind Act, Congress committed itself to ensuring that every student would have the opportunity to improve academically, to attend a safe school in a challenging and nurturing classroom environment, and to have a chance for real scholastic success.

Critical to achieving these goals is having highly qualified teachers in every classroom—teachers who are not only versed in general teaching skills, but who also have expertise in the subject matter they teach.

This is because when teachers pursue a graduate degree in education, they often focus on education theory and policy, rather than combining such a curriculum with substantive research in a particular subject area like math, science, or literature.

If we hope to achieve the goals of No Child Left Behind, we must ensure that the teachers in our children’s classrooms are indeed “highly qualified,” which should include expertise in the subject matter they teach.

That is why I offered, and the committee accepted, an amendment to improve the quality of our teachers, so that all of our schools can meet the standards of No Child Left Behind.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his support of my amendment, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3076, to reauthorize Title VII of the Higher Education Act to authorize graduate fellowship programs with the financial support necessary to complete advanced degrees in areas of need and in the humanities, social sciences and the arts. I would like to commend Chairman HOEKSTRA and Ranking Member HINOJOSA on their exceptional work on this resolution.

I am pleased that we are continuing to encourage our young people to persist with their studies to gain a graduate degree. There are three types of graduate fellowship programs that are authorized: the Jacob K. Javits Fellowships, the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) Fellowships and the Thurgood Marshall Legal Education Opportunity Programs. I am proud of these programs which are set up to give opportunity to individuals who may not have the change otherwise to gain a graduate degree.

Unfortunately, the Urban Community Service program, which was created to provide incentives to urban academic institutions to allow these schools to work with private and civic organizations to implement solutions to pressing problems in their communities, was eliminated. I understand that the program has been receiving funding since Fiscal Year 1999; yet this program is very rich on how urban colleges and universities can work with the surrounding area to strengthen and lift up the community by making it safer and a better place to live for both the students and the people in the community. At too many urban colleges and universities, the only safe place to be in the area is on the campus. I hope in the future we can try to implement this program or a similar program as a way to encourage urban academic institutions to not forget about the community that surrounds its campus and to proactively work with the community.

Again, I support the Chairman and Ranking Member for their efforts on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3076, the Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act.

The Graduate Opportunities in Higher Education Act, H.R. 3076, builds upon the success of the graduate fellowship programs within the Higher Education Act (HEA). Because graduate education trains the faculty who train the teachers of tomorrow, the legislation recognizes subject areas in elementary and secondary education facing shortages, and places a priority on those subject areas, working to create a pipeline of highly qualified teachers to improve education at all levels.

Since enactment of No Child Left Behind, this Congress, the administration and educational leaders have recognized the importance of having highly qualified teachers in the classroom. We need to raise teacher quality standards in our education system, but also help our teachers find the means to meet these goals. H.R. 3076 is an important step toward this end. By expanding our graduate programs, we guarantee our students will be educated by highly qualified teachers with an extensive knowledge base. It is a great step toward the betterment of our education system.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3076 as an important reform to our higher education system and ultimately to our Nation. Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3076, as amended.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3077) to amend title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to enhance international education programs, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3077

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Short title; references; table of contents.
Sec. 2. International and foreign language studies.
Sec. 3. Business and international education programs.
Sec. 4. Institute for International Public Policy.
Sec. 5. Evaluation, outreach, and dissemination.
Sec. 6. Advisory Board.
Sec. 7. Recruiter access to students and student recruiting information; safety.

SECTION 2. INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE STUDIES.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—Sec. 601 (20 U.S.C. 1221) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "post-Cold War" in paragraph (3);
(B) by redesigning paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and
(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) The Secretary may waive or reduce the required non-Federal share for institutions that—

(1) are eligible to receive assistance under part A or B of title III or under title V; and

(2) have submitted a grant application under this section that demonstrates a need for a waiver or reduction;"

(g) SELECTION OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.—

Section 608(a) (20 U.S.C. 1128(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "objectives" and inserting "missions"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new sentence: "In keeping with the purposes of this part, the Secretary shall take into account the degree to which partnerships, programs, and fellowships at institutions of higher education advance national interests, generate and disseminate information, and foster debate on American foreign policy from diverse perspectives."

(h) EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION.—

Section 608(a) (20 U.S.C. 1128(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Grants made under section 602 shall also reflect the purposes of this part."

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 610 (20 U.S.C. 1129b) is amended—

(1) by striking "1999" and inserting "2004"; and

(2) by striking "4 succeeding" and inserting "5 succeeding".

(j) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

Sections 603(a), 604(a)(5), and 612 (20 U.S.C. 1123(a), 1124(a)(5), 1130–1133) are each amended by striking "combinations" each place it appears and inserting "consortia".

SEC. 3. BUSINESS AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

(a) CENTERS FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS EDUCATION.—

Section 612 (20 U.S.C. 1130–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(3)(D), by inserting "including those that are eligible to receive assistance under part A or B of title III or under title V" after "other institutions of higher education"; and

(2) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may waive or reduce the required non-Federal share for institutions that—

(A) are eligible to receive assistance under part A or B of title III or under title V; and

(B) have submitted a grant application under this section that demonstrates a need for a waiver or reduction."

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

Section 614 (20 U.S.C. 1130b) is amended—

(D) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (7) and by inserting a semicolon; and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

"(8) to establish linkages between grant recipients under subsection (a) with libraries, museums, organizations, or institutions of higher education and related institutions of foreign countries to facilitate carrying out the purposes of this section; and

(9) to carry out other activities deemed by the Secretary to be consistent with the purposes of this section;"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection—

"(e) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary may waive or reduce the required non-Federal share for institutions that—

(1) are eligible to receive assistance under part A or B of title III or under title V; and

(2) have submitted a grant application under this section that demonstrates a need for a waiver or reduction."
(A) An Indian Tribal College or University or Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institution eligible for assistance under title III, an institution eligible for assistance under part B of title III, or an institution eligible for assistance under title III, an institution eligible for assistance under part B of title III or under title V; and

(b) Institutional Development.—Section 622 (20 U.S.C. 1131a) is amended by inserting after "educational institutions, or other academic areas related to the international affairs, international economics, or other academic areas related to the institutional objectives";

(c) Study Abroad Program.—Section 623a (20 U.S.C. 1131b(a)) is amended by inserting after "1978," the following: "Alaska Native-serving, Native Hawaiian-serving, and Hispanic-serving institutions,; and

(d) Advanced Degree in International Relations.—Section 624 (20 U.S.C. 1131b) is amended by—

(1) by striking "Masters" in the heading of such section and inserting "Advanced";

(2) by striking "a masters degree in international relations, international economics, or other academic areas related to the institutional objectives";

(3) by striking "The masters degree program" and inserting "The advanced degree study program shall be designed by the consortia in consonance with the fellow's career objectives"; and

(e) Internships.—Section 625 (20 U.S.C. 1131c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after "1978," the following: "Alaska Native-serving, Native Hawaiian-serving, and Hispanic-serving institutions,";

(2) in subsection (b), by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2); and

(b) by striking "; and" at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a period; and

(c) by striking paragraph (4); and

(3) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

(1) Ralph J. Bunche Fellows.—In order to assure the recognition and commitment of individuals from underrepresented student populations, or an institution of higher education's specific institutional objectives, the recommendations of the Board may address any area in need of improvement, except that any recommendation for the improvement of programs under this title shall not be taken into account if the President deems it necessary and expedient.

(2) Membership.—

(a) 5 members shall be appointed by the Secretary:—

(1) 2 members shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Department of Education, representatives, upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader; and

(2) 3 members shall be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader.

(3) Representation.—Two of the members appointed by the Secretary under paragraph (3)(A) shall be from the Federal agencies that have national security responsibilities, after consultation with the leaders of such agencies and representatives of the International Advisory Board shall also include (but not be limited to) representatives of States, institutions of higher education, cultural organizations, educational organizations, student organizations, local education agencies, students, and private citizens with expertise in international concerns.

(4) Qualification.—Members of the International Advisory Board shall be individuals who have technical qualifications, professional standing, experience working in international affairs or foreign occupa-

(b) to make recommendations that will promote the excellence of international education programs and result in the growth and development of such programs at the postsecondary education level that will reflect diverse perspectives and the full range of views on world regions, foreign language, and international affairs; and

(c) to advise the Secretary and the Congress with respect to needs for expertise in government, the private sector, and education, including foreign languages, and international affairs; and

(d) to recommend to the Secretary and the Congress for the improvement of programs under this title based on the purposes and objectives of this title in order to provide recommendations for improvement of the programs under this title in the future.

(C) make recommendations that will assist the Secretary and the Congress to improve the programs under this title to better reflect the national needs related to the homeland security, international education, and international affairs, including an assessment of the national needs and the training provided by the programs in higher education that receive a grant under this title for expert and non-expert level foreign language training;

(E) make recommendations to the Secretary and the Congress regarding such studies, surveys, and analyses of international education that will provide feedback about the activities supported under this title and assure that their relative authorized activities reflect diverse perspectives and the full range of views on world regions, foreign languages, and international affairs; and

(F) make recommendations that will strengthen the partnerships between local educational agencies, public and private educational institutions, and grant recipients under this title to ensure that the research and knowledge about
shall serve as members of the International Advisory Board. Members of the International Advisory Board may each receive reimbursement for travel expenses incident to attending International Advisory Board meetings, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(2) PERSONNEL.—The International Advisory Board shall elect a Chairman or Chairwoman from among the members of the International Advisory Board to serve a term of 4 years, as determined necessary by the Chairman, or upon the written request of the Secretary, to continue to serve after the expiration of a term until a successor has been appointed.

(f) SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT FOR COMMENT.—The International Advisory Board shall, upon the request of the Secretary, consult with the head of any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this section. The International Advisory Board is authorized to utilize, in such capacity, the services, personnel, information, and facilities of other Federal, State, local, and private agencies with or without reimbursement.

(g) PERSONNEL AND RESOURCES.—(1) COMPENSATION AND EXPENSE.—Members of the International Advisory Committee shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, except that, of the members first appointed (A) 4 shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, and (B) 3 shall be appointed for a term of 4 years, as designated at the time of appointment by the Secretary. A member of the International Advisory Board may be reappointed to successive terms on the International Advisory Board.

(2) VACANCIES.—Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of a predecessor shall be appointed only for the remainder of such term.

(3) NO GOVERNMENTAL MEMBERS.—Except for the members appointed by the Secretary under subsection (b), no full-time employees of the Federal Government shall serve as members of the International Advisory Board.

(4) MEETINGS.—The International Advisory Board shall hold additional meetings at the call of the Chairman or upon the written request of not less than 3 voting members of the International Advisory Board.

(5) QUORUM.—A majority of the voting members of the Board serving at the time of a meeting shall constitute a quorum.

(6) CHAIR.—The International Advisory Board shall elect a Chairperson from among the members of the International Advisory Board.

(7) PART D OF TITLE VI IS FURTHER AMENDED BY INSERTING AFTER SECTION 635 THE FOLLOWING NEW SECTION:

SEC. 636. STUDENT SAFETY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the International Advisory Board, shall conduct a study to identify foreign language heritage communities, particularly such communities that include speakers of languages that are critical to the national security of the United States.

(b) FOREIGN LANGUAGE HERITAGE COMMUNITY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘foreign language heritage community’ means a community of residents or citizens of the United States who are native speakers of or who have partial fluency in, a foreign language.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to the Congress on the results of the study conducted under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3077, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Speaker, I stand here today in strong support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies in Higher Education Act, a bill I offered to build on programs that encourage the study of international issues and foreign languages in higher education. Such programs not only foster knowledge of the world, but, importantly, these programs train experts prepared to meet America's national security needs.

SEC. 634. RECRUITER ACCESS TO STUDENTS AND STUDENT RECRUITING INFORMATION.

"(a) Each institution of higher education that receives a grant under this title shall assure that—

(1) recruiters of the United States Government and agencies thereof are given the same access to students as is provided generally to other institutions of higher education and prospective employers of students for the purpose of recruiting for graduate opportunities or prospective employment; and

(2) no undue restrictions are placed upon students that seek employment with the United States Government or any agency thereof.

(b) STUDENT SAFETY.

"Applicants seeking funds under this title to support student travel and study abroad shall submit as part of their grant application a description of safety policies and procedures for students participating in the program while abroad."

SEC. 8. NATIONAL STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE HERITAGE COMMUNITIES.

Part D of title VI is further amended by inserting after section 635 the following new section:

SEC. 638. NATIONAL STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE HERITAGE COMMUNITIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the International Advisory Board, shall conduct a study to identify foreign language heritage communities, particularly such communities that include speakers of languages that are critical to the national security of the United States.

(b) FOREIGN LANGUAGE HERITAGE COMMUNITY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘foreign language heritage community’ means a community of residents or citizens of the United States who are native speakers of or who have partial fluency in, a foreign language.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit a report to the Congress on the results of the study conducted under this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3077, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Speaker, I stand here today in strong support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies in Higher Education Act, a bill I offered to build on programs that encourage the study of international issues and foreign languages in higher education. Such programs not only foster knowledge of the world, but, importantly, these programs train experts prepared to meet America's national security needs.
Title VI of the Higher Education Act provides support for a critically important group of programs at colleges and universities which work to advance knowledge of world regions, encourage the study of foreign languages, and train American students to have the international expertise and understanding to fulfill pressing national security needs.

As we continue efforts to reauthorize the Higher Education Act and strengthen and improve the state of higher education in America, we cannot neglect these important programs for international studies. The bill before us, which I am proud to have crafted in a bipartisan fashion, updates the programs under title VI to reflect our national security needs in a post-911 era, as well as in the current international climate.

Again, I would particularly like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Hinojosa), the ranking member on the full committee, for his cooperation in moving this bill forward. In the spirit of bipartisan cooperation, the International Studies in Higher Education Act moved through our committee and stands before us today with positive reforms through our committee and stands before the full committee. It will produce a bill that will strengthen and improve international education programs under title VI. It will not interfere with curriculum nor with academic freedom.

Mr. Speaker, our professional staff on the committee have once again done an excellent job in preparing this legislation for our consideration. I would like to recognize the efforts of Alison Ream for the majority and Mr. Ricardo Martinez on our side of the aisle. I urge my colleagues to support this education legislation.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise today in support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies in Higher Education Act.

International education is increasingly important in today’s world. We are part of a global economy, and our fortunes are directly tied to the fortunes of other nations. As a global community, we must face many shared challenges: Protecting the earth’s natural resources, meeting our energy needs, feeding the growing world population, eradicating world hunger, protecting human rights, and ensuring that all people have the opportunity to reach their full potential through education and meaningful work.

We must build our Nation’s capacity to operate in this global environment. As our challenges in Iraq demonstrate, lack of understanding of other people’s culture and language can have deadly consequences. All of our young people, from elementary school through the university, must be exposed to the world at large. We must encourage and value multilingualism. That is why I am very pleased that we are considering H.R. 3077, which reauthorizes the International Studies Program in Higher Education Act.

I would like to thank our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Hoekstra), the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boehner), and our ranking minority, the gentleman from California (Mr. George Miller), for working to produce a bill that deserves bipartisan support.

This bill reauthorizes our international education programs, the international and foreign language studies programs, the business and international education programs, and also the International Institute for Public Policy. These are the core international education programs that have served our Nation very well for many years.

The legislation makes some needed improvements to these programs. It will ease the financial burdens that may discourage needy institutions, such as Hispanic-serving institutions, HSI's; it will benefit Historic Black Colleges and Universities, HBCUs; and it will also benefit tribally-controlled colleges and universities from participating in the programs by allowing the Department of Education to reduce the matching requirement on a case-by-case basis. It also encourages institutions to work in partnerships with minority-serving institutions in the international business programs.

Mr. Speaker, these are steps in the right direction. We must ensure that our national efforts in international education reflect the increasingly diverse population here at home in the United States.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with us to clarify the role and the responsibilities of the new advisory board. The International Advisory Board will provide recommendations to improve the international education programs under title VI. It will not interfere with curriculum nor with academic freedom.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in thanking our staff for the work that they have done not only on this bill but also on the previous bill. It is their work behind the scenes so often which enables us to come together and work out our differences and come to the floor on a bipartisan basis.

Again, these programs, the international education programs, they work to advance the knowledge for our young people of world regions. As we found in a post-911 world, it is very, very important that we train more of our young people in the area of foreign languages. It is a critical need. It is an area where we are woefully short of the resources that we need. It is a weakness that we face, so this bill will help encourage the study of foreign language. It will train Americans to have the international expertise and the understanding to fulfill pressing national security needs.

This bill will encourage the coordination between these important international and foreign language study programs and America’s national and international security needs. Since 9/11, we have seen and received heightened awareness of how important these types of programs are. We have found that these no longer are nice to have, but these are now essential programs that we need to build the expertise within the United States to face some of the international security threats that we face.

H.R. 3077 also seeks to strengthen and improve international education programs to ensure they are reaching the U.S. Department of Education to reduce the matching requirement on a case-by-case basis. It also encourages institutions to work in partnerships with minority-serving institutions in the international business programs.

Mr. Speaker, these are steps in the right direction. We must ensure that our national efforts in international education reflect the increasingly diverse population here at home in the United States.
As my colleague mentioned, the bill also creates an education advisory board. There were those who were concerned as we began this process that the language was not clearly written and that the end result would be that the advisory board would become more than an advisory board and that it would become a board that could dictate curricula. Working together, we were able to clarify that language to make sure that everyone understands that this is clearly an advisory board into which feedback can be provided. The Department of Education, provide feedback to Congress, and provide feedback to the institutions in the best way to get the maximum amount of benefit out of each and every one of these programs and the dollars that are administered, and also to foster cooperation between various universities so that they can learn from each other as to what the most effective practices are, what the new innovative programs might be, and how colleges and campuses can move forward aggressively. So this bill is a significant step forward. It builds on the long-term successes that we have had.

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending the subcommittee chairman and our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), who has demonstrated tremendous leadership on this whole question of international studies. His background and the need for internationalizing our workforce, internationalizing our universities, bringing attention to Hispanic-serving institutions and ensuring that they get their just share of federal dollars. The workforce in this Nation is second to none. It is certainly a pleasure for me to serve with him on this Committee on Education and the Workforce.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies and Higher Education Act of 2003. Education programs are vital to our Nation's colleges and universities. It is imperative that we train young men and women of all backgrounds to prepare for the increasingly global society. Today we live in a global village. Everything is interdependent. World trade organizations, world bank organizations, organizations that deal with world health, the current campaign to eradicate polio in countries needs to have physicians from throughout the world, and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control needs to have doctors that reflect the various cultures of the world. So that education, even though it is on a college level, we need to see the impact that it will have and should have in other agencies such as health, such as banking. So we must do more to prepare our students to take their place.

Unfortunately, though, this bill does not go far enough in recruiting and maintaining minority students in the field of international service. During the markup, I proposed an amendment which would have authorized the establishment of a Ralph Bunche scholarship for selected undergraduate students in the Institute for International Public Policy. We will be celebrating 100 years of Dr. Ralph Bunche's work, and the institution would have helped to underwrite the cost of studies of minority students. Dr. Ralph Bunche was a Nobel Peace Prize recipient. He did a tremendous amount of work in the Middle East, and he was a dedicated person during the 20 years he worked in trying to achieve global peace. The scholarship I was proposing would have helped to underwrite the cost of studies of more diverse students, minority students, in our country because in order for us to really have a foreign service that truly reflects the diversity of America, we must have more students from minority groups. We must have more Asian Americans and more Hispanic Americans and African Americans in our foreign service if we are, in fact, going to be successful.

The institute was created in 1992 in order to attract and retain women and minorities who are underserved. This legislation was supported by the United Negro College Fund and the American Council on Education; and hopefully as we move forward, that legislation will be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3077, but in the future, hopefully, we can be a little more sensitive so we can really, truly have our foreign service reflect the great diversity of our Nation.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to register my support for the bill that is currently before us, H.R. 3077. It is something that is badly needed. I am very pleased to see it come out of committee, and I hope it will soon pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies Act, in Higher Education Act.

I want to particularly commend the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Select Education, for including in the bill section 6, providing for the establishment of the International Higher Education Advisory Board.

This seven-member independent board will be empowered to review and comment upon the selection criteria for title VI grants, monitor and evaluate the activities of grantees based upon the purposes of title VI, and make recommendations regarding how to improve the programs to better reflect national needs, among other functions. Section 6 makes clear that the purpose of the Board's recommendations is to foster the "growth and development of international education programs at the postsecondary level that encourage diverse perspectives . . . ."

I am encouraged that the creation of this Advisory Board will help redress the problem which is a great concern of mine, namely, the lack of balance, and indeed the anti-American bias that pervades title VI-funded Middle East studies programs in particular. To the extent that it advances the national interest to commit taxpayer funds to institutions of higher education for the purpose of fostering expertise with regard to key regions of the world—and I would emphatically affirm that it does—then surely it is troubling when evidence suggests that many of the Middle East regional studies grantees are committed to a narrow point of view at odds with our national interest, a point of view that questions the validity of advancing American ideals of democracy and the rule of law around the world, and in the Middle East in particular.

The Advisory Board's oversight function does not compromise on the academic freedom that is and must be enjoyed by our institutions of higher education. In establishing the board, we are doing no more than exercising our responsibility to ensure that the Federal funds we authorize and appropriate are expended properly.

I commend the Committee on Education and the Workforce for addressing this issue, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3077, the International Studies in Higher Education Act. This bill is part of our comprehensive efforts to strengthen and renew higher education, and it will make real improvements to international and foreign language studies programs in campuses across America.

I'd like to commend my colleague Mr. HOEKSTRA, chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee, for his work on this bill. Thanks to his efforts, the measure before us today has received bipartisan support, as well as a positive response from those in the higher education community who are administering these critical international and foreign language programs. I'd also like to thank my good friend Mr. MILLER, the ranking member on the committee, and Mr. HINOJOSA, the ranking member on the subcommittee, for their cooperation in bringing this bill before us today.

The International Studies in Higher Education Act renews and reauthorizes the international and foreign language studies programs under title VI of the Higher Education Act. These programs are not only an important part of our postsecondary education system, but they are also a critical piece of our national efforts to fulfill national and international security needs.

Today, in the post-9/11 era, our Nation has been confronted with a new reality. No more than at virtually any other time in our history, we must understand our national interests and security concerns within an international context. We do not live in a vacuum, and our higher education system must reflect this. That's why the bill before us today is so important.

International and foreign language studies programs are often responsible for training experts with the skills and knowledge necessary
to meet our changing national security needs. Grants provided through title VI of the Higher Education Act allow colleges and universities across the country to offer programs that foster this type of learning, and help students gain significant understanding of international perspectives and languages.

The bill before us today will allow the continued success of these programs by allowing for increased undergraduate study, including study abroad. In addition, the bill allows for the creation of national resource centers to serve as informative resources for international and foreign language use at the K–12 level, encouraging international studies at all levels of education. The bill also seeks to enhance diversity among those participating in the Institute for International Public Policy, requiring that all underrepresented population segments be included.

Because of the increased prevalence and importance of international and foreign language studies programs, particularly in meeting our changing national security needs, this bill creates an important new resource for information and guidance through the establishment of an advisory board for international education. This advisory board will serve as a valuable information source for Congress and the Secretary of Education as we work to strengthen our language programs and ensure their continued success.

I’d like to acknowledge the hard work of members of my staff in bringing this bill forward today; particularly Kinsa Pearce, Alison Ream, Kathleen Smith, Alexa Marrero, and Rebecca Han with Mr. HOEKSTRA’s staff. Additionally, I would like to thank the Democratic staff, including Ricardo Martinez, Alex Nock, Ellynne Bannon and Moira Lenehan with Mr. HINOJOSA’s staff. Thanks to the leadership of Chairman HOEKSTRA, the bipartisan cooperation from members on both sides of the aisle, and the hard work of our staff, we have before us today a bill that will allow for the continued success of international and foreign language studies programs at campuses across the nation. I’m pleased to support this measure, and encourage my colleagues to join me in our efforts to ensure international and foreign language studies continue to thrive at colleges and universities across America.

Mr. HOLT, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 3077, International Studies in Higher Education Act. This bill authorizes a total of $108 million in FY 2004 for higher education international studies and foreign language programs. It also establishes a seven-member International Education Advisory Board to provide advice and recommendations to the Education Department and Congress on all title VI programs but specifically states that nothing in it should be construed as authorizing the advisory board to “mandate, direct or control” the specific institutional content, curriculum or program of instruction of any institution of higher education.

I would like to highlight two amendments that I offered in the Higher Education Committee. One concerned the final version of the legislation. One of the serious challenges facing our nation today is that our country lacks people who are fluent in a foreign language and also have a background in science and technology. There are few Americans who can understand technical documents, including research studies and scientific papers, written in foreign languages.

If we are to stay competitive with emerging economies in Asia, Central and South America, and Africa, this will have to change.

That is why I offered one amendment, which would support programs with curricula that combine studying science and technology in a foreign language. This amendment would allow universities to use grants to set up immersion programs here in the United States where students take science technology-related course work taught completely in foreign languages.

It also would provide for other programs, such as summer workshops, that emphasize the intense study of a foreign language and of science and technology.

Funds can further be used to support immersion programs for students to take science and math courses in a non-English speaking country.

To stay on top of innovations in science, mathematics, and technology, more professionals in these fields will also have to be proficient in a foreign language.

It is only with the knowledge of technical terms in foreign languages not taught in the average high school or college language class—that America can stay technologically and economically competitive.

I would like to thank Chairman BÖHNER for accepting this amendment. I hope in the future Congress will extend upon this amendment and authorize new funding for the study of science and technology in foreign languages.

The second amendment would allow the Department of Education to conduct a national study to identify heritage communities with native speakers of critical foreign languages. This will enable us to identify the foreign language capacity currently existing in the United States.

Members of heritage communities are better and less expensive educational investments than nonnative speakers with no previous foreign language experience.

More importantly, cultivating native speakers is critical to national security. The 9/11 Joint Inquiry released in July reports that the American intelligence community only has 30 percent readiness in languages critical to national security. As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I find this statistic quite troubling.

The al Qaeda terrorist network currently operates in over 75 countries where hundreds of different languages and dialects are spoken.

Unfortunately, 99 percent of American school, college, and university programs concentrate on only a dozen languages, most of which are European.

In fact, more college students currently study Ancient Greek (16,402) than Arabic (5,505), Korean (4,479), and Farsi (614) put together. We need to raise these numbers. Unfortunately, for nonnative speakers, learning languages like Arabic takes years of intensive effort and years of in-country study.

In this time of heightened awareness of national security and intelligence capabilities, we need to identify the foreign language resources already existing in this country, especially native speakers of languages that are rarely taught in our schools.

The only way to know what we have available to us in terms of native language speakers—and we can take advantage of this knowledge—is by conducting a comprehensive study. The results of this study should be extremely valuable to the intelligence community, to educators, and to Congress.

I again want to thank my colleagues on the Education and the Workforce Committee, and I want to express my strong support for this bill. As I hope the leadership of this Congress will see fit to properly fund it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3077, which reauthorizes title VI of the Higher Education Act to authorize new grant programs to increase the number of graduates who are trained in foreign language and international studies. I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman HOEKSTRA, for his leadership on this bipartisan resolution and in the Subcommittee on Select Education. I would also like to thank Ranking Member HINOJOSA for his leadership as well.

I believe we can all realize the great need to have educated individuals in our Nation with the main focus being in foreign language and international studies. After the knowledge of September 11. This bill will allow our country to strengthen that aspect of our education system by offering competitive grants to our nation’s colleges and universities. Some of the included grants offer institutions of higher education the opportunity to establish undergraduate area centers and programs as well as to create new programs or to strengthen existing programs in international studies and foreign language. I am pleased that this resolution has expanded the role of international centers and programs by allowing the centers and programs to serve as a national resource for courses and materials for elementary and secondary schools. This encourages an outreach to all school children to become more familiar and knowledgeable on international affairs and cultures.

Another section of this resolution will make grants available to establish centers for international business education. These centers promote the ability for our Nation to strengthen our economic and commercial interests after the knowledge of international understanding. I believe this is a great quality for our future business and small business leaders to have to not only support their businesses but as a way to expand and enrich their businesses.

Mr. KILDEE, Mr. Speaker, international education and Federal support for it is critical as we work to strengthen our economy and expand our diplomatic efforts around the world.

International education programs are vital in building and maintaining the nation’s supply of experts in foreign languages, international affairs, and international business. Providing high quality, useful opportunities for students to become knowledgeable in international issues and foreign languages has become increasingly important. America’s interests are tied to our knowledge and understanding of the rest of the world.

This legislation strengthens and reauthorizes the existing Title VI programs related to the study of international affairs, world regions and foreign languages in higher education. In addition, this bill makes significant improvements to the International Business Education program by reducing the match that Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic
Serving Institutions, and Tribal Colleges must make to participate in this program. This provi-
sion alone is likely to spur new ideas and per-
spectives in this area.

One provision I do want to express caution on is the International Advisory Board created
by this legislation. This board has been cre-
tated to provide recommendations to the Sec-
retary in the area of international education.
While I support this legislation, we should con-
tinue to refine the purpose and scope of the
Board’s responsibilities. As this bill moves to
conference later this Congress, I will work to
ensure that the role of this Board reflects a
true need in the area of international edu-
cation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support
of H.R. 3077, the International Studies in
Higher Education Act.

H.R. 3077 updates international and foreign
language studies programs by ensuring these
programs reflect the current international cli-
mate and national security needs. The bill also
emphasizes coordination between these pro-
grams and homeland security interests, while
ensuring the programs continue to enrich high-
er education by enhancing international knowl-
edge.

As a former Member of the Intelligence
Committee I authored legislation encouraging
American students to study foreign languages
and join the federal government in national secu-
ritv. This bill is vital to our national security
that we address our foreign lan-
guage deficiencies and support educational
initiatives that amend this problem. Our lack of
highly-trained linguists experts seriously
hampers our ability to fight the war on ter-
rorism and this legislation provides incentive
to focus these programs on the reality of the situ-
ations our men and women in uniform face
overseas. It is important that we build a critical
base of future leaders both in government
service and in higher education who have cul-
tivated international relationships and worked
and studies alongside experts of other coun-
tries.

I encourage my colleagues to support H.R.
3077.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.
SHAW). The question is on the motion
offered by the gentleman from Michi-
gan (Mr. HOOKstra) that the House
suspend the rules and pass the bill,
H.R. 3077, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on
the table.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMIN-
ISTRATION—REAUTHORIZATION
ACT OF 2003

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, pur-
suant to the order of the House of Mon-
day, October 20, 2003, I call up the bill
(H.R. 2535) to reauthorize and improve
the program authorized by the Public
Works and Economic Development Act of
1965, and ask for its immediate con-
dition.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursu-
tag to the order of the House of Mon-
day, October 20, 2003, the bill is consid-
ered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 2535 is as follows:

H.R. 2535

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Economic Development Administration Reauthoriza-
tion Act of 2003”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.

Except as otherwise expressly provided,
whenever in this Act an amendment or re-
xample is express in opportunity amexpand-
to, or a repeal of, a section or other provi-
tion, the reference shall be considered to be
made to a section or other provision of the
Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.).

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

Section 2 (42 U.S.C. 3121) is amended to
read as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the fol-
lowing:

(1) There continue to be areas experi-
encing chronic high unemployment, under-
employment, outmigration, and low per cap-
ita incomes, as well as areas facing sudden
and severe economic dislocations due to
structural economic changes, changing trade
patterns, certain Federal actions (including
environmental requirements that result in
the removal of economic activities from a lo-
city), and natural disasters.

(2) Economic growth in our Nation,
States, cities, and rural areas is produced by
expanding free enterprise through trade, develop-
ing and strengthening public infrastructure,
and creating a climate for job creation and busi-
ess development.

(3) The goal of Federal economic develop-
ment programs is to raise the standard of
living for all citizens and increase the wealth
and overall rate of growth of the economy
by encouraging communities to develop a more
competitive and diversified economic base by

(A) creating an environment that pro-
motes economic activity by improving and
expanding public infrastructure;

(B) promoting job creation through in-
creased innovation, productivity, and entre-
preneurship; and

(C) empowering local and regional com-
nunities experiencing chronic high unem-
ployment, low per capita income to de-
velop private sector business and attract in-
creased private sector capital investment.

(4) While economic development is an in-
herently local process, the Federal Gover-
ment should work in partnership with public
and private local, regional, tribal, and State
organizations to maximize the impact of ex-
isting resources and enable regions, commu-
nities, and citizens to participate more fully
in the American dream and national pros-
perity.

(5) In order to avoid duplication of effort
and achieve meaningful, long-lasting results,
Federal, State, tribal, and local economic de-
velopment activities should have a clear focus, improved coordination, a comprehen-
sive approach, and simplified and consistent
requirements.

(b) DECLARATIONS.—In order to promote
a strong and growing economy throughout the
United States, Congress declares the fol-
lowing:

(1) Assistance under this Act should be
made available to both rural- and urban-dis-
tressed communities.

(2) Local communities should work in
partnership with neighboring communities,
the States, Indian tribes, and the Federal
Government to increase their capacity to de-
velop and implement comprehensive eco-

momic development strategies to alleviate
economic distress and enhance competitive-
ness in the global economy.

(3) Whether suffering from long-term dis-
tress or a sudden dislocation, distressed com-
munities should be encouraged to support
entrepreneurship to take advantage of tech-
nological innovation and expanded global
markets.”.

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

(a) ELIGIBLE REGION.—Section 3(4)(A) (42
U.S.C. 3122(4)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking clause (i) and redesignating
clauses (ii) through (vii) as clauses (i)
through (vi), respectively; and

(2) in clause (iv) (as so redesignated by in-
serting “), including a special purpose unit of
a State or local government engaged in eco-

motor or infrastructure development activi-

ties,” after “State”.

(b) REGIONAL COMMISSIONS.—Section 3 (42
U.S.C. 3122) is amended by redesignating
paragraphs (8), (9), and (10) as paragraphs (9), (10), and (11), respec-
tively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) the fol-
lowing:

(8) REGIONAL COMMISSIONS.—The term ‘Re-

gional Commissions’ means the following en-
tities:

(A) The Appalachian Regional Commissi-

on established under chapter 143 of title 40,
United States Code.

(B) The Delta Regional Authority estab-
lished under subtitle F of the Consolidated
Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C.
2000a et seq).

(C) The Delmar Valley Commission estab-
lished under the Delmar Valley Commissi-

2681-637 et seq.).

(D) The Northern Great Plains Regional

Authority established under subtitle F of the
Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act
(7 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.).

(C) UNIVERSITY CENTER.—Section 3 (42
U.S.C. 3122) is amended by adding at the end
the following:

(12) UNIVERSITY CENTER.—The term ‘un-
iversity center’ means an institution of high-
er education or a consortium of institutions
of higher education engaged in the Uni-

versity Center for Economic Development under section 207(a)(2)(D).”.

SEC. 103. ESTABLISHMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVEL-
OPMENT PARTNERSHIPS.

Section 101 (42 U.S.C. 3131) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by striking “and
multi-State regional organizations” and in-
serting “multi-State regional organizations,
and nonprofit organizations”; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1) by striking “adjoin-

ing” each place it appears.

SEC. 104. COORDINATION.

Section 103 (42 U.S.C. 3132) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before

“The Secretary”;

(2) in subsection (a) (as so designated) by
inserting “Indian tribes,” after “districts;”; and
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(b) MEETINGS.—To carry out the responsibilities in subsection (a), or for any other purpose related to economic development activities, the Secretary may convene meetings with Federal agencies, State and local governments, economic development districts, and other appropriate planning and development organizations.

TITLE II.—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 201. GRANTS FOR PLANNING.

Invocation of supplementary grants.—The share of the project cost supported by a supplementary grant under this section may not exceed the applicable Federal share under section 208.

SEC. 202. COST SHARING.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 204(a) (42 U.S.C. 3144(a)) is amended by inserting after "paragraph (1)," the following:

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting "(2) the award of funds under this Act, which will be combined with funds transferred from other Federal agencies in projects administered by the Secretary.";

and

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

(D) assist in carrying out a State’s workforce investment strategy; and"

SEC. 203. SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

DIRECT EXPENDITURE OR REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to maintain the proper operation of revolving loan fund grants.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a grant to a recipient for a construction project under section 201 or 209, if the Secretary determines, before closeout of the project, that the cost of the project, based on the designs and specifications that were the basis of the grant, has decreased because of decreases in costs, the Secretary may approve, without further appropriations action, the use of the excess funds (or any amount of excess funds) by the recipient to increase the Federal share of the cost of a project under this subtitle to the maximum percentage allowable under section 204 or to improve the project.

(b) OTHER USES OF EXCESS FUNDS.—Any amount of excess funds remaining after applying the requirements of subsection (a) may be used by the Secretary for providing assistance under this Act.

(c) TRANSFERRED FUNDS.—In the case of excess funds described in subsection (a) in projects utilizing funds transferred from other Federal agencies pursuant to section 604, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the funds in accordance with subsection (a), with the approval of the originating agency; or

(2) return the funds to the originating agency.

SEC. 204. REGULATIONS ON RELATIVE NEEDS AND ALLOCATIONS.

(c) INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE.

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

(3) that the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the project will—

(A) increase economic development in the area represented by the recipient; and

(B) make an economic contribution to the area represented by the recipient.

SEC. 205. GRANTS FOR TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3147(a)(2)) is amended by inserting "and the Secretary may use the funds for providing assistance under this section to the heads of the Federal agencies responsible for carrying out applicable Federal programs; or"

SEC. 206. PREVENTION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION.

(a) DIRECT EXPENDITURE OR REDISTRIBUTION BY RECIPIENT.—Section 209(d) (42 U.S.C. 3149(d)) is amended by striking "an eligible recipient," inserting "eligible recipient;" each place it appears and inserting "a recipient" and "an eligible recipient;" each place it appears, and inserting "a recipient;" each place it appears, and inserting "an eligible recipient;" each place it appears and inserting "a recipient;" each place it appears and inserting "an eligible recipient."
SEC. 215. PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE GRANTS.

(a) In General.—The Secretary may make a performance incentive grant in connection with a project grant made, on or after the date of enactment of this section, to an eligible recipient under section 201 or 203.

(b) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to establish performance measures for making performance incentive grants under this section.

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider including performance measures to assess the following factors:

(A) Whether the recipient meets or exceeds scheduling goals.

(B) Whether the recipient meets or exceeds job creation goals.

(C) Amounts of private sector capital investments leveraged.

(D) Such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

(1) In General.—The Secretary shall base the amount of a performance incentive grant under subsection (a) on the extent to which a recipient meets or exceeds performance measures established in connection with the applicable project grant.

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a performance incentive grant may not exceed 10 percent of the amount of the applicable project grant.

(d) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding section 204, the amounts of a performance incentive grant under subsection (a) may use the amount for up to 100 percent of the cost of an eligible project or activity. For the purposes of meeting the non-Federal share requirements of this Act, or any other Act, the amounts of a performance incentive grant shall be treated as funds from a non-Federal source.

(e) USE OF PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE GRANTS.—A recipient of a performance incentive grant under subsection (a) may use the grant for any eligible purpose under this Act, in accordance with section 602 and such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

(f) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In making performance incentive grants under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(g) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall carry out this section using any amounts made available for economic development assistance programs.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall include information regarding the award of performance incentive grants under this section in the annual report required under section 603.

(h) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the implementation of this section in each fiscal year.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, and thereafter, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the Comptroller General's findings under this subsection.

(i) CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 215 the following:

“Sec. 215. Performance incentive grants.”

SEC. 216. SUBGRANTS.

(a) In General.—(1) The Secretary shall distribute grant funds received under section 201, 203, 207, or 209 for projects to expand, redevelop, or reuse brownfield sites.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Projects carried out under subsection (a) shall be subject to the limitations of section 104(k)(4)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(4)(B)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BRIGHTFIELD SITE.—The term ‘brightfield site’ means a brownfield site (as defined in section 209) that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

(2) QUALIFIED ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘qualified eligible recipient’ means a brownfield site that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

SEC. 217. BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT.

(a) In General.—On the application of a qualified eligible recipient, the Secretary may make grants under sections 201, 203, 207, and 209 for projects to expand, redevelop, or reuse brownfield sites.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Projects carried out under this section shall be subject to the limitations of section 104(k)(4)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(4)(B)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BRIGHTFIELD SITE.—The term ‘brightfield site’ means a brownfield site (as defined in section 209) that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

(2) QUALIFIED ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘qualified eligible recipient’ means a brownfield site that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

SEC. 218. BRIGHTFIELDS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—The Secretary shall carry out the following definitions:

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘brownfields development’ means the development of brownfield sites if the Secretary determines that the project will—

(A) improve the commercial and economic opportunities in the area where the project is located;

(B) improve the commercial and economic opportunities in the area where the project is located;

(C) improve the commercial and economic opportunities in the area where the project is located.

SEC. 219. BROWNFIELDS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

(a) In General.—(1) The Secretary shall make grants under section 209 for projects to expand, redevelop, or reuse brownfield sites.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Projects carried out under this section shall be subject to the limitations of section 104(k)(4)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(4)(B)).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BRIGHTFIELD SITE.—The term ‘brightfield site’ means a brownfield site (as defined in section 209) that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

(2) QUALIFIED ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘qualified eligible recipient’ means a brownfield site that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.
(1) in the first sentence by striking "in accordance with" and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting "in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code"; and

(2) in the third sentence by striking "section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 275c)" and inserting "section 3145 of title 40, United States Code".

(b) Evaluation criteria.—Section 506(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3196(d)(2)) is amended by inserting "program performance," after "applied research".

TLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. RELATIONSHIP TO ASSISTANCE UNDER OTHER LAW.

Section 609 (42 U.S.C. 3219) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by striking "(b) ASSISTANCE UNDER OTHER ACTS.—".

TLE VII—FUNDING

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 701 (42 U.S.C. 3232) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 701. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) Economic development assistance programs.—There are authorized to be appropriated for economic development assistance programs to carry out this Act—

"(1) $477,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; "(2) $450,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; "(3) $475,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and "(4) Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(b) Salaries and expenses.—There are authorized to be appropriated for salaries and expenses of administering this Act:

"(1) $425,000,000 for fiscal year 2005; "(2) $400,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; "(3) $33,377,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment designated by the previous order of the House, is adopted.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:
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Bill enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) Short Title.—This Act may be cited as the "Economic Development Administration Reauthorization Act of 2003." (b) Table of Contents.—
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Title VI—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

Sec. 601. Relationship to assistance under other law.

Title V—ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 501. Economic development information clearinghouse.
Sec. 502. Businesses desiring Federal contracts.
Sec. 503. Performance evaluations of grant recipients.
Sec. 504. Conforming amendments.

Title VII—FUNDING

Sec. 701. Authorization of appropriations.

Title II—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3212, et seq.).

TLE V—ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 501. Economic development information clearinghouse.
Sec. 502. Businesses desiring Federal contracts.
Sec. 503. Performance evaluations of grant recipients.
Sec. 504. Conforming amendments.

TLE VII—FUNDING

Sec. 701. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.

Title I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Findings and declarations.


TLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 101. Findings and declarations.
Sec. 102. Definitions.
Sec. 103. Establishment of economic development partnerships.
Sec. 104. Coordination.

TLE II—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 201. Grants for planning.
Sec. 203. Supplementary grants.
Sec. 204. Regulations on relative needs and alleviation.
Sec. 205. Grants for training, research, and technical assistance.
Sec. 206. Prevention of unfair competition.
Sec. 207. Economic adjustment.
Sec. 208. Use of funds in projects constructed under projected cost.
SEC. 201. GRANTS FOR PLANNING.

Section 203(d) (42 U.S.C. 3143(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Before providing assistance for a State plan under this section, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the State will consider local and economic development district plans:”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) COORDINATION.—Before providing assistance for a State plan under this section, the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the State will consider local and economic development district plans:”;

and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (C);

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) assist in carrying out a State’s workforce investment strategy;”.

SEC. 202. CONTROLLING.

(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 204(a) (42 U.S.C. 3144(a)) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Secretary shall increase the Federal share of the cost of projects carried out under this title based on the relative needs of the areas in which the projects will be located. Except as provided in subsection (c), the Federal share of the cost of any project carried out under this title shall not exceed 80 percent.”;

(b) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 204(b) (42 U.S.C. 3144(b)) is amended by inserting “assumptions of debt,” after “equipment,”.

(c) INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE.—Section 204 (42 U.S.C. 3144) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) INCREASE IN FEDERAL SHARE.—

(1) INDIAN TRIBES.—In the case of a grant to an Indian tribe for a project under this title, the Secretary shall establish the Federal share of the cost of projects carried out under this title based on the percentage specified in subsection (a) up to 100 percent of the cost of the project.

(2) CERTAIN STATES, POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS, AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—In the case of a grant to a State, or a political subdivision of a State, that the Secretary determines has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity, or in the case of a grant to a nonprofit organization that the Secretary determines has exhausted its effective borrowing capacity, the Secretary may increase the Federal share above the percentage specified in subsection (a) up to 100 percent of the cost of the project.

(3) PLANNING GRANTS.—Section 204 (42 U.S.C. 3144) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) PLANNING GRANTS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Federal share of the costs of planning activities under section 203 shall be at least 60 percent, but not more than 80 percent.”.

SEC. 203. SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 205(b) (42 U.S.C. 3145(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (c), in order to assist eligible recipients in taking advantage of designated Federal grant programs, on the application of an eligible recipient, the Secretary may make a supplementary grant for a project for which the recipient is eligible but for which the recipient cannot provide the required non-Federal share because of the recipient’s economic situation.”.

(b) REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.—Section 205(c) (42 U.S.C. 3145(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting the following:

“(A) AMOUNT OF SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS.—The Secretary shall make supplementary grants by—

(A) the payment of funds made available under this Act to Federal agencies responsible for carrying out the applicable Federal programs; or

(B) the award of funds under this Act, which will be combined with funds transferred from other Federal agencies in projects administered by the Secretary;”;

and

(2) by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 204. REQUIREMENTS, RELATIVE NEEDS AND ALLOCATIONS.

Section 206 (42 U.S.C. 3146) is amended—

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207(a) (42 U.S.C. 3147(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (F); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

“(G) studies that evaluate the effectiveness of coordinating projects funded under this Act with projects funded under other Acts;”;

(b) COOPERATION REQUIREMENT.—Section 207(a) (42 U.S.C. 3147(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COOPERATION REQUIREMENT.—In the case of a grant or loan under this Act, the Secretary shall cooperate with other Federal, State, or local agencies, or nonprofit organizations, in carrying out the purposes of the Act.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 208 (42 U.S.C. 3148), and the item relating to section 208 in the table of contents contained in section 1(b), are repealed.

SEC. 205. GRANTS FOR TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 209(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3149(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (F);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

“(G) studies that evaluate the effectiveness of coordinating projects funded under this Act with projects funded under other Acts;”;

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 209(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3149(a)) is amended by adding “or in part, as appropriate, the requirements of section (a), with the approval of the originating agency;”.

SEC. 206. PREVENTION OF UNFAIR COMPETITION.

Section 209 (42 U.S.C. 3149), and the item relating to section 209 in the table of contents contained in section 1(b), are repealed.

SEC. 207. GRANTS FOR ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT.

(a) DIRECT EXPENDITURE OR REDEMPTION BY RECIPIENT.—Section 209(d) (42 U.S.C. 3149(d)) is amended by striking “an eligible recipient” each place it appears and inserting “a recipient”.

(b) SPECIAL PRISONS RELATING TO REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANTS.—Section 209 (42 U.S.C. 3149) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) SPECIAL PRISONS RELATING TO REVOLVING LOAN FUND GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to maintain the proper operation and financial integrity of revolving loan funds established by recipients with assistance under this section.

(2) EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary may determine—

(A) at the request of a grantee, amend and exchange Commission or a self-regulatory organization thereunder.

(b) USE OF FUNDS IN PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED UNDER PROJECTED COST.

Section 211 (42 U.S.C. 3151) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 211. USE OF FUNDS IN PROJECTS CONSTRUCTED UNDER PROJECTED COST.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a grant to a recipient for a construction project under section 201 or 209, if the Secretary determines, before completion of the project, based on the designs and specifications that were the basis of the grant, has decreased because of decreases in costs, the Secretary may approve, without further appropriations action, the use of the excess funds (or a portion of the excess funds) by the recipient to increase the Federal share of the cost of a project under this title to the maximum percentage allowable under section 204 or to improve the project.

(b) OTHER USES OF EXCESS FUNDS.—Any amount of excess funds remaining after application of subsection (a) may be transferred to the Sec-
the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a written notice of the waiver, including a justification for the waiver.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 213 the following:

"Sec. 214. Special impact areas."

SEC. 210. PERFORMANCE AWARDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 215. Performance awards."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 214 the following:

"Sec. 215. Performance awards."

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make a planning performance award in connection with a grant made, or after the date of enactment of this section, to an eligible recipient for a project under section 201 or 209.

(b) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall issue regulations to establish performance measures for making performance awards under subsection (a).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—In issuing regulations under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider including performance measures that assess the following:

(A) Whether the recipient meets or exceeds scheduling goals.

(B) Whether the recipient meets or exceeds job creation goals.

(C) Amounts of private sector capital investments leveraged.

(D) Such other factors as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) AMOUNT OF AWARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall base the amount of a performance award made under subsection (a) in connection with a grant on the extent to which a recipient meets or exceeds performance measures established in connection with the grant.

(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of a performance award may not exceed 10 percent of the amount of the grant.

(d) USE OF AWARDS.—A recipient of a performance award under subsection (a) may use the award for any eligible purpose under this Act, in accordance with section 602 and such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding section 204, the amounts of a performance award may be used for up to 100 percent of the cost of an eligible project or activity.

(f) TREATMENT IN MEETING NON-FEDERAL SHARE REQUIREMENTS.—For the purposes of meeting the non-federal share requirements of this Act or any other Act, the amounts of a performance award shall be treated as funds from a non-federal source.

(g) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In making performance awards under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall carry out such amounts made available for economic development assistance programs.

(ii) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall include information regarding performance awards made under this section in the annual report required under section 603.

(i) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the implementation of this section in each fiscal year.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a written report on the Comptroller’s findings under this section."

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—Projects carried out under this section shall be subject to the limitations of section 104(k)(4)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(k)(4)(B)); except that recipients may use grant funds awarded under this section for the administrative costs of economic development activities.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BROWNFIELD SITE.—The term ‘‘brownfield site’’ has the meaning given such term in section 101(39) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(39)).

(2) QUALIFIED ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘‘qualified eligible recipient’’ means any qualified eligible recipient that meets the definition of ‘‘eligible entity’’ in section 104(k)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(4)(B)), except that for any project undertaken under this section the term may include a nonprofit organization acting in cooperation with officials of a political subdivision of a State.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary may make a planning performance award to an eligible recipient under subsection (a) in connection with a grant for a project if the Secretary determines before closeout of the project that—

(1) the recipient actively participated in the economic development activities of the economic development district in which the project is located;

(2) the project is consistent with the comprehensive economic development strategy of the district;

(3) the recipient worked with Federal, State, and local economic development entities throughout the development of the project;

(4) the project was completed in accordance with the comprehensive economic development strategy of the district.

(i) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall carry out this section using any amounts made available for economic development assistance programs.

(j) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a written report on the Comptroller’s findings under this section."

"Sec. 216. Planning performance awards.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make a planning performance award in connection with a grant made, or after the date of enactment of this section, to an eligible recipient for a project under section 201 located in an economic development district.

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary may make a planning performance award to an eligible recipient under subsection (a) in connection with a grant for a project if the Secretary determines before closeout of the project that—

(1) the recipient actively participated in the economic development activities of the economic development district in which the project is located;

(2) the project is consistent with the comprehensive economic development strategy of the district;

(3) the recipient worked with Federal, State, and local economic development entities throughout the development of the project;

(4) the project was completed in accordance with the comprehensive economic development strategy of the district.

(c) AMOUNT OF AWARDS.—A recipient of a planning performance award under subsection (a) shall use the award to increase the Federal share of the cost of a project under this title.

(d) USE OF AWARDS.—A recipient of a planning performance award under subsection (a) shall use the award to increase the Federal share of the cost of a project under this title.

(e) FEDERAL SHARE.—Notwithstanding section 204, the amounts of a planning performance award may be used for up to 100 percent of the cost of a project under this title.

(f) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall carry out this section using any amounts made available for economic development assistance programs.

(g) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—In making performance awards under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(h) FUNDING.—The Secretary shall carry out such amounts made available for economic development assistance programs.

(ii) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall include information regarding performance awards made under this section in the annual report required under section 603.

(i) REVIEW BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the implementation of this section in each fiscal year.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a written report on the Comptroller’s findings under this section.

"Sec. 217. Subgrants.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 217. Subgrants."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 214 the following:

"Sec. 217. Planning performance awards."

SEC. 212. SUBGRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 212. Subgrants."

(1) Subject to subsection (b), a recipient of a grant under section 201, 203, or 207 may directly expend the grant funds or may redistribute the funds in the form of a subgrant to other eligible recipients to fund required components of the scope of work approved for the project.

(b) LIMITATION.—A recipient may not redistribute grant funds received under section 201 or 203 to a for-profit entity.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 216 the following:

"Sec. 217. Subgrants."

SEC. 213. BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title II (42 U.S.C. 3141 et seq.) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 213. Brownfields redevelopment."

(1) IN GENERAL.—On the application of a qualified eligible recipient, the Secretary may make a grant for a project for the development of brownfield sites if the Secretary determines that the project will—

(1) utilize solar energy technologies to develop abandoned or contaminated sites for commercial use; and

(2) improve the commercial and economic opportunities in the area where the project is located.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Projects carried out under this section shall be subject to the limitations of section 104(k)(4)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(k)(4)(B)); except that the amounts may be used under this section for the administrative costs of economic development activities.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) BROWNFIELD SITE.—The term ‘‘brownfield site’’ means a brownfield site (as defined in section 217) that is redeveloped through the incorporation of solar energy technologies.

(2) QUALIFIED ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘‘qualified eligible recipient’’ means a recipient of a grant that meets the definition of ‘‘eligible entity’’ in section 104(k)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601(4)(B)), except that for any project undertaken under this section the term may include a nonprofit organization acting in cooperation with officials of a political subdivision of a State.

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents contained in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 218 the following:

"Sec. 219. Brownfields demonstration program."

TITLE III—COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

SEC. 301. COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 302(a)(3)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3162(a)(3)(A)) is amended by inserting"
"maximizes effective development and use of the workforce consistent with any applicable State or local workforce investment strategy," after "access.", (b) APPROVAL OF OTHER PLAN.—Section 302(c) (42 U.S.C. 3162(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "To the maximum extent practicable, a plan submitted under this paragraph shall be comprehensive and coordinated with any existing comprehensive economic development strategy for the area.",

TITLE IV—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

SEC. 401. INCENTIVES.
Section 403 (42 U.S.C. 3173), and the item relating to section 403 in the table of contents contained in section 1(b), are repealed.

SEC. 402. PROVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES TO REGIONAL COMMISSIONS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 404 (42 U.S.C. 3174) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) PROVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES TO REGIONAL COMMISSIONS.—

“(1) Any plan for an economic development district is in a region covered by one or more of the Regional Commissions (as defined in section 3), the economic development district shall ensure that a comprehensive economic development strategy of the district is provided to the affected Regional Commission.(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to section 404 and inserting the following: “SEC. 404. PROVISION OF comprehensive economic development strategies to Regional Commissions.”

TITLE V—ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 501. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.
Section 502 (42 U.S.C. 3192) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following: “(1) maintain a central information clearinghouse on the Internet with—

(A) information on economic development, economic adjustment, disaster recovery, defense conversion, and trade adjustment programs and activities of the Federal Government; and

(B) links to State economic development organizations; and

(C) links to other appropriate economic development resources.”

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following: “(2) assist potential and actual applicants for economic development, economic adjustment, disaster recovery, defense conversion, and trade adjustment assistance under Federal and State laws in locating and applying for the assistance;”

(3) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting “; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: “(4) obtain and aggregate information from other Federal agencies needed to carry out the duties under this Act.”

SEC. 502. BUSINESSES DESIGNING FEDERAL CONTRACTS.
Section 505 (42 U.S.C. 3195), and the item relating to section 505 in the table of contents contained in section 1(b), are repealed.

SEC. 503. PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF GRANT RECIPIENTS.
Section 506(c) (42 U.S.C. 3196(c)) is amended by striking “after the effective date of the Economic Development Administration Reform Act of 1998.”

SEC. 504. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.
(a) STANDARDS.—Section 602 (42 U.S.C. 3212) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking “in accordance with” and all that follows before the period at the end and inserting “in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code”; and


(b) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—Section 506(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3196(d)(2)) is amended by inserting “government performance, after ‘applied research,’ ”

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. RELATIONSHIP TO ASSISTANCE UNDER OTHER LAW.
Section 609 (42 U.S.C. 3219) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a); and

(2) by striking “(b) ASSISTANCE UNDER OTHER ACTS.—”

SEC. 602. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REPRESENTATIVES.
(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Planning and coordination among Federal agencies, State and local governments, Indian tribes, and economic development districts is vital to the success of an economic development program.

(2) Economic Development Representatives of the Economic Development Administration provide distressed communities and economic development districts with the technical assistance necessary to foster this planning and coordination.

(3) In the past five years, the number of Economic Development Representatives has declined by almost 25 percent.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary should maintain a sufficient number of Economic Development Representatives to ensure that the Economic Development Administration is able to provide effective assistance to distressed communities and foster economic growth and development among the States.

TITLE VII—FUNDING

SEC. 701. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
Section 702 (42 U.S.C. 3221) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 701. GENERAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—There are authorized to be appropriated for economic development assistance programs to carry out this Act—

(1) $400,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

(2) $425,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

(3) $450,000,000 for fiscal year 2006;

(4) $475,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

(5) $500,000,000 for fiscal year 2008.

Such sums shall remain available until expended.

(b) SALARIES AND EXPENSES.—There are authorized to be appropriated for salaries and expenses of administering this Act $33,377,000 for fiscal year 2004 and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter. Such sums shall remain available until expended.

TITLE VIII—APALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 801. ADDITIONS TO APPALACHIAN REGION.
(a) KENTUCKY.—Section 14102(a)(1)(C) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “Nicholas,” after “Morgan,” and

(2) by adding “Robertson,” after “Pulaski.”

(b) OHIO.—Section 14102(a)(1)(I) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “Ashtabula,” after “Adams,” and

(2) by adding “Fayette,” after “Coshocton.”

(3) by inserting “Mahoning,” after “Lawrence,” and

(c) TENNESSEE.—Section 14102(a)(1)(K) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “Giles,” after “Franklin,” and

(2) by inserting “Lawrence, Lewis, Lincoln,” after “Knox.”

(d) VIRGINIA.—Section 14102(a)(1)(L) of such title is amended—

(1) by inserting “Henry,” after “Grayson,” and

(2) by inserting “Patrick,” after “Montgomery.”

SEC. 802. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.
Section 14703(a) (40 U.S.C. 3392(a)) is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) $88,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

(2) $91,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(3) $93,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

(4) $95,000,000 for fiscal year 2006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore, The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LAUETTE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2535, the Economic Development Administration Reauthorization Act, continues the work of the EDA by reauthorizing the agency for 5 years, updates the statute to reflect a changing economy, promotes the efficient use of the program, eliminates unnecessary and outdated provisions, and gives the Secretary flexibility to assist particularly hard-hit parts of the country. This reauthorization also includes several new provisions that will be important additions to the work of the EDA.

This legislation creates a performance-based incentive program in which eligible recipients are eligible for a 25 percent increase up to 10 percent of the project cost by meeting criteria established in regulation; allows for the improved management and operation of revolving loan funds by allowing loan areas and consolidating overlapping loans with the operator’s consent and by crafting regulations that would allow for the securitization of loans consistent with security laws; and creates a planning performance award that would go to States that meet the maximum award amount if a recipient meets several mandated criteria. By adding these provisions, EDA can better serve its constituents and do more to improve the economic future of America.

This legislation was developed through an intense process of hearings and markups. It was an open process that allowed for the input of all Members and groups with an interest in the legislation. This process has resulted in legislation that has bipartisan support, the support of the administration, and the support of such important partners as the National Association of Development Organizations, Interstate Economic Development Council, National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, and the United States Conference of Mayors. This is a well-crafted piece of legislation. I want to thank the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young) and the chair of the full committee the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Oberstar); and my distinguished ranking
member on the subcommittee the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. Norton) for helping us put this legislation together. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the Oversight Subcommittee for the several hearings he had with great profit on the bill before us today and with the way he conducted those hearings so as to bring out many new ideas that have improved this bill. I rise, therefore, in support of H.R. 2535 as amended by the manager's amendment, a bill to reauthorize the program authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

This bill will reauthorize the Economic Development Administration for 5 years and provide authorization for sufficient funding levels to carry out its statutory obligations to provide economic opportunities in distressed areas. This bill is of great importance to many struggling rural communities in our country and has very strong bipartisan support in this body.

The bill being considered this morning authorizes some new concepts, such as performance grants, and reinforces some tried and true approaches, such as ensuring economic development proceeds with close cooperation between local governments and Federal partners. One of these concepts is the authorization of a performance grant program. Under this new program, grantees that meet or exceed goals for projects scheduled, jobs creation and financial leverage will be eligible for a performance grant of up to 10 percent of the project grant.

Further, for purposes of this act, the grantee can consider the proceeds as local funds to meet the non-Federal share requirements of this or other economic development acts. This is a new and innovative approach to rewarding high performance and provides the grantees with a tangible asset for future use. This will, we think, bring important new efficiencies to a program where there was already great efficiency according to many who testified.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary for major grants for projects to expand, redevelop or reuse brownfields sites. This is a much needed authority for major industrial sites.

I also appreciate the consideration the committee gave to my own interest in universities and the expertise and resources they can bring to small and disadvantaged communities, just as they are well known to bring such advantages to big cities. Report language will highlight the committee's intent that the EDA should consider increasing the number of university centers. With the increase in authorized sums, I hope new university centers will become a reality.

Most of the districts that will benefit from this bill are rural communities, some of them very small, some of them larger communities. Many communities wanted to be a part of this bill because of its long history of promoting economic development and leveraging resources were otherwise that would be very difficult. Although, I represent a highly-urbanized district, I certainly know firsthand the singular importance of economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.

At the April hearing on economic development, I mentioned the recent opening of the new Washington Convention Center and the immediate economic effect that it is having on my community and on the residents and community at large, including the entity I represent, the Convention Center and the immediate economic development, the benefits associated with the businesses that are created with a strong, vibrant economic development program and, of course, the persistent need for funding to transform ideas into reality.
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this bill will also mean that the private sector, whose resources get leveraged as well, will understand why this bill is important for their participation, because they understand incentives. The joining of the performance with incentives, which means that some of that actually comes back to you to give them a model I would like to see in other Federal legislation as well. I regret that there was not more money. I applaud the fact that there is a greater amount than before. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his hard work on this bill.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a couple of observations. One, to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his eloquent statement. I think as he recited those communities that have been helped by the EDA, that was the only commercial that witness for the reauthorization of this valuable program. In the exhaustive hearings that we had on this issue where the gentlewoman from the District and I had the opportunity to listen to economic development experts from around the country, they talked about the fact that the average size of EDA grant is $600,000. So we are not talking about hundreds of millions, we are not talking about billions, but that $600,000 when then translated into the local community and what it meant, as recounted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think was truly remarkable. It really is life-changing and community-changing money, and the work that they do is certainly not only well-spent but it is productive.

The second piece, the amendment that was self-executed by the agreement of the House of yesterday, I think, is important in that we have added 32 counties to the Appalachian Regional Commission. Some people expressed concern about that, particularly those communities that are already located within the ARC. I want to highlight and commend the distinguished work of one of our committee members, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) that was concerned about the fact that that might stress the resources. She made sure that an amendment was included therein that also made sure that there were sufficient funds so that that fine organization could continue its work and continue its work at a fiscally responsible level.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time and allowing me the opportunity to speak on this bill. I am enthusiastic about this bill. It has bipartisan support, supported by development organizations. It is supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Education Association of the University Centers. So it has clearly met the needs of a number of folks. But as we take a look at what the bill does specifically, it creates a new program that allows for the designation of special impact areas which allows the Secretary to waive their economic development requirements to help isolated areas in distressed communities.

This designation, I think, really will enable the Secretary to respond more quickly to get help to those areas, to address the communities that need it; and when they need it, they need it quickly. It creates a performance-based incentive program that rewards high performance, as determined by criteria established in regulation, with a bonus of up to 10 percent of the project cost that can be used on other eligible activities. Again, these reforms focus on getting better results. It creates a planning performance award equal to 5 percent of the project cost that can be awarded prior to closeout of a grant if the recipient satisfies four mandated criteria. And as with any program or any reform, it removes outdated and burdensome administrative procedures. It updates several citations and allows for subgranting of assistance to eligible recipients. It also authorizes the issuance of grants for brownfields redevelopment. Again, important in many communities because if we want to revitalize a community, what we want to do is we want to revitalize those areas that we classify as brownfields. It also allows the EDA to explore the use of photovoltaic technology in brownfield redevelopment on a limited basis, again, enabling us to use perhaps breakthrough technology in cleaning up the brownfields. So I rise in strong support of H.R. 2535, the Economic Development Administration Reauthorization bill, and I thank my colleague. Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a couple of vocal speakers show up here, and I am not sure whether the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia was expecting that. So I would ask unanimous consent that the time she has yielded back be restored to her in case she wants to make some observations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Without objection, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia's (Ms. NORTON) time is restored.

There was no objection. Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his hard work and dedication in increasing economic opportunities through the reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration.

I strongly support this legislation. Established in 1965, the EDA was created in an effort to improve conditions of substantial and persistent economic distress throughout the United States.

I am fortunate to have been able to work with the EDA, and specifically Dr. David Sampson, on economic development issues that are vitally important to the future and the people of the eighth district of North Carolina.

H.R. 2535 requires Federal agencies to coordinate their economic development initiatives, including a requirement for comprehensive economic development strategies, CEDS, to maximize the effective use of workforce investment initiatives. Our CEDS committee is a local economic development council, led by Dr. Judy Stevens and comprised of local economic development, education, and chamber officials. With the hard work of Dr. Sampson and his staff at EDA, our CEDS committee is coming closer to a final recommendation to present to EDA which will serve as a blueprint for regional economic development for the eighth district of North Carolina.

With relatively small investments of Federal funds, the EDA has been able to achieve remarkable successes and change the economic outlook for many citizens. As an example, since 1965, the Appalachian Regional Commission has invested over $900 million toward transportation, business development, education, health care, and community projects in North Carolina. As a direct result of this investment, poverty rates in the commission region have been cut almost in half.

These are real results for real people, and I look forward to continuing to work with Dr. Sampson and the EDA as we continue to address economic development and jobs in areas such as the eighth district of North Carolina. I am hopeful that the 108th Congress will authorize the Southeast Crescent Authority, or SECA, which will provide 428 counties in the southeastern United States access to Federal funds and expertise that will support increased economic opportunity, prosperity, and jobs for our citizens.

I again thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his service and leadership on this issue, and I support the bill strongly.

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

I thank the gentleman for moving to restore my time by unanimous consent. And since we do have the time, I want to note how little this bill has been. I mentioned that it was first authorized in 1965 when the President was Lyndon Johnson. It was a bipartisan bill then, and it remains bipartisan today. And it comes at a time of special need for such a bill.

Since January, 2003, if we look nationwide, the number of unemployed have increased by 50 percent. We know what that means in big cities because of the media in big cities. The effect on small communities is far more serious, and they do not have economic development vehicles in the first place and because those areas by definition have found it harder to attract the vehicles on their own.
The importance of this bill is that it has given the signal to the private sector to come on in, and the bill is so successful because that is exactly what the private sector has done in rural communities where they would not have been on their own without the Economic Development Act. So these grants are critical to economic development in good times and in poor times. They keep economic development alive very often. And what kind of money are we talking about? The chairman indicated the size of the average grant. When we come on the floor with a bill that authorizes $400 million for fiscal year 2004 and $500 million by the year 2008, we are really talking pocket change for bills that come before this body. And look at what it does. Hundreds of millions more is leveraged from private resources because of this bill.

I am very proud of the work the committee has done, but I am prouder still of what we do, and I think our process has benefited rural communities and efficiencies that they had incorporated into their own economic development work.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him and the ranking member on bringing this important legislation to the floor. And I am rising in strong support of passage of H.R. 2535.

I would like to share a very personal story. Sometimes we talk in grand pictures and sometimes abstract pictures about our impact of legislation. I want to cite for the Members of this body a very specific example. In 1995 with the BRAC closures, the Base Realignment and Closure at the Fitzsimmons Army Medical Hospital in Aurora, just on the edge of Denver, found itself on that list. And one can imagine the impact on a community when it finds out that about 4,500 jobs, both direct and indirect, are going to be lost from that community, a tremendous financial and economic impact to a relatively small neighborhood and a community.

To make lemonade out of lemons, the EDA came in with some assistance, provided assistance in the form of an infrastructure grant to provide basic infrastructure needs, transportation needs for this old Army base. That Army base now is going to be home for a health sciences center, a collaborative health sciences center, involving the University of Colorado, Health Sciences. We hope the Veterans Hospital will move there. We have a cancer center there, an eye center there. A bioethics clinic is locating there.

A long story made short, 35,000 jobs, 35,000 jobs have been expected to be on that site by the year 2010, 35,000 high-paying jobs. And indirectly we estimate 66,000 jobs will come to Colorado in large part because of the EDA’s willingness to step up to the plate, be a partner with the community in redeveloping a site and creating a huge opportunity.

Net gains in Colorado for a $51 million grant by the EDA to provide this basic infrastructure, as the ranking member just cited a minute ago, so as to attract private industry, it is estimated that by 2010, $3.1 billion will be generated for the Colorado economy and $6.3 billion once the site is fully developed in all years.

So it is with great pride that I again compliment the chairman and the ranking member on bringing this legislation to the floor and with great confidence that it can strongly support this legislation.

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

To close, I just want to remind Members of what the mission is of this bill that was declared in 1965, to enhance community success in attracting private capital investment and lucrative job opportunities. This is not a classic public works program. What we are providing, Mr. Speaker, is seed money, and the indications are that is worth putting on the record. The average project, EDA project, leverages $10 million in private sector investment for every $1 million in Federal assistance. And I spoke earlier of the efficiency of this program that was presented at hearings. Here is an indication of that: 99 percent, that is 99 percent, which is a rare number on this floor, of EDA infrastructure projects are completed as planned. Ninety-one percent of projects are completed on time. Would that we could say that about some other projects I can think of. I will not even mention the Visitors Center.

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

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

I again thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, who has truly been a wonderful cooperative partner during this first year of the 108th Congress, and I look forward to a good number of legislative successes with her in the coming year.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2535, the Economic Development Administration Reauthorization Act, offered by my colleague from the great state of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, and urge its immediate passage. As you know, the Committee on Fi-

Mr. Speaker, while the country experienced record growth during the past 10 years, there continued to be pockets of the country that did not enjoy that bounty. An economic downturn of the sort we have had over the past couple of years hits these areas especially hard. Now, as the economy is turning up again, even as we tend to the economic wounds suffered by the rest of the country, I believe that all of these areas were even harder-hit, and for this reason I salute Mr. LATOURETTE’s diligent work on this matter.

Operating out of six regional offices as widely spread as Seattle and Philadelphia, the EDA provides community and regional grants on a cost-share basis for economic adjustment assistance, public works, development facilities, and planning and technical assistance, all with the purpose of leveraging private-sector investments, creating or retaining long-term private-sector jobs and generating industrial and commercial development in both urban and rural areas.

Importantly, Mr. Speaker, the EDA is focused not only on reversing or mitigating the effects of long-term economic distress, but also on dealing with sudden economic impact brought on by the closing of, say, a military base or a large manufacturer or group of manufacturers in a small, economic development area. As the United States economy experiences the loss of some manufacturing jobs due to increased foreign competition, it is imperative for us to find or stimulate new jobs for displaced workers, and the EDA is an important tool in this effort.

David A. Sampson, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, is fond of saying that President Bush is committed to increasing the productivity and wealth of the American economy, and then noting that the People’s President has already spent all the money that is available in that regard. Mr. Speaker, I echo the President and Secretary Sampson. I am sure that the President’s goal is the goal of each and every one of us, regardless of which state or which party we represent.

I commend Mr. LATOURETTE for his creativity in this area, and note that the reauthorization of the EDA contains a number of new and exciting programs, including the sector strategies. These sector strategies are aimed at leveraging public and private sector lenders in a way that will give us even more bang for our economic buck in these areas. This is a forward-looking bill that seeks to help some of America’s hardest-hit economic areas. I commend it, and seek its immediate passage.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I come here today in support of the reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration at Commerce. We in the Ninth District of North Carolina have had great success with the programs from EDA. Mr. Speaker, EDA helped my district come together and formulate a comprehensive economic development plan for the next decade. This was the first time all of the economic development officials, business leaders, and community developers came to one place and really discussed where they saw our counties going and what was needed to ensure economic success.

Our area has been hit extremely hard by job losses, particularly in the manufacturing and textile sectors. The help that the EDA has provided and will continue to provide has given my district a vision for the future and a way for each citizen to become involved in its community. I thank the EDA for their help and assistance and commend them for the important job they do in districts like mine all around the country.

If the EDA is given the resources provided in this bill, it will result in the creation of approximately 623,314 jobs and the leveraging of $46.4 billion in private-sector investments over 5 years. With job challenges facing all of our districts every day, how can we not support a bill that will result in many jobs being created?
I support this bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2535, as amended by the manager’s amendment, a bill to reauthorize the Economic Development Administration (EDA). In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Public Works and Economic Development Act creating EDA. In fact, I still have the pen he used at the signing ceremony. Since its inception, I have been a strong supporter of EDA and now, nearly 40 years later, I continue to believe in EDA’s core mission—to create economic opportunity for those living and working in economically distressed communities.

EDA’s mission—to create economic opportunities for all—remains as vital and necessary today as it was four decades ago. As our economy continues to struggle, the importance of EDA becomes even more apparent. Since early 2001, the national unemployment rate has risen to 6.1 percent, the highest level in 9 years. Further, in that time, the number of unemployed workers has increased from 5.9 million in January 2001 to more than 9 million—an increase of more than 3 million unemployed workers, or 50 percent. Moreover, workers who have lost their jobs are having more trouble finding new jobs. The average length of unemployment is now almost 20 weeks, the longest it has been in nearly two decades. Within the last 2 years, the number of workers who have been unemployed for longer than 6 months has increased by more than 1.5 million to more than 2.1 million—an increase of 218 percent. One-half of the unemployed are out of work for more than 9 weeks and more than one in five have been out of work for more than 6 months. As in every recession, it is the people living in our Nation’s economically distressed communities—the very people who are served by EDA—that are hardest hit by the economic downturn.

Mr. Speaker, EDA works. I know it works because I’ve seen it work—providing jobs, job training, and real economic opportunities in distressed communities across the country. A recent series of Rutgers University studies found that every $1 million in EDA public work funding creates 325 jobs; leverages $10 million in private sector investment; and increases the local tax base by $10 million. EDA grants are particularly vital for many smaller, rural communities where deterioration of infrastructure facilities is especially prevalent. Deterioration in infrastructure is often part of a downward cycle that contributes to erosion of human and financial resources. For these rural communities, EDA grants are critical to improving their economic conditions.

This bill enhances the agency’s ability to deliver economic development services to those who need it most. The bill authorizes EDA for 5 years and provides the agency with the financing levels necessary to affect real growth and development in economically distressed communities. To that end, the bill authorizes $400 million for the agency in fiscal year 2004, increasing to $500 million in fiscal year 2008. Further, the bill moves the agency forward by building on a solid base of good administrative practices. It requires comprehensive economic development plans for the State and local level. Such planning is essential for state and local governments to tackle effectively the tremendous economic development challenges they face and to take full advantage of EDA’s program. EDA planning grants, which are re authorized under the bill, provide a vital tool for state and local governments to undertake this important planning.

There are also many new, innovative programs. The bill, for example, authorizes EDA to award performance incentive awards to high performing grantees. Grantees can use their performance award money in any manner consistent with the Act. The bill also authorizes an EDA brownfields program and establishes a demonstration program for developing brownfield sites developed through the use of photovoltaic solar energy systems. The ability to invest in these areas and technologies provides communities with the tools needed to reap further benefits.

When EDA was last reauthorized in 1998, this House and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee took the lead in enacting that legislation. I am proud that we are again leading the efforts to reauthorize EDA with this bill. It is a true bipartisanship product, and I extend my thanks to Chairman Young, Subcommittees Chairwoman Chapman, and Ranking Member Norton for their hard work and diligence on this bill. I urge its passage.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2535, legislation to reauthorize the Economic Development Agency for an additional 5 years.

Since its inception in 1965, the EDA has been successful. Positive changes have occurred in every State of this Nation. More than $18 billion in Federal money has been invested in rural and urban communities, which leveraged more than $74 billion in private sector investments. More than 2.8 million jobs have been created. In my congressional district, the EDA has provided assistance for a variety of economic development projects—ranging from ports to business parts—to improve the region’s economy.

The bill we have before us today will continue the success of the EDA by providing the agency with $2.25 billion over a 5-year period for economic development assistance. These resources will result in the creation of almost 625,000 jobs and leverage $46.4 billion in private sector investments.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us today is a good bill. It builds on the success of the EDA, and will improve the responsiveness and flexibility of the EDA, while improving coordination with other Federal agencies.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for H.R. 2535, the Economic Development Administration Reauthorization. In my congressional district, under the leadership of Pedroza, the local Economic Development Corporation, EDA has been a strong partner in helping my rural and urban communities in a variety of ways.

EDA grants have helped my small rural towns build wastewater facilities and other infrastructure projects. With EDA grants, South Hidalgo Community College has built an allied health center that is training hundreds of new nurses and health professionals. These students will have the opportunity to work in a high-paying career and alleviate the nursing shortage that is plaguing the entire State of Texas. EDA funding helped us complete a new pediatric specialty clinic in one of the poorest counties in the nation. An EDA planning grant is currently helping the Delta Regional Authority in Franklin County develop an economic development plan that will lead us into a new era of economic growth. Whenever we have called on Mr. Garza, he has been there to help us to the best of his ability. I want to thank him for all he has done for the 15th Congressional District of Texas.

As in every recession, it is the people who need it most. The bill authorizes EDA for regional economies. In my own district of southern West Virginia, the EDA has been an important catalyst that has created or saved an estimated 2,240 jobs just since 1993. Similarly, over $31 million in federal funding has enabled 78 projects in southern West Virginia to leverage more than $50 million in private sector funding as well as approximately $24 million in state and local funding. In 2003, alone, EDA programs have provided much-needed funding for projects as diverse as University Center funding at several of West Virginia’s institutions of higher education, an airport business park in Raleigh County, and engineering for building construction in Hinton, WV.

But in some regions of our Nation, EDA cannot complete its mission without additional help. For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) works in coordination with EDA for regional development in our portion of the Appalachian region. Historically, the Appalachian region has faced levels of poverty and economic distress higher than national averages as a result of its geographic isolation and inadequate infrastructure.

My home State of West Virginia lies entirely in the Appalachian region. Mr. Speaker, neither of these two important programs can sufficiently serve the area without the other.

For over 30 years, the ARC has provided critical assistance to my constituents in the southern part of the state, through the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council has been critical. It has aided the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources to develop educational funding, training and job opportunities for local health care.

In my district, the ARC made $1 million available to the Mingo County Redevelopment Authority to provide water service, and to create 130 jobs by processing West Virginia timber into hardwood flooring and related projects. Similarly, the ARC provided water service to the city of Hinton, West Virginia, and it helped to improve the quality of mathematics and science education in Bluefield, WV.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration (EDA).

The EDA enhances regional competitiveness and provides critical long-term support for regional economies. In my own district of southern West Virginia, the EDA has been an important catalyst that has created or saved an estimated 2,240 jobs just since 1993. Similarly, over $31 million in federal funding has enabled 78 projects in southern West Virginia to leverage more than $50 million in private sector funding as well as approximately $24 million in state and local funding. In 2003, alone, EDA programs have provided much-needed funding for projects as diverse as University Center funding at several of West Virginia’s institutions of higher education, an airport business park in Raleigh County, and engineering for building construction in Hinton, WV. But in some regions of our Nation, EDA cannot complete its mission without additional help. For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) works in coordination with EDA. The ARC works in coordination with EDA for regional development in our portion of the Appalachian region. Historically, the Appalachian region has faced levels of poverty and economic distress higher than national averages as a result of its geographic isolation and inadequate infrastructure. My home State of West Virginia lies entirely in the Appalachian region. Mr. Speaker, neither of these two important programs can sufficiently serve the area without the other.

For over 30 years, the ARC has provided critical assistance to my constituents in the southern part of the state, through the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council has been critical. It has aided the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources to develop educational funding, training and job opportunities for local health care. In my district, the ARC made $1 million available to the Mingo County Redevelopment Authority to provide water service, and to create 130 jobs by processing West Virginia timber into hardwood flooring and related projects. Similarly, the ARC provided water service to the city of Hinton, West Virginia, and it helped to improve the quality of mathematics and science education in Bluefield, WV.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my strong support for the reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration (EDA).

The EDA enhances regional competitiveness and provides critical long-term support for regional economies. In my own district of southern West Virginia, the EDA has been an important catalyst that has created or saved an estimated 2,240 jobs just since 1993. Similarly, over $31 million in federal funding has enabled 78 projects in southern West Virginia to leverage more than $50 million in private sector funding as well as approximately $24 million in state and local funding. In 2003, alone, EDA programs have provided much-needed funding for projects as diverse as University Center funding at several of West Virginia’s institutions of higher education, an airport business park in Raleigh County, and engineering for building construction in Hinton, WV. But in some regions of our Nation, EDA cannot complete its mission without additional help. For example, the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) works in coordination with EDA for regional development in our portion of the Appalachian region. Historically, the Appalachian region has faced levels of poverty and economic distress higher than national averages as a result of its geographic isolation and inadequate infrastructure. My home State of West Virginia lies entirely in the Appalachian region. Mr. Speaker, neither of these two important programs can sufficiently serve the area without the other.

For over 30 years, the ARC has provided critical assistance to my constituents in the southern part of the state, through the West Virginia Infrastructure and Jobs Development Council has been critical. It has aided the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources to develop educational funding, training and job opportunities for local health care. In my district, the ARC made $1 million available to the Mingo County Redevelopment Authority to provide water service, and to create 130 jobs by processing West Virginia timber into hardwood flooring and related projects. Similarly, the ARC provided water service to the city of Hinton, West Virginia, and it helped to improve the quality of mathematics and science education in Bluefield, WV.
Tragically, however, the Bush administration proposed decreased funding levels for the ARC's nonhighway program by more than 50 percent. Of course, President Bush's friends in the Republican-led House followed through with his wishes by imposing the cuts in appropriations for next year. Now, the administration and the Republican Party say that they want to shift the ARC's nonhighway responsibilities to EDA for larger multijurisdictional projects, diluting the unique attention ARC provides this region of vast potential to serve our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have to be able to explain my strong support for the EDA, and I support reauthorization of this vital agency. But, on behalf of West Virginians and all those throughout the Appalachian region, I mourn for the cuts to the ARC.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, October 20, 2003, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. 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 the motion to go to conference on H.R. 3289, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to go to conference on a bill which spends $87 billion. It is the second installment of what will be many installment payments to deal with the consequences of the war in Iraq. This motion to instruct attempts to put the House on record in favor of three provisions which the Senate passed earlier last week.

First, with respect to the issue of loans versus grants, this motion would provide that after $5.1 billion is set aside for Ambassador Bremer to deal with other costs associated with the effort in Iraq, that the remaining $10 billion of the reconstruction portion of the package be provided in the form of a loan, unless the President certifies that 90 percent of the bilateral debt owed by Iraq to other countries is forgiven.

The purpose of this first provision is to recognize that, over the next 5 years, the per capita foreign debt of the United States will be larger than is the per capita foreign exports. And since foreign debts can only be paid off by a country running trade surpluses, that means that, in effect, over the next 5 years Iraq will be in a better position to repay their foreign debts than we will be.

Secondly, we ask the House to go on record in support of two provisions that relate to quality-of-life measures for our troops. The first is to provide medical screening and dental screening for Guard and Reserve personnel prior to their being mobilized; and, second, to extend the transitional health care coverage to servicemembers who have been on active duty in Iraq and are now returning home, to provide that transitional health care coverage from the existing 60 days to 180 days. Certainly, that is the least we can do for these returning servicemen and women.

Thirdly, we ask the House to go on record in support of $1.3 billion in additional soft loans for veterans where so that Priority 7 and Priority 8 veterans can make better use of veterans health care facilities without having to pay a $290 deductible and without seeing the cost of their prescriptions virtually doubled. This is, in essence, the content of the Bond-Mikulski amendment adopted in the other body.

That is what this does, and I would ask Members to support it.

I would also ask that if they do support it, they recognize that they have an obligation to then insist that these provisions be contained in the conference report, because they are already in the Senate bill. As Members know, conference committees are supposed to deal only with those matters which are in dispute between the two bodies. So I would urge any veteran or any other interested American citizen watching this debate to keep close track of how Members vote today, and compare that vote with how they vote when this conference report comes back. I think in that way it will in effect mean that they will be acting as a 'hypocrisy detector,' which is always good for this body, when someone is looking over our shoulders.

I want to say one other thing. I know that the President of the United States is a powerful man. I know that in this town he is probably the biggest man on campus that you can find. But the fact is that I have never yet met a White House who did not think that Article I of the Constitution was a drafting error by the Founding Fathers. And I think that we need to remind all Presidents that we represent the same citizens that they do. We owe every President our respect, we owe every President a respectful hearing, but he also owes us the same thing, and that means that we need to work with each other.

Checks and balances: Mr. Speaker, in my view checks and balances is not simply an ornamental concept of democracy; it is a core element. It is the heart of our democratic system, and we have a right to expect the same respectful hearing from the President if we have an opinion that differs from his, as we have an obligation to give his views a respectful hearing.

But I note in today's article by E.J. Dionne in the Washington Post that the President, in a meeting last week, appears to have provided something other than that respectful hearing to Members of Congress.
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Now, I know that the President is a business school graduate of a distinguished university, and I know that he regards himself in many ways as being an MBA President. He wants to bring business practices to the White House. Fine. But I would say that if that is the case, then even under the model that he sees, that means we are the Board of Directors.

We owe it to the country, it seems to me, to approach issues like this with great care and great seriousness. When we rubber-stamp the desires of any President, we, in essence, do not behave like the greatest deliberative body in the world; we behave instead like a poor imitation of the Board of Directors at Enron.

I do not think we ought to do that. Yet I notice in Mr. Dionne’s column of today, he is describing a discussion that took place at the White House between the President and a number of Senators, and he is quoted by one Senator as saying, “I’m here to tell you that this is what we have to do and this is how we have to do it,” one Senator quoted the President as saying.

Then that Senator went on to say that after she had asked a question of the President, “He looked at me and said, ‘It is not negotiable, and I don’t want to debate it.’”

Now I would suggest that that might be a proper attitude if a parent is dealing with a minor child. It is not a proper approach when we are dealing with co-equal branches of government.

So I ask every Member today to use their best judgment and think through what they think is in the best interests not just of this country, but of the Guard and Reserve forces who we are asking to fight our battles over in Iraq and our veterans who have done their duty and are looking for some help with health care problems that they incur along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge support for the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, motions to instruct are usually a very strong tool of the minority party, and the reason I know that is because we were in the minority for a lot of years. As a matter of fact, one party controlled the House of Representatives for 40 years without a break. During that time, the minority party, our party, used a lot of motions to instruct and try to learn some of these never-passed, because the majority party has to manage and has to function and pass bills. So motions to instruct, although they are not binding, still seem to carry weight in the conference meeting. We need to move this conference quickly.

After lengthy debate in the House on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of last week, and for nearly 2 weeks in the Senate, a lot of debate on amendments took place. Some amendments were agreed to; some amendments were adopted, and some were defeated.

Two of the amendments we dealt with seriously through most of the debate had to do with loans to Iraq. As we all know, the House spoke rather emphatically that loans are not the way we were going to proceed. One problem is there is no government in Iraq to whom we would make a loan. Our own laws require that there be a government before we can make a loan to a country.

But what we are dealing with primarily, is to finish the job that was started in Iraq; and, when we finish the job, that means bringing our troops home. While we are getting our troops home, we are going to have to complete what they set out to do.

Saddam is gone, his regime is gone, but we cannot guarantee that another Saddam will not arise from the ashes of Baghdad if we do not help the Iraqi people establish a government, if we do not help the Iraqi people establish a health system, if we do not help the Iraqi people establish an educational system, and we are doing very well on the educational system. The health system is ongoing, and we are providing additional money in the supplemental to provide additional health systems.

We need to rebuild the infrastructural system, the electrical generation and distribution to people of Iraq, and to create a security force, where the people themselves can own their government, control their government, and not have to worry about a dictatorical regime raising it ugly head. When that happens, we can bring our troops home.

The safety of our troops and the bringing of our troops home is important to me.

I do not know that this motion to instruct would actually delay the process, but it could. This should be understood, although most of the debate has been about the construction funds and the reconstruction in Iraq and Afghanistan, most of the money in the bill supports our own troops. It provides them with the very things we need—water and drinkable water facilities. We have spoken strongly on several occasions, and we speak strongly again in this bill, that no American soldier should be in Iraq or any other place of hostility without body armor. In addition, having armor on the Humvees and the military vehicles that are not armored today, also needs to be done for the protection of our troops.

So we need to get this country stabilized and get our troops back home so that they do not have to be deployed constantly, not only our active duty troops but our reserves as well.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has put together a pretty interesting motion to instruct. I would have to tell him that I like a lot of the things he has put in there, but there is one thing that we are not going to agree to, and that is the loan provision.

The President has spoken strongly on loans numerous times. The House has spoken strongly on it. And for those who think that the Senate is not going to do it like the House did, understand that the Senate already included $10 billion in their bill as a grant to the construction of Iraq and Afghanistan. And so if the Senate is not opposed to it this time, they might have a little different arrangement.

So I am going to vote against this motion to instruct primarily because of the provision dealing with loans to Iraq, which the President feels very strongly about. And in the statement of the administration’s position, the director of OMB has said specifically that the President’s leadership, his top leaders and advisors, would advise for a veto if that loan provision stayed in the bill.

So I am going to vote against this because I am not sure that motions to instruct have ever had any influence whatsoever, as they are not binding. But for any Members on our side who feel that this is something that we should vote for to have a symbolic vote, I will have no problem with that. And I am not going to ask the House to defeat this motion. I am just going to say that for the reasons that I mentioned I am going to vote against it primarily because I am not going to agree in conference to the loan provision. I am going to support the President’s position on that issue.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferred today to add $1.3 billion to the supplemental for veterans health care. This motion to instruct offered by Mr. OBEY recognizes caring for our veterans is a continuing constant war.

Last week, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs heard testimony from four veterans who spoke about the terrible injuries they and their families sustained in combat in the global war on terrorism. The costs of caring for these veterans, 2,000 who have used VA to date and hundreds of thousands more who will be eligible for VA health care when they return to the United States, all should be considered part of this cost of this war.

I urge my colleagues to support this motion. Let us not let our veterans down with a budget that will not meet the needs of returning troops or those that currently serve.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ).

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, last week I went to the Committee on Rules during its consideration of the supplemental request for Iraq in order to seek protection for an amendment to transfer $1.8 billion to our veterans when it came from the Iraqi reconstruction to
veterans health care. My amendment was not protected, thus not found to be in order. So I greatly appreciate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for offering this motion, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield this vote, if you look at additional monies that the Senate has allocated for our veterans at this time, if today, like many other days since Operation Iraqi Freedom began, wounded troops will continue to arrive at Walter Reed Army Hospital and other facilities in an average of 10 each day, 10 veterans who need services and who need assistance.

The military lists thousands, in fact, close to 1,600 now, that have been injured, have lost their limbs. Thousands more may come to our veteran hospitals in search of medical care for the conditions that may become evident in days and months after their military service has ended.

This summer the House broke its promise with our veterans. Our budget resolution promised to add $1.8 billion for veterans, yet the appropriations we approved for the VA added nothing. We have another chance to correct that situation. We have a chance to do the right thing for our veterans. We have asked them to go to Afghanistan; we have asked them to go to Iraq. And they have been willing, but we have to be there for them when they come back home.

This money will allow the military to provide better equipment and supplies to men and women who also have volunteered to defend our country. We also need to recognize that these veterans, this additional resource is not money that is above and beyond; it is for existing services. So it becomes important that we do the right thing. We ask that you support the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on this motion.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on this motion.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion to instruct conferees. Let me note I support our President in his military requests for Iraq, and I applaud his leadership and the great job that our military has done in Iraq.

The question is not the $56 billion that we are providing in the supplemental for our military, but the $18.6 billion in reconstruction money. And the question is should we just give this as a grant or should half of that $18.6 billion, at least half of it, be in the form of a loan that will be repaid after 20 years.

Well, I do not see any reason why after bearing such a heavy burden, it is not $56 billion, but only $18.6 billion, why the American people have to carry the whole burden. Why do we not permit half of this, $10 billion of this, to go in the form of a loan that can be repaid? After all, we are in debt $400 billion a year. That is our level of deficit spending. We have to borrow that $10 billion to give it to Iraq as a gift. Why do we not let them repay it after 20 years, put it in the form of a loan? That way our children will not have to repay this $10 billion 20 years from now. Instead, Iraqi children, who will have benefited from all of our investment and will probably be the richest kids in the world because one of the richest oil producing country’s in the world, let them pay it back.

Mr. Speaker, I would support this motion to instruct. Let us give the American people a little break.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDBERG). The gentleman has 16½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this clearly is a better bill than we received from the White House. It specifies that money be used for Kevlar jackets, for example, for the jamming devices. There is no question but that there are improvements.

What this instruction would do is to improve those improvements so that this is a bill that is far more in keeping with what our constituents would like to see. I have no question about that. I know that from the perspective of Americans who want to protect our troops overseas, and from the perspective of taxpayers, they would want this entire body to support this instruction to the conferees. Because that is what it is about, troops and taxpayers.

First of all, the troops. It provides the kind of quality-of-life improvements that every single one of our constituents would want us to include in this bill. Every single one. I would challenge any Member on the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle to say to an American who has served in Iraq or Afghanistan or Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Russia, France, some to Germany. How was that money to Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Russia, France, some to Germany. How was that money spent? A whole lot of it was spent to build the palaces. Some we know was taken by Saddam and his henchmen. That is the kind of thing that works, that corruption is pervasive.

And why those countries that were dealing with Saddam should be first in line before the American taxpayer is beyond me and beyond every single one of our constituents.

That is why the Senate put this provision in the bill. We know our constituents want the provision in the bill. I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wants the provision in the bill. I know I cannot speak and I should not be speaking for him, but he is doing what the White House has asked us to. I am saying we have already told the White House we can fashion a better bill. This法案 would provide in a much better bill, one much more consistent with what our constituents would want us to do.

Mr. Speaker, vote in the interest of the troops and the taxpayers; approve this motion to instruct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking Democrat on the Military Construction Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to be making promises to Iraqis while breaking promises to America’s veterans. It is wrong to say Americans can afford to build new hospitals in Baghdad, but we can’t afford to keep open veterans hospitals here at home.

This motion is about doing right by America’s veterans, veterans such as Robert Armstrong. I met this brave American, a constituent of mine, recently at Walter Reed Army Hospital. Sergeant Armstrong was protecting a children’s medical center in Baghdad when a grenade went off close by. He was badly wounded and near death. Army doctors were so sure that he would die that they ushered him out of the Army in order to help his family receive higher death benefits.

But Sergeant Armstrong did not die even though his heart flattened five times and he lost an eye and a leg. In and out of consciousness, Sergeant Armstrong kept repeating his name Mary, Mary, Mary. It turns out that Mary was his 15-year-old daughter, and he had promised her he would come home alive.

My wife was with Mary at Walter Reed Hospital when she saw her loving father for the first time in 5 months. His first words to his daughter were, “Mary, I always keep my promises.” Mr. Speaker, this motion is about America saying to Sergeant Armstrong that we will keep our promise to you, the promise to provide you with quality health care because of your service and sacrifices for our Nation.

The truth is the proposed VA health care budget does not even keep up with inflation, even during the time of war. It would require Congress take a $3 billion more than the House bill,
Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.
taxpayers are not the only ones stuck with the bad deal, you need to vote for this amendment.

I would also say that we have heard the argument that somehow this proposal might slow down consideration of the bill. All this notion does is to accept three items that the Senate has already agreed to. The Senate has already determined that veterans deserve the additional $3.1 billion in veterans health care that we are trying to build. So all we are doing is narrowing the differences between the two Chambers, which ought to make it faster in terms of the time it takes to deal with this bill.

I do hope, however, that particularly veterans groups, I hope veterans groups will put out a very large report that this would not prevent the remote detonation of bombs and mines. This is, after all, the same administration that did not see to it that we had enough armor for the Humvees so that they would not be vulnerable to explosions from the roadbed.

And this is the same administration that asked for so little money for clean water for our troops that 80 percent of our troops in Iraq, right now, are still drinking putrid water.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Lind- ner). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct the Senate to report the bill; just the opposite. All this motion might slow down consideration of the amendment that did not see to it that we would be the ultimate act of insin- citer. And I hope that veterans groups will not let Members of this House pose for political holy pictures on this vote and then bug out of their responsibilities to stick with the vote until the bill is conference and comes back from con- ference.

I also would like to say one other thing. The President, as I said earlier, deserves the respect of every Member of this House, if for no other reason than by virtue of the office that he holds. But I want to say that the Presi- dent is our leader; he is not a one-man band.

This Congress has an obligation also to weigh in with its own best judg- ments. I think this President, rather than telling Members of Congress that items like this are nonnegotiable, I think, as teachers often say to parents, he needs to learn to "work well with others". And I think that applies to how well he needs to be able to work with the Congress, and I think it also applies to how well he needs to work with our allies. And I would hope that, I would hope that that would happen.

After all, this is the same adminis- tration that did not provide the needed Keval linings for body armor for over 40,000 American troops.

This, the same administration that did not provide enough jammers, electronic jammers, to our troops in Iraq. And as a consequence, we have had American servicemen and women killed or maimed because they could not prevent the remote detonation of bombs and mines.

This is, after all, the same adminis- tration that did not see to it that we

So I would say, with all due respect, no one is perfect. This administration certainly does not have a monopoly on wisdom. Neither does this end of Capitol Hill; but we ought to be able to work together in an effort to reach rea- sonable compromises. I think this re- commit motion is, in fact, an effort at a reasonable compromise, and with that, I would ask for an "aye" vote, Mr. Speaker.
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This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 19, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 568]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie   Del. ay
Ackerman       j ohnson (CT)
Aderholt       j ohnson (IL)
Alexander      j ohnson, E. B.
Akkin          j ohnson, Sam
Baca           j ones (NC)
Bachus         j ones (OH)
Baier          k anji
Baker          k etter
Baldwin        k eeler
Barker         k idlee
Bass           l eeds
Baucus         m ettles (MD)
Bell           n eelers
Berman         o ber
Berry          o rst
Biggs         p atterson
Bilirakis      q uinn
Bishop (GA)    r adanovich
Bishop (NY)    r adner
Bishop (UT)    r edding
Blair          r edley
Blumenauer     r eynolds
Boehlert       r egan
Boehner        r egan
Bonilla        r eynolds
Bono           r eynolds
Boozman        r hodes
Boucher        r ichard
Boyd          s cott
Bradley (NH)   s tenger
Brady (PA)     s tenger
Brady (TX)     s tenger
Brown (OH)    s tenger
Brown (SC)    s tenger
Brown, Corinne  s tenger
Brown-Watle,  s tenger
Burr           s tenger
Burns         s tenger
Burr (IN)      s tenger
Burr (TN)      s tenger
Burns         s tenger
Cackler       s tenger
Calvert        s tenger
Camp           s tenger
Campbell       s tenger
Cannon        s tenger
Capito         s tenger
Carbajal       s tenger
Caranko        s tenger
Carson (IN)    s tenger
Carson (OK)   s tenger
Carter         s tenger
Castle         s tenger
Chabot        s tenger
Chapman        s tenger
Chesnutt       s tenger
Clay          s tenger
Clyburn       s tenger
Cole           s tenger
Conyers        s tenger
Cooper         s tenger
Cotler         s tenger
Cox            s tenger
Cramer         s tenger
Crenshaw       s tenger
Crowley       s tenger
Curley         s tenger
Culberson     s tenger
Cummins        s tenger
Cunningham     s tenger
Davis (AL)    s tenger
Davis (FL)    s tenger
Davis (IL)   s tenger
Davis (TN)   s tenger
Davis, J. Ann  s tenger
Davis, Tom    s tenger
Deal (GA)      s tenger
DeGette       s tenger
DeLahunat     s tenger
DeLaurio      s tenger
DeLauro       s tenger
Dempsey       s tenger
Denton         s tenger
Dentzer       s tenger
Devine        s tenger
Diaz-Balart,  s tenger
Diaz-Balart,  s tenger
Dickerson     s tenger
Dickson       s tenger
Dicks         s tenger
Dingell       s tenger
Dixon         s tenger
Dodd          s tenger
Dooley        s tenger
Dreier         s tenger
Duncan         s tenger
Dunn           s tenger
Ebers         s tenger
Emerson       s tenger
Engel         s tenger
Beauprez
Bell
Berman
Berry
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blair
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Watle, Ginny
Burgess
Burr
Burr (IN)
Burr (TN)
Burns
Cackler
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Capito
Carbajal
Caranko
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chapman
Chesnutt
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Cotler
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Curley
Culberson
Cummins
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, J. Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLahunat
DeLaurio
DeLauro

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews
Ballance
Case
Coble
Doggett
Fletcher

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIN- DER) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

Messrs. NUNES, YOUNG of Alaska, HOBSON, BASS, CHOCOLA, ISA, COLE, and FRELINGHUYSEN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. KELLER, TANCREDO, ROG- ERS of Alabama, GRAVES, BALLENGER, NORWOOD, BACHUS, MARIO, DIAZ-BALART of Florida, HEFFLEY, ST. JUDE, CARTERTT of Maryland, DICKS, SKELTON, LINCOLN DIAZ- BALART of Florida, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, SHAYS, and Mrs. CUBIN and Ms. DUNN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BALLANCE. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently did not vote on the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferences on H.R. 3289, Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY04. This motion directs conferences to keep the Senate-adopted language to: convert half of the Iraq rebuilding funds into a loan provided 90 percent of Iraq’s bilateral debts are forgiven; provide quality of life improvements for our troops; and provide $1.3 billion in emergency funds for veterans’ health care.

Had I been present, on rollcall Vote No. 567, I would have voted “aye.”

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 21, I was unavoidably detained and missed a recorded vote number 567 on a motion to instruct conferences for H.R. 3289, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for FY04. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of passage of the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 73, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. Emerson). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for the purpose of informing us of the schedule, and it seems to me we did this just yesterday.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 for morning hour debates and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of rules. A final list of these bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, the House will convene at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We may consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 2443, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2003. Next week we hope to have the conference report for H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act for 2003 ready for consideration, as well as the Department of Defense authorization conference report. And in addition to that, there are four appropriations bills currently in conference that will be ready at any time.

Members should also be aware that we will be in session next Friday, October 31, and expect to have votes that day. Finally, I would like to make all of the Members aware that we hope the following week, the week of November 3, will be our last week of the session. We expect our first votes of that week to occur after 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday, and we anticipate having votes through Friday, November 7.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I will be happy to answer any questions the gentlewoman may have.

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information, and for his optimism. The gentleman indicated that Members should expect there will be votes in the House next Friday. That is Halloween. How certain is the gentleman that, as we are going to have votes on that day?

Mr. DELAY. I am pretty certain we are going to have votes on that day. If Members look at the conference reports and the fact that the present continuing resolution runs out on that day, if things do not go as we expect them, we could have some very important legislation on that day, although we understand that it is Halloween and Members want to be home with their families and want to trick or treat. And hopefully even if we work on that day, we can let Members out in time to go trick or treating.

Mr. HOYER. Better trick or treating at home the next day.

Mr. DELAY. I understand.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, November 7 is indicated as the target date for adjournment. So that Members can plan, how confident is leadership that we can make it that date? How strong is leadership's intention to meet that date?

Mr. DELAY. As the gentleman knows, any date is tentative at the end of any session; but we are working very hard. The Senate is working very hard. If we get the conference reports that I outlined in my opening remarks next week, then we really only have the Medicare conference report, the finishing of the appropriations process, and we hope that we can do all of that in the next week or so.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask the gentleman, would it be fair to conclude there will be no action on the child tax credit?

Mr. DELAY. I would hope there would be action. I believe that the Senate would realize that allowing the child tax credit to expire in just a couple of years is actually raising taxes, and would accept the House bill that makes them permanent.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, I think I am correct that every tax bill that we have passed over the last 3 years has been sunsetted. Therefore, pursuant to your rationale on child tax credit, in effect those bills would be raising taxes, sometimes in 2010, sometimes a little before, and sometimes a little after, 2006, 2007 some sunset. How does that rationale differ from the rationale being applied to the child tax credit?

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, it is pretty simple. The House has voted for the tax bill and has included more families than the Senate bill, and we think that they ought to receive that child tax credit, and they ought to receive it on a permanent basis. The House has spoken, and the Senate does not seem to want to come together with the House and work out our differences.

Mr. HOYER. Unfortunately, it is our position that the children, those 12 million children, the 6.5 million families, the 200,000 military families who we know are the ones who are paying the price for the inability of the two Houses to come together when apparently both Houses believe that they ought to get the tax relief of which we speak, and but for the difference on making it permanent, would be getting.

I would again reiterate our hope in the next 2 weeks that we plan on being in session, that if we cannot resolve the differences between the two Houses in conference, then leadership will reconsider that and pass at least the 1- or 2-year extension while we try to reach agreement on the differences that exist between the two Houses.

Mr. Leader, on the FSC bill, it is our understanding that the Committee on Ways and Means will mark up this legislation on Monday. Does leadership expect the bill to be on the floor next week or does leadership expect it to pass before we leave here?

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means is considering a markup in the very near future, and once the committee has completed its work, because this bill has been in process for a longer time than we thought it would take to mark it up in committee, we have not scheduled time for it. But obviously, it is a very important piece of legislation; and once the committee has completed its work, we will look for floor time to move it. But at this point we cannot give an exact prediction of whether it is next week or the following week.

Mr. HOYER. As the leader knows, this bill comes about by a WTO ruling which places in jeopardy the United States, and we believe that we have a solution which advantages U.S. manufacturers, and we are very hopeful this does move ahead so our country does not confront the end of this year, as the European Union has said it might, take action if we have not corrected the deficiency which the WTO has found. I hope that we could move that bill before we leave here. It is also important to have several conference reports which will come up next week. Which are the most likely? Energy was mentioned. Energy was a possibility for this week. How confident is leadership that energy will come next week? This is a complicated bill, a very important bill; and I would ask you to comment, and I would ask you to facilitate the availability of this bill as soon as possible, and more than 24 hours before because it is a complicated bill. We need time to read it and understand it, and it has not been included, from our perspective, in the conference proceedings so we do not know what is in this bill at this point in time.

First, how confident is the gentleman that the conference report will come next week; and, second, can we be assured that we will receive a copy of the report and the accompanying bill hopefully by Friday afternoon?

Mr. DELAY. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we do not have to be in session for us to get our work done in conference committees or other committees. People are going to be working the rest of this week to finalize what will be submitted to formal proceedings of the conference committee on the energy bill, the comprehensive energy bill. The gentleman is correct in that it is a very complicated bill. Obviously we want to make sure that Members have enough time to read it so we can deal with it. Some sort of understanding of what is in the bill. Obviously, I cannot predict when the final proceedings on the energy bill will be, but we will get to the
Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, we would hope that would give Members no less than 48 hours to review the bill, have the staffs review it, so we know what is in it. Because, as I said, we have not had the opportunity to be included in the conference.

On the Medicare prescription drug, the gentleman mentioned the Medicare bill in response to my question. Can he tell me the status of the Medicare conference?

Mr. DELAY. A lot of people are working very hard to try to get that very complicated piece of legislation put together. The chairman of the conference continues to work with the various parties interested in reaching a compromise by the end of this session.

There have been several bipartisan, informal meetings since last week. I expect that there will be a few more before the end of this week. Hopefully, these meetings will produce a draft product that all the members of the conference will concur in at the next formal conference meeting. I would anticipate that that would start happening, probably next week or so.

We really think it is important to keep pushing the bill. We really think it is important to provide the kind of health care that seniors need before we adjourn in this session. A lot of people are working very hard to accomplish that.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Leader, I keep harping on this because I think it is important to make the point. Our folks are not included in whatever discussions are going on. As a result, we have no idea as to whether or not we think, in fact, Medicare is being weakened, whether prescription drugs are being made available to seniors, whether they are affordable, accessible, guaranteed, all of which we think is very important. We think this is occurring, probably next week or so.

Mr. Leader. If the gentleman will check on that and let us know whether or not, in his terms, a formal conference will be held or is scheduled to be held on the Labor-Health bill, I will make sure that he gets the invitation.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, and I will notify the gentleman that I am not being noticed. My conclusion is different than his, however. My conclusion is that I would be invited if they want me to come on it, but I may be in error.

Mr. Leader. If the gentleman will check on that and let us know whether or not, in his terms, a formal conference will be held or is scheduled to be held on the Labor-Health bill, it will be news to me. But I would appreciate that information, and I appreciate the gentleman’s offer.

Madam Speaker, last week the gentleman and I had a discussion about the conference on the No Child Left Behind. I believe that we want to have a very strong conference. In the inarticulate terms there, we want to make determinations as to whether they will support them or not. If the gentleman is not being invited to formal conferences, let me know, and I will make sure that he gets the invitation.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, and I inform the gentleman that I am not being noticed. My conclusion is different than his, however. My conclusion is that I would be invited if they want me to come on it, but I may be in error.

Mr. Leader. If the gentleman will check on that and let us know whether or not, in his terms, a formal conference will be held or is scheduled to be held on the Labor-Health bill, it will be news to me. But I would appreciate that information, and I appreciate the gentleman’s offer.

Madam Speaker, last week the gentleman and I had a discussion about the No Child Left Behind. We believe that we want to have a very strong conference. In the inarticulate terms there, we want to make determinations as to whether they will support them or not. If the gentleman is not being invited to formal conferences, let me know, and I will make sure that he gets the invitation.

Mr. DELAY. As the gentleman knows, motions to instruct are not binding. Many times it is just an expression of how you feel that day. The House voted to fund the No Child Left Behind. We believe in that funding. Does the gentleman have any offer.

Mr. Leader. I look forward to hearing from the gentleman as to where these conferences are occurring because I assure the gentleman that I will be enthusiastic about participating and raising this issue and other issues when we find out where that elusive conference is occurring.

I thank the leader for his information.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARKEY 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. 6 be instructed to insist upon the provisions contained in—

(1) section 14011 of the House bill relating to the transfer of nuclear material; (2) section 14012(d) of the House bill relating to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to issue regulations for renewable energy facilities; and (3) section 14013 of the House bill requiring the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, before entering into any agreement of indemnification with respect to a utilization facility, to submit a report to the Senate and the House, setting forth the terms of the agreement.
adequate protection of public health and safety if subject to a terrorist attack, and that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission also consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security before issuing a license or a license renewal for a sensitive nuclear facility concerning the emergency evacuation plan for the communities living near the sensitive nuclear facility.

Mr. MARKEY (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

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

I am offering this motion today to address one of the most inexplicable and indefensible decisions made by the House and Senate Republican energy conferees closed-door negotiations. I am talking about the decision that has apparently been made by the Republican majority to weaken critical nuclear security provisions Democrats had earlier attached to the energy bill, H.R. 6, in order to better secure a President Bush’s 103 currently operating civilian nuclear power plants from the threat of terrorist attack.

Remember less than 2 years ago, President Bush told the Nation in his State of the Union address, quote, our worst fears and showed us the true scope of the task ahead. We have seen the depths of our enemies’ hatred in videos where they laugh about the loss of innocent life, where the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, surveillance maps of American cities and thorough descriptions of landmarks in America and throughout the world.

So we know that nuclear power plants are at the very top of al Qaeda’s list of targets, and that operating nuclear reactors is a suicide mission with the Department of Homeland Security for any of the existing power plant, although the Republican conferees have yet to share this new language with us in this bill.

This provision originated as an amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to last year’s Price-Anderson bill, which this year was attached to the base text of H.R. 6. It also requires the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to consult with the Department of Homeland Security before issuing or renewing a license to operate a new or existing nuclear power plant to determine the adequacy of the emergency evacuation plan for communities around the plant. This provision originated as an amendment that I authored. We have also been informed that they are preparing to eliminate the requirement for consultation prior to a relicensing of an existing power plant, although the Republican conferees have yet to share this new language with the Democrats.

The elimination of the Waxman amendment’s linkage between NRC consultation with Homeland Security and Price-Anderson indemnification eliminates the threat of the Waxman amendment. Instead of mandating a consultation aimed at determining whether the design or location of a nuclear facility poses an unreasonable risk before giving the owner government-subsidized insurance, we are now merely calling for such consultation to take place.

Moreover, tying consultation to the initial licensing of a plant, and not recovering relicensing of the 103 currently operating nuclear plants, greatly narrows the application of the amendment since no new nuclear power plant has been successfully ordered since 1973 and no new nuclear power plants are likely to be ordered for decades, if ever. If this change is made, there would be no mandate of emergency consultation by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with the Department of Homeland Security for any of the existing nuclear power plants in this country, not for Seabrook, not for Pilgrim, not for Indian Point, not for Diablo Canyon, for none.

Finally, eliminating the specific requirement for consultation regarding
the adequacy of emergency evacuation plans in the event of a successful ter-
rorist attack on a nuclear power plant means that we are failing to do what is
needed to ensure that citizens living near plants such as the Indian Point
reactor complex located on the eastern shore of New York City are fully protected against the threat of a terrorist attack.

And third and finally, my amendment addresses the decision to weaken nuclear materials transportation re-
quirement section 14011 of the House-passed bill, requiring the NRC to estab-
lish a system to better secure the security of nuclear materials transferred
to, from, or within the United States. This provision originated as an amend-
ment I authored that has now passed the House twice in H.R. 6 in this Con-
gress and as part of Price-Anderson re-
authorization last year.

The latest Republican conference report draft, in contrast, limits the NRC's regulations to the security imports of nuclear mate-
rials, failing to cover the transpor-
tation of these materials within our own country. This limitation is in-
explicable in light of the fact that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission told Congress in 2002 that there are mil-
lion radioactive sources in the United States and that each year there are on
average 300 reports of lost or stolen or abandoned radioactive materials.

The NRC also reported at that time that in the past 5 years, there have been 1,495 reports of lost, stolen, or abandoned radioactive materials; 835 these have not been found. According to the NRC, a radioactive source as
small as 1Curie, if dispersed by a bomb, "could spread low-level contamination
over an area up to several city blocks, possibly resulting in restriction of the area
until the area was surveyed and decontaminated." But the Republican energy
conferes have exempted trans-
port but on future bills to make our nuclear facilities the best and the
safest in the world.

The latest Republican conference re-
port significantly weakens these security requirements. That makes no sense.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this motion today and send a strong mes-
sage to the House and Senate Republic-
lian energy conferes that this body
insists on tougher protections against a terrorist attack on our Nation's nu-
clear facilities; that this body insists on tougher protections against the threat of a radiological dirty bomb; and that this body rejects secret, back-
room talks that result in the weak-
ening of critical antiterrorism prote-
tions.

I heard the majority leader earlier make reference to the fact that a mo-
tion to instruct might just reflect what the Members in this body are feeling
that day. That is not what the provi-
sions that we are talking about reflect. They reflect what has happened on this
House floor several times with the
motion today and send a strong mes-

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Rush).

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given per-
mission to revise and extend his re-
marks.)

Mr. RUSH. Madam Speaker, as a con-
fer to the energy bill, I rise in strong sup-
port of the gentleman from Massa-
husetts' (Mr. Markay) motion to in-
struct conferes, and I want to com-
mand him for his long history of lead-
ership on the issue of nuclear security, which is the subject of this motion.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to hear the chairman of the subcommittee
on energy and commerce promise that this conference report will come
back with "may" and that the provisions out that he has just al-
mended will be rewritten in the ways that he said.
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Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman very much. I regret that Texas was not part of the Union at the time. Perhaps they could have exercised some influence in that final decision making.

But the other body, as it likes to be called, and I understand why in many instances, was a good example of where anonymity is something to be much desired and sought, that the other body here, according to the majority, is calling all the shots in terms of nuclear security, which is a premise which I doubt is actually accurate. I do believe that it was a bicameral Republican decision to take out the nuclear security issues, since we know that the Democrats in the Senate, like the Democrats in the House, are searching the corridors of this building trying to find where the meetings are taking place. We have no idea.

We do know this though, that reports are rampant that the bill, when it comes out on the House floor, is going to be loaded with billions of dollars of subsidies for the nuclear industry. I understand it is that time of the year where the oil, gas, coal and nuclear industries just really think that they deserve billions of dollars in subsidies to pay off the taxpaying public, even though they are among the wealthiest industries in the United States.

But, it seems to me, the least that the nuclear industry should be willing to accept are antiterrorism provisions that are attached to the nuclear gifts which it appears the Republican House and Senate and White House is willing to, and I am sorry I said “Senate,” I meant the other body, that they appear willing to confer upon them.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, just to reiterate that we do not oppose the motion to instruct, and we support the gist of the gentleman’s motion to instruct in terms of the policy. The House has already supported it twice, and the committee supported it twice. We just have to get the other body to support it, which, unfortunately, they have been unwilling to do in its totality.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Emerson). Members will refrain from characterizing action or inaction of the other body, including urging the Senate to take a specific action.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I said “the other body.” What did I say wrong?

The Speaker pro tempore. Members will refrain from characterizing the other body.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to conclude this debate.

Madam Speaker, without question, back in 1787 when a deal was being cut on the construction of the Union and the small States demanded that, rather than equal representation for all States, that another body be created in order to represent them, that other body that was created at that time has developed peculiar characteristics that, unfortunately, are manifesting themselves here on the House floor today.

There are many who look back with regret that that deal was ever cut, the grand compromise in the Constitution, allowing for that disproportionate influence, and I see nodding bipartisan agreement on the Republican side on this subject.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I think that agreement that the gentleman alluded to in the Constitution was one of the biggest mistakes in the Constitution.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman very much. I regret that Texas was not part of the Union at the time. Perhaps they could have exercised some influence in that final decision making.

But the other body, as it likes to be called, and I understand why in many instances, was a good example of where anonymity is something to be much desired and sought, that the other body here, according to the majority, is calling all the shots in terms of nuclear security, which is a premise which I doubt is actually accurate. I do believe that it was a bicameral Republican decision to take out the nuclear security issues, since we know that the Democrats in the Senate, like the Democrats in the House, are searching the corridors of this building trying to find where the meetings are taking place. We have no idea.

We do know this though, that reports are rampant that the bill, when it comes out on the House floor, is going to be loaded with billions of dollars of subsidies for the nuclear industry. I understand it is that time of the year where the oil, gas, coal and nuclear industries just really think that they deserve billions of dollars in subsidies for each one of their industries from the taxpaying public, even though they are among the wealthiest industries in the United States.

But, it seems to me, the least that the nuclear industry should be willing to accept are antiterrorism provisions that are attached to the nuclear gifts which it appears the Republican House and Senate and White House is willing to, and I am sorry I said “Senate,” I meant the other body, that they appear willing to confer upon them.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BROWN of Ohio moves that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

Madam Speaker, my motion instructs the conferes working on the Medicare prescription drug coverage bill to abandon provisions in the House bill to privatize Medicare by turning it into a private insurance voucher program. The public has asked this Congress and President Bush to supplement Medicare by adding prescription drug coverage to the Medicare benefits package.

You may remember early this year, almost a year ago, President Bush proposed a prescription drug plan only if people left fee-for-service Medicare and went into a privatized plan. Clearly, the public rejected that. Even members of his own party said no to that. The American public has not asked this Congress, has not asked President Bush, to dissolve Medicare and replace it with a private insurance voucher program.

The voucher provisions in the bill have nothing to do with prescription drug coverage. The voucher provisions do not supplement Medicare, the
voucher provisions destroy Medicare. They choose off funding for the program and force enrollees back into the private insurance market to try their luck.

If you do not believe me, Madam Speaker, ask the bill’s authors. Ask these questions:

First, under the voucher provisions of H.R. 1, will every senior be guaranteed access to the same reliable health coverage, regardless of geographical location, regardless of a senior’s income, regardless of health status? If the authors are honest, they know the answer is no.

Two, will the Federal Government’s financial commitment to Medicare automatically keep pace with the costs of the health care seniors need? If the authors of the bill are honest, the answer is no.

Three, will the private health medical organizations, private HMOs which accept Medicare vouchers, will they be required to provide ongoing, reliable coverage to Medicare beneficiaries? In other words, will HMO cost-sharing and benefit levels be predictable year after year, will beneficiaries even be able to rely on the same plan being available next year after another election? If the authors are honest in answering that question, they will admit the answer is no.

History also says that senior after senior after senior in this country in State after State and district after district and plan after plan have seen their coverage drop as they are unceremoniously dumped from their Medicare HMO. Today, Medicare offers reliable medical coverage to seniors and disabled Americans, regardless of where they live, how much they earn, or their health status. Enrollees go to the doctor of their choice and the hospital of their choice.

The insurance voucher provisions in H.R. 1 simply throw all that away. Under these provisions, seniors will be given a voucher to cover part of the cost of their health coverage. They will then be required to shop in the private insurance market, what they had to do before Medicare was available, shop in the private insurance market for whatever HMO happens to be in town that year.

Over the last 4 years, HMOs participating in Medicare+Choice enrolled and then unceremoniously dropped 2.4 million Medicare beneficiaries. That means 2.4 million of our senior constituents got notice in October or November that, come January, they would have to find another place to deliver their health care.

By undermining the existing Medicare program, by forcing seniors to pick and choose between and among private insurance plans, the voucher provisions in H.R. 1 would ensure that every Medicare beneficiary has an opportunity, an opportunity to be abandoned by their HMO.

The core Medicare program, the program that would be replaced if the voucher provisions in H.R. 1 make it into the final prescription drug bill, the core Medicare program does not drop anyone, period. In fact, over the last 4 years, one of its most important roles has been to pick up the pieces when HMOs abandoned seniors and left them high and dry.

Medicare+Choice HMO plans abandoned seniors. The fee-for-service, traditional Medicare, has had to clean up afterwards.

Under the voucher provisions in H.R. 1, the core Medicare program would itself be abandoned. Proponents of the voucher provisions, proponents of Medicare privatization, say that seniors deserve more choice. That is what we are going to hear today. That is what we have heard for years from my friends on the other side of the aisle, that seniors deserve more choice. That is why vouchers are such a good thing.

But does anybody in this body really think retirees are clamoring for their choice of HMOs when you and me and our seniors want their choice of doctor, they want their choice of hospital. They do not want their choice of insurance companies. They do not want their choice of insurance agents. They do not want their choice of HMO brochures. They do not want their choice of hospital.

Proponents of the voucher provisions claim that private HMOs operate more efficiently than the core Medicare program, so they say first of all you get more choice with an HMO, so you can choose among insurance company brochures and agents. They say you have more choice in HMOs. Then they try the second myth, and that is the myth that HMOs operate more efficiently than core Medicare.

My Republican friends know that Medicare operates more efficiently than HMOs. HMO administrative costs, Madam Speaker, are currently five times higher than traditional Medicare. Private insurance premiums have consistently grown faster than the cost of providing Medicare, not just recently, but over the past 30 years since the time Medicare first existed.

H.R. 1 will not reduce Medicare spending unless, and this, I guess, is their third point, unless the Federal Government caps its contribution to Medicare.

So privatized Medicare HMOs are not more efficient. Privatized Medicare HMOs do not give more choice, and privatized Medicare HMOs do not cost less, do not save the government more, unless government simply caps the money. In other words, unless seniors pay more out-of-pocket.

That is the cost control mechanism in H.R. 1, seniors picking up more of the cost. That is not efficiency; that is betrayal of our senior constituents.

The American public asked this Congress and this President to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, not to privatize and dismantle Medicare. This motion tells their conferences to keep their eye on the ball. The voucher provisions would undo 38 years of reliable cost-effective health care for our Nation’s retirees. If my colleagues, Madam Speaker, to take a stand on behalf of seniors, on behalf of disabled Americans, and on behalf of taxpayers who finance Medicare. If you want a Medicare program with a prescription drug benefit, you have to protect Medicare. If you want Medicare, if you want to cost-shift health care costs to seniors, if you want more HMOs and privatization of Medicare, then you vote “no” on this motion. It is an easy choice. Vote for the motion to instruct.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consider necessary.

Madam Speaker, a group of Members, both Republicans and Democrats, have been meeting for months in an attempt to reach a compromise on a very important and complicated subject, namely, Medicare reform or Medicare modernization.

There are Members who care deeply about Medicare who have very different views about how to best strengthen and improve Medicare for future generations, which is why there are substantial differences between the House and the Senate-passed Medicare prescription drug bills. That is why it has taken so long for this bipartisan group of negotiators to reconcile the differences between the two bills.

However, Madam Speaker, I am pleased to report that this group is making substantial progress and that it is my sincere hope that we will get a conference report done this year and provide our seniors with a prescription drug benefit they need and deserve.

Motions to instruct like this are not helpful; and, in fact, they hinder our ability to reach a compromise on Medicare prescription drugs. I honestly, and I mean this sincerely, do not believe that that is the goal of the author of this motion. And it certainly is not mine. I want a bill.

The particular section the gentleman refers to is not without controversy. And that is why we are working on it in a bipartisan manner. However, the section that we are talking about, which would inject competition into the Medicare program and provide seniors with choices similar to those choices Members of Congress enjoy, is probably the most misunderstood provision in the House-passed bill, and the most mischaracterized, I might add.

Let me attempt to clarify some of the issues that are often misunderstood surrounding so-called FEHBP-style competition. First, H.R. 1 contains no changes, no changes to the basic entitlement to Medicare. The traditional Medicare program will continue to be
Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in my conversation with my constituents, one issue that comes up over and over again is the future of Medicare. This is a concern for millions of Americans. Medicare is a program that provides health insurance to people aged 65 and older, as well as some younger people with disabilities. The program was established in 1965 as a part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty. It is a central part of the social safety net in the United States, with 58 million people enrolled and an estimated $626 billion spent on Medicare in 2021. The Medicare program is financed by a combination of general revenues and hospital insurance payroll taxes, and it is managed by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who has been a leader in health care in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in order to think about Medicare, you have to think about us all being in the same boat. Right now we made a decision a long time ago that all seniors will be in the same boat, we would get the same benefits, we would have the same amount we would put into it no matter where you lived, or how old you were, or whatever your medical condition was, what color you were, what State you lived in, how much money you had. It did not make any difference; we were all in the boat.

Now, many of the Republicans have said we are going to blow the bottom out of the boat. They have done that with tax cuts, and they set up a situation in 2010 where it is going to be absolute chaos in this body over how we fund anything because of the bottom having been blown out of the boat when we made these tax cuts recently.

Their answer to the seniors of this country is, well, we are going to give you all the same life ring. You can just take this life ring and go out and do the best you can with it.

Now, I sat on the Medicare commission for a year and heard this issue debated. What we have today is a program where all senior citizens get the same guaranteed set of benefits, no matter who you are, where you are, or anything. And what is attempted to be done in this bill is to say that in 2010 we are going to take away those guaranteed benefits and we are just going to give you a life ring of a voucher for $5,500.

Now, I could just take my own example. I am 65. My mother is 93. So you are going to give us each the same life ring. Now for the moment, any Member of this Congress, do you think that my mother and I could go out and get a benefit package of the same size for the same cost? I mean, who has not bought any insurance? We all know from our government employers insurance thing that you have got to pay more if you are older, if you have got kids, or you have got some pre-existing condition or whatever.

Well, to send me and my mother out with the same amount of money is basically going to pay to stay to 40 million people on Medicare. You have got to go out there and find an insurance company that wants you.

Now, I do not know how many of you have dealt with somebody who is In the end, it does not make any sense. You can make a little money on the side simply makes no sense.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we spoke before about the reforms in H.R. 1 which are similar to some provisions of the Federal Employee Health Benefits program. I want to address that for a moment. The FEHB-style reforms in H.R. 1 seek to place the traditional Medicare program on a level playing field with private plans. Only by creating this type of competition within Medicare can we hope to bend the growth curve and place Medicare on a sound financial footing for the future.

These reforms make no changes to the basic entitlement to Medicare. The traditional Medicare program will continue to be available to all seniors throughout the country. These reforms simply provide incentives for seniors to choose the most cost-efficient form of care in areas in which a vibrant private plan market exists.

This type of competition can only be triggered in areas in which two or more private plans are in operation, where they have a certain level of enrollment and meet certain market penetration requirements. In areas where these conditions are not met, nothing changes after 2010. In areas in which these conditions are met, the traditional Medicare program on a level playing field directly to private plans in the market, and seniors will have incentives to choose the most cost-efficient form of care in their area.

Reforms must be made to ensure that Medicare continues to exist for future generations. As we add a $400 billion drug benefit to a program that already has a $13 trillion unfunded liability, we must also enact real reforms that will place the program on a sound financial footing for the future. And most of us hope we never take a dime out of this program. It is an insurance program, strictly voluntary, but it is also one that we do not want to take advantage of. And to say to people, well, why do you not go buy your own and see if you can make a little money on the side simply makes no sense.
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yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS). Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might indicate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this motion.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA).

As a Representative of a rural area in California, I must voice strong opposition to any provision in the Medicare conference that would put my seniors at risk of higher premiums and reduced quality of care as this so-called premium support would do.

The House plan includes provisions that would for all intents and purposes, I believe, could spell the demise of Medicare as we know it. In the year 2010 Medicare beneficiaries would be given something similar to a voucher that they could use to purchase health care services in what they would believe would be better than the Medicare system provides.

The move creates a defined contribution system in one that for decades has been a defined benefit. I just trying to explain to my constituents at home has been a trying experience. Medicare has always been a program that you are eligible to receive at age 65. In the current program, once you reach that golden age, you know exactly what you are going to receive and exactly what services you are going to be covered with.

Premium support creates a situation where seniors will receive a benefit determined by their health, by where they live, or by what they are willing to risk.

Why do we not put our resources, Mr. Speaker, into crafting a Medicare bill that will actually help those who need the assistance? Why do we not close the doughnut hole? Why do we not give our hospitals the basic funding levels that they need to survive? Why do we not give seniors a prescription drug benefit that they can understand?

I predict that if we pass this measure with the provisions that are in it currently, we will be acting upon a repeal within months. Privatizing Medicare is not the answer.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown), had asked some questions earlier. I just want to reassure him, because I know he is very concerned, and thus the reason he raised these questions.

The first question was, under H.R. 1 will the entitlement to Medicare continue? The answer to my friend from Ohio is yes. Traditional Medicare will continue to be available to all seniors in all parts of the country.

The second question the gentleman from Ohio raised was, will government contributions keep pace with the cost of health care? The answer to my friend is yes. Government payments to providers in the traditional program will continue the same way that they do today.

The third question my friend from Ohio raised was, will private plans be required to provide reliable benefits and cost sharing? The answer again to my friend is yes. Plans must be required to provide reliable benefits and cost sharing. The answer again to my constituent at home has been a trying experience. Medicare has always been a program that you are eligible to receive at age 65. In the current program, once you reach that golden age, you know exactly what you are going to receive and exactly what services you are going to be covered with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he might indicate.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have heard my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about, particularly the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON) talk about that privatized HMOs are so efficient. And I hear that over and over and over. I just because they are private business, that they must be extraordinarily efficient, that they must do such better work than the government could do. But my friend from New Jersey also knows that, in fact, Medicare, traditional fee-for-service Medicare has one-fifth the administrative costs as a privatized HMO, as an insurance company, as a health care plan that he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give one reason why and just read a couple of statistics and then ask for my colleagues’ ‘yes’ vote on this motion to instruct.

In the year 2000, the Inspector General documented that in a survey of Medicare+Choice, privatized Medicare, they found that they tried to bill taxpayers for $116 million in inappropriate administrative costs. Now, this is one of the reasons that private insurance is so
Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

Ms. WOOLSEY moves that the managers on the part of the House in the conference on the Senate amendment to the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 be instructed as follows:

1. The House conferences 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 conferences 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 conferences 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 conferences shall be instructed to include in the conference report any additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions of the Senate amendment and to include in the conference report all of the additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions of the Senate amendment.

5. The House conferences shall be instructed to include in the conference report the provision of the Senate amendment that includes additional tax benefits not offset by other provisions.

6. The House conferences shall, as soon as practicable after adoption of this motion, meet in open session with the Senate conferences and the House conferences shall file a conference report consistent with the preconference instructions, not later than the second legislative day after adoption of this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XX, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that traditional Medicare works. It works because it gives full choice of physician, choice of provider, choice of hospital; not choice, as private insurance does, not the choice among insurance agents and insurance HMO brochures.

Traditional fee-for-service Medicare works because it is reliable. It will always be there. You will not find yourself unceremoniously dropped like 2.4 million children who have been left behind, exactly what was left out of that bill.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct.

It is time that this Congress restore true compassion for our Nation and its working families, and to pass a child tax credit bill, which would cost $3.5 billion with part of the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

I urge my colleagues, support this motion so we can pass the child tax credit bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of an interesting thing that we are talking about a child tax credit bill, which would cost $3.5 billion with part of the earnings of the individuals serving in the combat zone.

While the House passed a child tax credit bill, we missed the chance to pass a clean bill that would immediately grant our Nation's hardworking families with an increased child tax credit.

This supposed party of compassionate conservatism has exploited the child tax credit issue to pass even more tax cuts for their wealthy friends. Instead of bringing up the other body's child tax credit bill, which would cost $615 with no offsets, at a time when America's Federal deficit will exceed $1 trillion, they passed a bill that costs $80 billion with no offsets, at a time when America's Federal deficit will exceed $1 trillion.
when they say that people lost their tax credit, they lost their tax credit because they were no longer paying taxes. It is just that simple.

So the question before this House is, Should the House take money from people who pay taxes and give it to people who do not pay taxes and do it under the Tax Code? If we are going to put this in the form of handouts, then it should go to the Committee on Appropriations, and it is where it ought to be; but when we put it in the form of tax credits, we are simply taking money from people who pay taxes and giving it to people who do not pay taxes. But let me go through this motion to instruct point by point because there are some points here that we should cover, particularly as it affects the men and women in the military.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) in her motion to instruct has said that the conference report should provide the refundable credit to families in the form of immediate payments in the same manner it was provided to taxpayers who qualified under the original bill. The response is, this provision is no longer valid. The child tax credit payments approved in the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 have already been mailed out to the families who qualify. Moreover, the House bill does not deny immediate payment. It lets the IRS decide the most efficient way to deliver the payments.

The second point provides that the conference report should make the tax credit refundable to military families. The response is, that the Senate version of the 2003 tax bill specifically excludes combat pay from the calculation of the child credit, unlike what is being asked for by the other side. The Senate is now seeking to reverse its own provision.

The decision to exclude combat pay from the definition of earned income was based on President Clinton’s 2001 budget proposal and the Joint Committee on Taxation’s simplification study. The motion to instruct contradicts President Clinton’s proposal, the JCT simplification recommendation, and the Senate’s own action. Nonetheless, a proposal is being considered in the context of the conference; but, again, this is not in the Senate bill.

Number three, the conference report should include tax benefits not found in the Senate bill unless the tax benefits are offset. Our response is that the instruction would effectively cut the child credit for families from $600 to $700 in 2005 as provided in the Senate bill. Why would we want to do that? Why would the other side want to do that? In addition, this instruction would prevent us from changing the marriage penalty and the child credit. If the instructions were adopted, millions of children would be denied the child credit simply because their parents were married.

The fourth point says that the conference report should include tax relief for military personnel and astronauts who died in the Columbia Shuttle disaster. The underlying House bill already provides this tax relief; the Senate bill does not. So this has gone over.

The fifth point that is in is simply a rehash of the other four points.

So I cannot see why anyone on either side of the aisle would want to support this motion to instruct. I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, one of my Republican colleagues favored arguments against extending the child tax credit to the families left out is that these families do not pay taxes and they should not receive a credit. They argue that Congress should not grant tax relief to families who are unemployed or who do not pay Federal income taxes. However, the truth is that all of these excluded hardworking families do pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes, State and local sales taxes, property taxes, excise taxes, and we must ensure that they receive credit for these taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 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 thank the gentlewoman from California, one, for her leadership as the chairwoman of the Democratic Caucus Task Force on Children and her willingness to take this very important step to instruct the conference. I thank her very much.

Mr. Speaker, we just have an enormous disagreement, plain and simple; and I am glad that I am standing on the other side of the aisle. One side of the aisle, our good friends on the other side of the aisle really believe that the only ones who should get tax cuts are the 1 percent richest Americans. They are getting almost 80 percent to 90 percent of the tax cut. So, frankly, they have a one-sided view of the world.

On this side of the aisle, we truly believe, and the Senate agreed with us with a 94 to 2 vote, 94 for a child tax credit that includes those individuals who are unemployed or not paying any taxes. I believe that is the ultimate tax cut. They pay payroll taxes, and I have not looked at every one of their personal conditions. There may be a myriad of other taxes that they might pay; car tax, property tax. So they do pay taxes.

But the tax credit is on children, and that is the only way to have a credit back to people on the number of children that they have to support, and in doing that, many of our families have used that for the necessities of life. Maybe they have used it for school books. Maybe they have made a rental payment on it. Maybe they have used it to buy extra food.

I do not know how many of my colleagues realize that military personnel are sometimes on what we call WIC and welfare because the money they have as a military allotment is not enough for them to be able to support their families, and so it is unbelievable that we would not want to provide the partnership to the already-passed Senate provision that says that the military families with a simple restructuring of their oil, but yet we can give them $2.1 billion on behalf of the military families with a simple child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, just have an enormous disagreement, plain and simple; and I am glad that I am standing on the other side of the aisle. One side of the aisle, our good friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the only ones who should get tax cuts are the 1 percent richest Americans. They are getting almost 80 percent to 90 percent of the tax cut. So, frankly, they have a one-sided view of the world.

On this side of the aisle, we truly believe, and the Senate agreed with us with a 94 to 2 vote, 94 for a child tax credit that includes those individuals who are unemployed or not paying any taxes. I believe that is the ultimate tax cut that has been paid, that is, the men and women on the front lines in Afghanistan and Iraq. Who is paying a tax like that? So are we suggesting that military families who are making between $10,000 and $26,000 a year are not worthy of a very small, minute child tax credit? What an outrage.

I believe there are two bodies. The Constitution set up the House and the Senate; but I do not believe that one has the upper hand over the other. My body, believes that is a viable approach, 94 to 2, how silly it is for us to continue to have this ongoing debate with the same dried-up story, they do not pay taxes, they pay payroll taxes. They pay sales taxes, and I have not looked at every one of their personal conditions. There may be a myriad of other taxes that they might pay; car tax, property tax. So they do pay taxes.

But the tax credit is on children, and that is the only way to have a credit back to people on the number of children that they have to support, and in doing that, many of our families have used that for the necessities of life. Maybe they have used it for school books. Maybe they have made a rental payment on it. Maybe they have used it to buy extra food.

I do not know how many of my colleagues realize that military personnel are sometimes on what we call WIC and welfare because the money they have as a military allotment is not enough for them to be able to support their families, and so it is unbelievable that we would not want to provide the partnership to the already-passed Senate provision that says that the military families with a simple child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, just have an enormous disagreement, plain and simple; and I am glad that I am standing on the other side of the aisle. One side of the aisle, our good friends on the other side of the aisle believe that the only ones who should get tax cuts are the 1 percent richest Americans. They are getting almost 80 percent to 90 percent of the tax cut. So, frankly, they have a one-sided view of the world.

On this side of the aisle, we truly believe, and the Senate agreed with us with a 94 to 2 vote, 94 for a child tax credit that includes those individuals who are unemployed or not paying any taxes. I believe that is the ultimate tax cut that has been paid, that is, the men and women on the front lines in Afghanistan and Iraq. Who is paying a tax like that? So are we suggesting that military families who are making between $10,000 and $26,000 a year are not worthy of a very small, minute child tax credit? What an outrage.

I believe there are two bodies. The Constitution set up the House and the Senate; but I do not believe that one has the upper hand over the other. My body, believes that is a viable approach, 94 to 2, how silly it is for us to continue to have this ongoing debate with the same dried-up story, they do not pay taxes, they pay payroll taxes. They pay sales taxes, and I have not looked at every one of their personal conditions. There may be a myriad of other taxes that they might pay; car tax, property tax. So they do pay taxes.

But the tax credit is on children, and that is the only way to have a credit back to people on the number of children that they have to support, and in doing that, many of our families have used that for the necessities of life. Maybe they have used it for school books. Maybe they have made a rental payment on it. Maybe they have used it to buy extra food.
fact, some of them have rejected it and said we do not need it. Warren Buffett happens to be one of them.

We are still willing to saddle America’s children with an enormous debt because in the spring of 2001 we had a $5.3 trillion projected surplus. Today, we have a $500 billion in a deficit and growing.

So this is a simple request to this House, and I ask my colleagues to vote enthusiastically to render a child tax credit that will be implemented in this process we can address the needs of our children in America.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, in that this is the 16th time we have been through this exercise, at this time I have no requests for speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time. I do recognize that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), a co-chair of the Children and Families Task Force.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would like to reiterate once again the families who did not receive child tax credit relief when checks were mailed out this summer:

More than three-quarters, 803,000, of the children of sales workers; more than half, 503,000, of the children of janitors and maids; more than half, 526,000, of the children of cooks and other kitchen workers; more than half, 290,000, of the children of farmers and farm workers; two out of five children, 376,000, of child care workers and their aides; one in four, 483,000, children of secretaries and related office workers; one in five, 264,000, children of truck, bus and cab drivers; more than 260,000 of active duty armed services personnel.

Mr. Speaker, how can we forget so many families who are the backbone of our Nation’s safety, transportation, health, food supply and other children’s care?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few points that I think are very important. The gentleman from North Carolina gave a very impassioned speech, but what he did leave out is that to go ahead and get this bill conferenced and stick to the House language, most of the people he talked about are off the tax rolls. In fact, all of them will be off of the tax rolls if this happens. And that is a good thing, because we have in our bill that we passed, the $90 billion bill, we took millions and millions of Americans off of the tax rolls. And they are low-income people where we need to do this.

Also, the gentlewoman’s motion to instruct would cut the tax credit from $1,000 to $700. Why do we want to do that? Why does the other side want to do that? I really do not understand the logic in doing this.

But, in any event, we have been through this many, many times. We are going over worn-out roads, and at this point I would, again, urge a “no” vote on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and in closing, I wish to repeat that the people we are talking about pay taxes. They pay their employment taxes, their payroll taxes, they pay local sales taxes, they pay property taxes and franchise taxes, sometimes. They are taxpayers. They earn a living, and they are the backbone of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, according to the Citzens for Tax Justice, the child tax bill passed on June 12, 2003, by the House Republicans, we will give two and a half times more to families with children under 17 that have incomes above $104,000 than it would give to families making less than $28,000 a year.

This is just bad policy, and this motion to instruct will correct that bad policy. And I ask that my colleagues vote “yes” on this motion to instruct.

Mr. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my outrage regarding the Republican leadership’s unjust treatment of the child tax credit.

Week after week, month after month, Republican leaders scheme and delay, unable or unwilling to find an ounce of compassion for families making under $26,625 dollars a year.

In my district, one out of every 4 families will get no child tax credit or compassion from the Republican leadership.

Military families who live in my district, and whose children serve proudly in our military, will get no child tax credit.

Yet somehow, Republicans found $90 billion to give to 200,000 millionaire families, while each million working class Latino families got nothing.

And yet again, Republicans found $20 billion for reconstruction in Iraq, while working class families got nothing for reconstruction here at home.

As our deficit grows, $400 billion for Fiscal Year 03 and $500 billion for Fiscal Year 04, these working families will get something . . . a higher debt burden they can pass onto their children, loss of essential health services, infrastructure funds, environmental protections and social security.

These families deserve more than that, they deserve a child tax credit.

I implore my colleagues of good conscience and compassion across the aisle to join me in supporting the Motion to Instruct Conferees and instructing our families, our many families and all American children a Child Tax Credit!

Ms. DELAUNO. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that we have been discussing this matter for 5 months now. 5 months ago, the extension of the child tax credit was stolen from six-and-a-half million families, 12 million children—a million of whom are in military and veterans families. 5 months have passed since we first discussed how every one of these low-wage earning families pay more in taxes than Enron, a multibillion-dollar company that paid no taxes in the last 4 or 5 years.

It is simply unconscionable. The other body passed a bill months ago. The president’s spokesperson said then that the House should take it up, and the president would sign it. Why then is the Republican leadership so reluctant to lift a finger to help people who work—people who pay taxes, people who have children? Republicans pass tax cut after tax cut for the wealthiest Americans, and then they cut out the families of 12 million children.

As much as the other side of the aisle would like to say that they don’t pay taxes, they do pay taxes—they pay property taxes, they pay sales taxes, they pay payroll taxes, and they work and live paycheck to paycheck.
Unlike so many of the millionaires who received a $93,000 tax cut in the $350 billion tax bill, these families who earn between $10,500 and $26,000 per year and know what it is to work and pay taxes. We should walk in their shoes.

And let me remind the majority who this injustice has affected disproportionately. Two-thirds of the parents who will not be receiving this tax cut are women. 4 million single mothers, a million married couples with stay-at-home moms. Fifty-five percent of all married-couple families. Two hundred thousand military families. All have been left out by this Republican majority. On average, these families would have received $276 in this year alone had the tax credit been extended to them.

Maybe that does not sound like a lot of money to some, particularly those millionaires who are going to get their $93,000, but it can be a difference between a child going to school with or without school supplies, it helps the families of the 9 million children in this country without health insurance pay for the health care services that they need.

Assisting these families, these 12 million children, is a moral issue. It is a matter of values. Mr. Speaker, we must call on the president to use his moral authority, to do something about those six-and-a-half million working families. They have earned that child tax credit like we will never know. We should pass this motion to instruct.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to instruct. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Gutknecht) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, back in 1838, the conservative leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution prohibiting the discussion of slavery, essentially banning the debate of slavery in this body, which was the largest blot on our national heritage. For 4 years, people were not allowed to debate the issue of slavery on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Former President, then Congressman John Quincy Adams, night after night, day after day, week after week, came to the House floor, and not being able to debate slavery, he read letters from his constituents, most of them women, who could not vote in those days in the middle of the 19th century. So he read letters from his constituents protesting government policy on slavery.

Today, we have seen in this body the continued suppression of debate on whether or not the Bush administration told the truth about Iraq, a continuation of disallowing of amendments that would have provided and supplied for our soldiers better than they have been, and that the military is able to, and so, as a result, Mr. Speaker, today I want to read letters from my constituants protesting government policy on slavery.

Celia from Strongsville writes: No more money should be allocated for Iraq until we make Bush’s administration accountable for it and tell us what he is doing with it.

Again, she is talking about Halliburton, the $13,000 a month to Vice President Cheney, and all the money unaccounted for going to these large corporations which are major contributors to the President.

Celia continues to write: You cannot cut taxes and continue to increase spending without bankrupting the next generation in this country. When Congress appropriated $87 billion last week, at the President’s demand, understand every one of those $87 billion was borrowed money from the next generation.

Celia then closes by saying: I used to think Republicans were more fiscally responsible than Democrats. I know that is not true any more.

Jack from Strongsville, Ohio, writes: Enough is enough. Let us stop losing American lives and get back to saving our country.

Ed from Strongsville, Ohio, writes: We agree to have more money for anything other than defense initiatives. The Iraq war has totally distracted us from the real issues of terrorism and from our domestic economic agenda.
What Ed from Strongsville is talking about is the President and the administration have lost sight of going after Osama bin Laden, lost sight of going after al Qaeda, lost sight of protecting us at home, lost sight of spending money, bar currency at home, for jobs to homeland security, and, instead, has gone into another country and is spending these untold billions on reconstructing Iraq.

Ed concludes by saying: It is time for a constructive effort to fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have received hundreds, thousands of letters from our constituents upset about this policy and they want some direction. They want no more corruption in Iraq.

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.)

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

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

HOUSE SHOULD ELIMINATE DEATH TAX

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

(Mr. Jones of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am back on the floor again. This is my fourth or fifth week of coming down at least one time a week to remind the leadership of the House, both Republican and Democrat, that each and every time a man or woman dies for this country, whether it be in training or in Iraq or Afghanistan, when the family not only buries that loved one, the next year they will receive a tax from Uncle Sam on a small amount of money called a death gratuity. It is $6,000.

I have a bill in, and it is my second year of introducing legislation to eliminate that tax. It was put on by mistake in the early 1990s; but since that time, everyone in uniform that has died for this country, whether peacetime or wartime, the families have paid the gift of that child who died for freedom, particularly now in the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Behind me are the faces of those, just a few, who have given their lives for America. Outside of my office, 422 Cannon, we update each and every week the faces of those who have given their lives.

It touches one’s heart to see people walking down the hall stop to take a moment to look into the faces of those who have died for freedom. That is the purpose of honoring those who have given their lives and families, by having people here to give there is an expensive cost for freedom, and that is the lives of those who have given their lives for this great Nation. I am hopeful that the leadership will be bringing legislation to the floor that will reduce and eliminate that tax on the death gratuity.

Mr. Speaker, I show this photograph of a young man whose name is Tyler Jordan. Tyler is from Connecticut. His father was Marine Gunner Sergeant Philip Jordan. This was one of the shots I saw in the newspaper that touched my heart so much that I contacted the photographer and asked him to buy this photograph. This young man is 6 years old. He has the American flag under his arm which draped his father’s coffin, and he is looking at the coffin holding his father.

The reason I keep bringing this to the floor along with these other photographs is because this Congress cannot leave this year without passing legislation to eliminate the tax on the death gratuity. For this young man and his family to receive a bill from Uncle Sam in 2004 to pay the tax on the gift of his father, and the husband and son, it just does not make any sense.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Renzi) and I have been working on this issue, and I have been told that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Renzi) will be bringing legislation to the floor that will increase the death gratuity and also eliminate the tax. I am pleased to say that I know that every Member of Congress on both sides of the aisle will join us in passing the legislation and send it to the other body, and plead with the other body to pass the same legislation and send it to the President before we end this year. It is wrong and unacceptable that any family that gives a loved one to this Nation for freedom be sent a bill from Uncle Sam.

I am pleased that I have been told that there will be legislation coming to the floor that will eliminate the tax and also will raise the death gratuity.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that these men and women who have given their lives for this country, that the families have given enough and they need not give any more to Uncle Sam.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless our men and women in uniform, please bless their families, for God to please hold in his loving arms those who have given a loved one for freedom. I ask God to please bless the young men and women in uniform. I ask God to please bless the American people that we will do what is right in the eyes of the Lord. I ask God to please give the President of the United States wisdom, courage, and strength to do what is right.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking three times, please God, please God, please God continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. Jackson-Lee) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. Jackson-Lee of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

TRIBUTE TO TERRI SCHINDLER-SCHIAVO

Mr. Feeney. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to speak for the life of a fellow citizen, Ms. Terri Schindler-Schavo. Her story has been heard worldwide and I join millions across the world, including our Governor, Jeb Bush, to urge that her feeding tube be replaced and her life spared.

According to the web site established on her behalf, Terri was 26 years old when she suffered brain damage from a sudden collapse. She receives her food and water by means of a feeding tube. Terri’s other bodily functions are physically stable. Terri smiles, laughs and cries. Terri recognizes voices and responds. At times, she vocalizes sounds, trying in her best way to speak. While these situations are heart-breaking for all of those involved, we need to remember that all life is precious. It is not for us to measure what constitutes “valuable life v. invaluable.” We never know how one’s life may impact others. While Terri’s life seems “a waste” or “over” to others, she obviously brings delight and happiness to her family and those around her. Her parents and siblings have fought in court to keep Terri alive.

Members, the prospect of a society that places price-tags on human life, is terrifying. We must uphold the American precedent that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I stand in support of Terri’s family, as well as our Governor and State leaders who are trying to preserve this precious life.

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis) is recognized for 5 minutes.
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(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

WAR ON TERROR

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

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of Iraq, and specifically how our war on terror, a truly just war in the defense of American civilization, entailed the strategic imperative for Iraq's regime change and reconstruction, and now how in the war on terror we stand at a crucible for our reconstruction, and now how in the war on terror we stand at a crucible for our country and civilization.

On September 11, 2001, America was shaken by a sudden and concerted act of terrorism by fanatics who possessed no justification and our Nation no culpability for their willful, deliberate, and premeditated murder of innocents. Stunned, we resolutely marshaled our courage and solemnly accepted the duty to defend our country and human civilization from the atavistic nihilism of Islamic extremism which amorally and arbitrarily colors and conditions the unviable sanctity of human life within the skewed prism of its adherents' abject pursuit of power.

This is neither the first nor undoubtedly the last time our Nation will be called upon to protect itself and all the world from an extremist enemy with inhuman aims. In our relatively brief existence, we have led the successful efforts to eradicate the evils of imperialism, fascism and communism; and, heartened by our storied tradition of valor and victory, our current efforts must and will continue to tighten nooses around the necks of the practitioners of terror until they have joined their extremist antecedents in the ash can of history.

It will be a long, hard, bitter task to defeat these disparate, desperate denizens of terror, who skulk in the shadows and steep in the venom of their perverted political phantasms. Their strength is their stealth and ruthless ness which, in the absence of their own nation-state, was spawned by their inability to wage conventional war upon traditional combatants. Their weakness is, in turn, is their inability to sub sist and act without sustenance from a cut-throat confederation of sheltering nation-states and sympathizers.

These murderers are at once everywhere and nowhere; shrill in their threats, silent in their tactics; housed in the bosoms of evil and hunted in the citadels of freedom. They are the face less foes of a million-mile front in a war without borders or bounds, but with this grim reality: they want to kill us. They want to kill our children. They want to kill each other. They want to kill themselves, too. Make no mistake, the only way to stop them from killing us is to first kill them until they capitulate.

The war is here. The war is now. And unless and until our victory is won, every American man, woman and child will live with an intolerable state of imminent threat from terrorists and their patrons because, as proven by the sneak attack on September 11, the extremists' existence is an imminent threat to our existence.

Given this grim reality and our enemies' assets and liabilities, defeating terrorists requires severing them from their sponsoring states and sympathizers in tiered theaters of operations determined and devised as necessary and as provided; and within these theaters of operations involved, diplomatic, economic and military, must each be tailored by time and circumstance for maximal advantage and efficiency. It is a root-and-branch approach and its allies must uproot regimes supporting terrorism; serve notice on other rogue regimes to cease and desist in their succor of terror, lest they suffer the same fate; and leave terrorists to die on the vine of their own dependencies and the seed of our resolve.

Within this mission, theaters of operations must first be defined. Tragically, the tier-one theater has already been designated for us: the homelands of America and her allies. Tier-two theaters exist within those nations in which America and her allies must diplomatically, economically, and/or militarily act to end a rogue regime's intransigent sponsorship of terrorism.

Prioritizing tier-two theaters is an agonizingly difficult task; but a practical, tripartite regime change, reconstruction calculus can be formulated from the factors of necessity, victory, and stability.

First, necessity is determined by the rogue regime's continued support of terrorism, a question answered only by these nations' actions.

Secondly, victory's viability is determined by the prospects for a successful regime change through diplomatic, economic and/or military means.

Third, stability is determined by the prospects of reconstructing within the newly liberated nation a stable, civilized, indigenous government opposed to terrorism.

Regime change and reconstruction are the twin pillars of one policy: victory. Having effectuated a regime change, the U.S. and its allies cannot idly and anxiously await a newly liberated nation's indigenous developments in politics and economics for, devoid of stability and a steady progress toward democracy and prosperity, a deposed regime's vacuum will be filled by more ruthless rulers or by anarchy, and either outcome will foster terror's network.

The U.S. and its allies must promptly and purposely act, even prior to the final ending of military hostilities, to commence reconstructing newly liberated countries and actively facilitating their reentry into the community of civilized nations opposed to terrorism. Such reconstruction will not happen instantaneously; and reconstruction will not happen inexpensively. But happen it must, lest the war on terror never end.

But strategic imperatives are insufficient rationales for Americans to wage war. As a civilized people, we will only fight a just war, one necessarily engaged and morally waged. In prosecuting the war on terror, America solidly stands on the moral high ground.

The moral legitimacy of our war on terror is lost upon many amidst the fog of rhetoric surrounding the determination of which rogue regimes supporting terror must be changed through America's military force. The logic remains: as all civilized nations have allied to end terrorism, any contrary country harboring and helping these criminals is, itself, uncivilized and criminal; and such a rogue country's immoral regime is illegitimate within the community of moral nations.

As for the moral legitimacy of unilateral American preemptive of rogue regimes aiding and abetting terrorism, the United States, a sovereign Nation, cannot and will not delegate or subordinate to any country or international organization our morally justified duty of defend and deliver ourselves from evil. Having already been grievously wounded by an unannounced, unprovoked attack on our soil, the U.S. is already in a state of war against terrorists and their state sponsors, and is morally justified in speaking out andboldly to justify our aid to any country who aid, and all who abet our self-appointed enemy. The doctrine of preemption, then, is both morally justified and wholly irrelevant, because the terrorists' insidious on to this war means the war on terror is now. America is not arbitrarily or preemptively prosecuting a prospective war on terror; America is necessarily defending itself against terrorists and their state sponsors in a war which reached our shores over two years ago.

In the final analysis, because America was immorally and unilaterally attacked, America can morally and unilaterally counterattack. We have the regime change to end the moral duty to do no less. Throughout this just war on terror, America possesses a moral right to seek rogue regime changes; and America possesses a moral responsibility to reconstruct liberated nations. This is in no small way to the path to a just and equitable peace for Americans who, in rebuilding our war-torn enemies following World War II, honorably fulfilled the promise of their late
President, Franklin Roosevelt: “Freedom means the supremacy of human rights everywhere. Our support goes to those who struggle to gain those rights to keep them. Our strength is our unity of purpose.”

Presumably such unity of martial and moral purpose can only be fulfilled by rehabilitating the newly liberated countries of Afghanistan and Iraq into democratic Middle Eastern allies in the world’s war on terror.

Immediately following September 11, 2001, the United States and its allies against terror squarely set their sites upon Afghanistan, whose primitive Taliban regime repeatedly refused to terminate its assistance for the butchers of innocents.

Affirmatively evaluating the necessity for and viability of a regime change, and the prospects for reconstruction and post-conflict stability within Afghanistan and the region, on October 7, 2001, America’s initial tier-two tier of operations opened in Afghanistan. Then, targeting terrorist enclaves and training camps and various Taliban military and political assets, the U.S. and our allies, including indigenous anti-Taliban Afghans, struck with unprecedented speed and success and the rogue regime rapidly disintegrated and capitulated on November 13.

Following the fall of Kabul, the U.S. and its allies have engaged in both military operations against terrorists and Taliban loyalists and reconstruction operations with the Afghan people. Militarily, there exists a NATO force of 5,000 troops in Kabul to provide security and stability to the fledgling government of President Hamid Karzai, and there remains a U.S.-led coalition force of 11,500 troops throughout the country to hunt down al-Qaida and Taliban diehards. In reconstruction efforts, the U.S. alone has contributed over $10 billion in assistance to the people of Afghanistan, including the rehabilitation of 72 hospitals, clinics and women’s health care centers; the vaccination of 4.3 million children against measles; the treatment of 700,000 cases of malaria, the enrollment of 4 million children in school, the repatriation of 2.5 million Afghans to their homes, the commencement of 6,100 water projects to aid farmers, and commitment to rebuild the Kabul Kandahar road.

To date, this concerted implementation of the regime change rebuilding nexus, still in its infancy, has been successful in eliminating the state-sponsored terrorism of the Taliban, facilitating a stable new government progressing toward democracy and prosperity, and increasing America’s and the world’s security.

For the allied forces, this success in the Afghan tier-two theater of operations provided concrete milestones and guideposts along the path toward the next tier-two theater of operations, Iraq.

Under the despotic direction of Saddam Hussein, Iraq long posed a danger to America and the international community. Suffice to say the threat was recognized by all nations after Iraq’s 1991 invasion of and expulsion from Kuwait. Curiously, though, after the onset of the war on terror, minds have differed over whether or not Iraq’s centralized and brutal regime was a danger to the world community in general, sufficiently existed to compel martial force be used to effectuate an Iraqi regime change.

The necessity test met, what was the viability of deposing Hussein and his minions? While the level of U.S. and allied military force required was debated, especially in the presence of the United Nations’ cooperation, the viability of successful Iraqi regime change was little disputed by knowledgeable minds. Iraqi forces remained hobbled after their defeat during the liberation of Kuwait, and its economy languished under postwar economic sanctions. Still, it was not an easy decision and never is when sending good American sons and daughters into harm’s way.

But it was a decision which nearly all agreed was and which any assessment concluded would lead to a victorious military operation. Events, to date, have validated this original assessment.

On March 20, 2003, the U.S. and its Coalition of the Willing allies launched military strikes against Iraqi leaders. By April 5, U.S. tanks entered Baghdad. By April 9, U.S. troops aided Baghdad residents in toppling a statue of Saddam Hussein, thereby symbolizing his removal from power. By April 14, the Pentagon announced it “would anticipate that the major combat operations are over” and it began the process of sending air and naval forces home. And finally on May 1, President Bush declared end of combat operations in Iraq. Yet even as the general assessment of the viability of an Iraqi regime change was upheld, significant opposition has arisen and jeopardizes the final stage of the operation, the reconstruction of a stable, democratic and prosperous Iraq.

Initially, the postregime change reconstruction of Iraq portended a long, but ultimately successful, transition to a stable democratic state. The Iraqi people, though long oppressed by Hussein, remained a highly-industrious, highly-educated people, possessed of a long history replete with notable accomplishments in the areas of agriculture, commerce, science and scholarship. Once liberated, it was projected, Iraqis would seize upon their newfound freedoms to forge a new nation of equality and prosperity and join the league of civilized nations.

According to the State Department, Iraqis have experienced post-Saddam progress in the areas of security, essential services, economics and governance. On the security front, significant accomplishments have occurred. More than 40 of the 55 most wanted former Iraqi officials have been apprehended by Coalition forces. Northern Iraq and the Shi’a heartland, running from just south of Baghdad to the Kuwaiti border, have been secured; and recruitment for the first battalion of the Iraqi National Army has commenced, with 1,200 Iraqi being trained this year and 40,000 to be trained over the next 2 years.

Essential services, too, have progressed. All of Iraq’s hospitals and 95 percent of its health clinics have opened and are providing services, including the dissemination of 22.3 doses of measles, TB, hepatitis B, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus and polio vaccines required to inoculate 4.2 million children.

More than 100 schools have been rehabilitated, with 600 more projected to be completed prior to the start of the
school year. Ninety percent of Iraq's public schools and all of Baghdad's universities have reopened.

Dilapidated and looted power, water, and sewage treatment facilities have been rehabilitated and electricity generation now nears 75 percent of prewar levels. Further, phone service has been restored to hundreds of thousands of customers; and massive cleanups of Baghdad's poorest neighborhoods have advisory councils. All Baghdad councils, and over 85 percent of Iraqi towns have town councils. Progress in the Iraqi political system and viability of regime change in Iraq are employing terror’s ruthless tactics to wage a guerilla war against American soldiers and a psychological war against American citizens. These cowardly criminals’ ghoulish goal is to kill innocent citizens and force a disheartened American public to demand a hasty withdrawal from Iraq. The criminals learned this lesson from the successful North Vietnamese military dictum asserting their war with the U.S. would not be won or lost on battlefields of Southeast Asia but in the streets of America. Thus, heartened by every politician’s or pundit’s groundless pontificating to the effect Iraq is our new Vietnam, these Iraqi extremists’ killing strategy, along with any false hope they will usurp power when a dispirited America retreats. They are, of course, wrong. America will not retreat from Iraq. America will reconquer Iraq. And we will do so in the very face of this guerilla phase of the Iraqi campaign. Unfortunately, this act of humanitarianism is both unprecedented in world history and little noticed by the world community, including many nations who have always been fully aware that to recognize the context and accurately gauge the progress of Iraqi reconstruction forms a misguided basis for opposing Iraqi reconstruction, jeopardizes the coalition’s efforts to win the Iraqi theater of operations, and increases the odds of Iraq becoming the first setback in America’s and its allies’ war on terrorism. And it is not the only misguided basis for opposing Iraq reconstruction. While subsequent events have so far vindicated the decisions dictated by the regime change-reconstruction calculus regarding the necessity and viability of regime change in the Iraqi theater of operations in the war on terror, the stability wrought only through successful reconstruction efforts remains elusive due to international, Iraqi, and American opposition.

In 1940, England’s finest hour arrived as it singlehandedly fought off the Wehrmacht war-machine subjugating Europe, and today, the continent’s savior, Mr. Churchill, implored the United States to abandon its intrinsigent, antiquated isolationism and join the struggle to save civilization from Nazism. Ironically, we now find ourselves similarly situated in the concert of international events and the court of world opinion. Yet unlike the opposition Prime Minister Churchill faced from international appeasers and American isolationists in the nascent stages of World War II, the war on terror no civilized country denies the danger and all demand its end. Still, many nations are reticent to make the hard sacrifices needed to end terror. This is thoroughly disgusting but hardly surprising. Nearing the close of World War II, a former isolationist and eventual bipartisan leader in international cooperation, U.S. Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Republican of Michigan, squarely addressed the problem of international cooperation against common foes:

It means the continued and total battle fraternity of the United Nations. It must mean one for all and all for one, and it will mean that unless somehow in the mortal and abiding conflict the stupid and sinister folly of ulterior ambitions shall invite the enemy to postpone our victory through our own rivalries and our own conflicts, Nations, in even greater unity of military action than heretofore, must never, for any cause, permit this military unity to fail again. If it does, we shall count the cost in mortal anguish even though we stumble on to a belated though inevitable victory. This is an obligation which rests not upon us and no less than upon us and our allies. First things must come first. History will not deal lightly with any who undermine this aim are it is achieved. Destiny will one day balance any such ghastly accounts.

Now I am not so naive as to expect any country to act on any basis other than self-interest. I know of no reason why it should. What is nations are for. I certainly intend that intelligent and loyal Americans act upon self-interest, vigilantly and vigorously guarded as is amply obvious from time to time in their own behalf by half the actions of our allies. The real question is simply this, where does real self-interest lie?

Until last week, the answer was mixed, with too many nations cravenly calculating to meanly subsidize their security from terrorism with the blood of American and allied soldiers. Yes, the recent unanimous approval by the United Nations’ Security Council of Resolution 1511, (2003) provides a faint, begrudging admission a democratic Iraq would benefit the world community. However, these nations’ true test will come not through their delicate words, but through their concrete deeds. The international community’s first concrete deed must be relieving the new Iraq of the debts amassed by the old Iraq. The resolution of this issue involves billions of dollars of debt, much of it munitions debts owed to members of the very United Nations Security Council which sanctioned Iraq, yet who continued to sell weapons and dual-use technologies to the former rogue regime until the removal of Mr. Hussein, will prove the real answer to where these nations believe their real self-interest lies. Regardless of their decision on the debt, and their track record does not portend a proper one, the U.S. and its allies must still fulfill the obligation of international etiquette to ask these other nations’ participation and cooperation. But we must, throughout the process, rid ourselves of any delusion these nations will suddenly abandon their old greed and accept their true duty. And we must dedicate ourselves to the arduous task of reconstructing the new Iraq.
wherever these nations perceive their real self-interest to lie.

This debt test also applies to American supporters of reconstruction efforts who advocate U.S. reconstruction funds to Iraq be tendered as a loan rather than a grant. Indeed, by the simple, albeit the faint of short-term pecuniary interest, it will eclipse the faint hope the world's predator-creditor community will relent from their billions in claims upon Iraq. The death of this simile hope will then write its own wicked epitaph by causing debt and interest under oceans of red ink, precluding Iraqi prosperity, undermining Iraqi democracy, and spawning a new Iraq regime of the old Iraq regime, by the old Iraqi regime and for the Iraqi regime, or worse.

Prior to determining where their real self-interest lies, these international amassers of Iraqi debt and American loan proponents should read an elementary treatise recording the mounting misery of their philosophical predecessors beginning with the Treaty of Versailles up to the Weimar Republic and Saddam up to the Weimar Republic. Then, they might see their position may or may not “saddle our children with tomorrow's debt”; but it will saddle our children with today's threat.

Not surprisingly, active Iraqi opposition to reconstruction is comprised of the same thugs who opposed Iraqi regime change, namely, defeated members of the former Baathist regime, former soldiers who were disbanded under the first wave of de-Baathification, and terrorists both native to and newly arrived in the country. These bands' opposition to a new, democratic Iraq is self-evident. They will fight to the death to restore the old Iraq, for they have nothing to live for in the new Iraq. The larger, long-term obstacle to reconstruction is the passive nonparticipation of large segments of the Iraqi general population. Typified by a reticence to assist Coalition forces and nongovernmental organizations in rebuilding efforts, this de facto opposition is a direct result of recent history. Too often Iraqis have witnessed Saddam's apparent demise only to see him resurrected; and, not illogically, a chary Iraqi populace will not risk life and limb in reconstruction efforts so long as there exists a glimmer of danger the Coalition will depart and Saddam will return.

Despite this indigenous opposition, the beneficial prospects for long-term reconstruction. The active opposition must and will be dealt with by both coalition forces and the new Iraqi security apparatus; while the defunct opposition must be dealt with through a firm coalition commitment to reconstruction, consistent progress towards democracy, prosperity, and by Saddam’s corpse.

Finally, there exists domestic American opposition to the reconstruction of postwar Iraq. Such opposition is fascinating, particularly when viewed in light of the President's $87 billion Iraqi reconstruction request, a reasonable request, the New York Post observed, as it was less than “the sum to replace a chunk of Manhattan, which could easily top $100 billion, not to mention the toll on the broader economy.” And not to mention the death toll of 3,000 Americans on September 11.

Why this domestic opposition? To begin with, previous antagonists in the war utilized information, or more crudely, propaganda, to galvanize one’s homefront and demoralize an opponent's homefront. In the war on terror, contrarily, and especially in the area of homeland security, unprecedented propaganda constraints severely delimit a nation's ability to broadcast its victories to its citizens.

Practically and strategically, the U.S. and its allies cannot list all of the internationalist requests for postwar Iraq. A chunk of Manhattan, which could easily top $100 billion, not to mention the toll on the broader economy. This, in effect, would isolate America from its supreme sovereign duty to defend its own interests and from its special role to defend freedom and democracy throughout the world.

Naturally, while America must still always welcome international support to defend freedom and ourselves, in the war on terror where America is the enemy’s primary target, isolationism disguised as hyperglobalism is ridiculous and dangerous: If we surrender our self-defense to the whims and good wishes of the U.N., soon we will never be more loved and never more dead.

The separate branch of the same tree, traditional isolationism, once thought as ideological casualty of Pearl Harbor, has never expired because of its emotional, albeit fanciful, appeal: Who would not want to avoid foreign wars costing the lives of Americans? Of course, so few people against a wish so enticing, and this of course is why so many politicians propound isolationism, be it however subtly or less than subtly.

For example, consider these excerpts from a certain Senator’s radio address:

“My friends, it is this satanically clear, clever propaganda that appeals to Christianity, the idealism, the humanity, and the loyalty of the American people that takes us into war.

“Do not let yourselves be swayed by mass hysteria.

“Warmongers, sordid romanticists, reckless adventurers, and some whose sympathies and sentiments are strong than their reasonableness would plunge this Nation into war. Plunge us into a war from which we would gain nothing.

“Do not let yourselves be misled by the so-called notables . . . they do not represent labor, the farmer, the youth and the mothers or fathers of America.

“. . . Americans in greater numbers must firmly resolve and express themselves that we will fight no offensive war.

The Senator continued: America's war ought to be against industrial unemployment and low farm prices . . .
“We sympathize with the oppressed and persecuted everywhere. We also realize that we have great problems at home, that one third of our population is ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clad, and unless and until this situation is corrected, our democracy is in danger.”

He then concluded: “I cannot help but feel that we should settle our own problems before we undertake to settle the problems of Asia, Africa, Australasia, South America and Europe. As Americans interested first in America, what is our national stake?”

This isolationist ode to only spending Americans’ money solving Americans’ domestic problems comes not from the current Iraqi reconstruction debates. They were the remarks of U.S. Senator Burton Wheeler, Democrat, Montana, in opposing the Roosevelt administration’s lend-lease proposal with England.

Still, the crude cruc of the matter, originally pointed out by Wheeler, is that by his isolationism ilk from the debates over aid to Greece and Turkey through the Marshall Plan right up to today’s debates over Iraqi reconstruction remains: What is in it for us? A bitterly ironic inquiry from baby boomers, Democrats who rose to prominence under the inaugural challenge to “ask not what your country can do for you,”’ but I despair.

What is in it for us is what is in it for everyone: a stable, democratic, and prosperous new ally in the war on terror.

For while our path is clear, our road is hard. But we must trod it ever bravely to a better world for ourselves and our children. There is no turning back to await an ignoble death.

In his December 26, 1941, address to a joint session of Congress, Prime Minister Winston Churchill warned another shocked generation of Americans that it was sucked into the tragication to firmly press on: “Some people may be startled or momentarily depressed when, like your President, I speak of a long and hard war. But our peoples would rather know the truth, somber though it be. And, after all, when we are doing the noblest work in the world, not only defending our hearts and homes but the cause of freedom in other lands . . . Sure I am that this day, now we are masters of our fate, that the task which has been set us is not above our strength, that its pangs and toils are not beyond our endurance. As long as we have faith in our cause and an unconquerable willpower, salvation will not be denied us.”

Once again ambushed but not belied, we heirs of Churchill and Winston Churchill have again allied and formed a coalition of the willing to defeat the common enemies of our countries and our civilization, while much of the world stands mute or worse and seems blissfully ambivalent to the arrival of the terrorists upon their doorsteps. But we cannot evade this crusade. We cannot wish the world away. Today’s war on terror will yield either a bitter death or a better day.

And thusly does our generation of Americans face our fiercest foe and our children. This we will not do to our children. This we will not do to our civilization. History is a harsh mistress, beautifully chaste in her truth, but brutally cruel in her treatment of fools who fail to learn her lessons. So while many today may not recall Senator Burton Wheel-er’s name and many presently reprise his siren song of isolationism, for both, history will record and return an equally ignominious and indelible indictment. Or worse, for our contemporary isolationists.

After all, the isolationist Wheeler railed against democracy through diplomatic, economic, and military operations, often including the concomitant tactics of rogue regime change and reconstruction, in tiered theaters of operations. To do so throughout this unsought struggle, we must mobilize our Nation’s greatest resource: ourselves.

As Americans, we are honor bound to defend freedom for ourselves and all the world. And no one more ably embodied and expressed this grim acceptance of our sacred duty than our valiant wartime Commander in Chief, whom I quote: “There comes a time when you and I must see the cold, inexorable necessity of saying to these inhuman, unpruned seekers of world conquest, and give not their world domina-

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and support the
Road Map for Democracy in Burma Conference, which was held in Fort Wayne, Indiana, my hometown, on October 11 through 12, 2003. I had the distinct pleasure to address the conference and speak to some of the attentive audience. I pledged to them to insert this Road Map for Democracy in Burma into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and let me explain why.

My colleagues are well aware of the military dictatorship currently ruling in Burma. In July of this year, the House passed the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, which imposes sanctions on Burma until the military gives up power and a new democratic Burma is established.

While the Burmese appreciate the support of the United States, they are working among themselves to organize a future democratic Burma. The conference in Fort Wayne brought together members of the democratically elected Burmese government-in-exile and ethnic groups.

As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) recently explained in the last few minutes, the problems that we face in Iraq, Burma, in fact, is trying to address these in advance. They had a democratic government overthrown by force. They are not trying to pull the different factions together to be prepared, when this junta collapses, with a balanced democratic government.

Burma has long been plagued with ethnic tensions. The delicate balance among ethnic groups was shattered early in Burma's independence. Since the military takeover in the 1960s, many ethnic groups have been persecuted and harassed. In such an atmosphere, suspicion and mistrust have been the norm.

The conference was particularly significant, because so many of the Burmese ethnic groups were brought together to discuss Burma's future. The fact that the groups were able to meet in one room together is a noteworthy accomplishment. Compare this to the problems we had in Iraq. In my hometown we have 125 Iraqis who fled. There are Sunni, Shia, and Kurds. Prior to the recent conflict in Iraq, when I wanted to meet with the different groups, they would not meet together. That was a pretty good forebunner of what was going to happen when we got into Iraq.

In fact, we have nearly 2,000 Burmese in Fort Wayne. When we tried to meet there, initially some of the ethnic divisions were a problem even in meeting with their United States Congressman from that district.

This conference, unlike what we are seeing in many places of the world, we see the Burmese and the different ethnic groups trying to pull together to address what kind of government in Burma will be when democracy is restored. Cooperation among the groups at this conference is an important step towards a future democratic Burma.

The road to democracy is not easy for any country, and Burma is no exception. I believe that the resolution unanimously passed by the conference is a positive step in the right direction. Democracy in Burma will only be achieved if all Burmese work together.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert in the Record following my remarks, "The Full Road Map to Democracy," and I will just summarize a couple points.

In this Road Map for Democracy, they established a long-term goal. For example, number one is, "To fully realize that goal, the committee in charge of establishing a sharing, fund-raising body has been formed." Because, as they state right at the beginning, "The conference firmly believes that the objective of the struggle to abolish dictatorship and promote democracy in our country."

They have also, in conclusion, how to build a country, so we do not see repeats of our struggles in Iraq, which are very important, which we must back up. We do not really have much option.

But, at the same time, to the degree we can do this in advance of a people getting their freedom back, this is what we need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

[From the News Sentinel, Oct. 13, 2003]

Participants Worked Out Several Key Resolutions

(By Kevin Kilbane)

They agreed any transition to democracy in Burma would begin with leader Aung San Suu Kyi, whom the ruling military dictatorship has kept under house arrest for more than a decade.

Members of the various ethnic groups making up the Burmese refugee community agreed they all must be given political equality and the right of self-determination.

Most importantly, however, Burmese attending the two-day Road Map for Democracy in Burma conference this weekend in Fort Wayne agreed to work together.

"All arguments are settled," said U Peter Limbin of Bluffton, who was elected to the Birmese parliament. Other pro-democracy officials elected then had to flee to escape government persecution.

About 300 Burmese gathered for the conference Saturday and Sunday at Neff Hall on the campus of Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne. Organizers held the event here because the 1,500 Burmese in Fort Wayne make up the largest Burmese community in the United States.

The conference drew representatives from Burmese pro-democracy groups around the world. People flew in from Australia, New Zealand, Japan and Thailand, said Zar Wint, 30, of Fort Wayne, who attended the conference.

"I feel like I am home again," Wint said as many different conversations swirled around him, all in Burmese.

Guests also included Sein Win, acting prime minister of the exiled democratic government.

Burmese pro-democracy groups have enjoyed support from the United States and European Union, Win said during a break Sunday. Trade sanctions and travel restrictions those nations have placed on the Burma junta have added pressure for change. But Burmese refugees must network more to increase the pressure on the regime to step down.

"We need more push," he said.

To develop such strategies, people attending the conference broke into six panels to
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Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolutions:

FORWARD ACTIONS PLANNED AT THE CONFERENCE

1. Myanmar democratic forces abroad are to stage demonstrations on December 10 (Human Rights Day) to display unity.

2. To urgently carry out organizational work in different regions.

3. To organize and encourage all the people of Myanmar and organizations to oppose the dictatorship in Burma and participate in the activities to liberate their country.

PRESS AGAINST MILITARY REGIME IN BURMA BY INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITIES & UNITED NATIONS

1. To step up economic sanctions against the military regime of Burma through the United Nations Security Council.

2. To seek stronger pressure from the international community to secure the release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and all political prisoners.

3. To work toward the implementation of resolutions passed by the International Labor Organization at its conference in Year 2000.

4. To work toward the European Union to use stronger pressure mechanisms, including economic sanctions.

5. To request the United Nations Secretary General to fully implement the Burma resolutions passed by successive sessions of the United Nations General Assembly.

For the Burmese democratic forces worldwide to urge international governments and members of Parliament concerned to exert pressure on the Burmese military regime.

6. To collect information and prepare reports to increase the effectiveness of the visa ban on SPDC leaders and their close relatives, the freezing of their assets, and the ban of transfer of funds imposed by the United States and the European Union.

7. To urge Burmese communities to stop paying tax to SPDC Embassies.

8. To raise the awareness of the people of the world about the true condition in Burma through educational and lecture tours.

9. To believe that the nuclear reactor project being carried out jointly by the SPDC and Russia directly threatens regional security.

10. To work for the reversal of the ruling by the United States Department of Justice to suspend lawsuits against UNOCAL.

11. To prevent the SPDC from selling off land owned by the Burmese people in foreign countries where Burmese Embassies are located.

12. To propose to the conference to form a Networking Committee so that Burmese democratic forces all over the world can coordinate their activities and work in unity.

THE INCREASING ECONOMIC DIVIDE AMONG AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2003, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the corporate media does not talk about it too much here in the Congress, but the United States of America is rapidly on its way to becoming three separate nations: An increasingly wealthy elite, a small number of people who have inherited wealth and inordinate power; a middle class, the vast majority of our people, which is shrinking, where the average person is working longer hours for lower wages; and at the bottom we discuss key topics and propose future action. Discussion topics included how to replace the ruling military dictatorship and how to build solidarity among Burma's ethnic groups: how to increase pressure on Burma's military rulers to relinquish control.

To follow Aung San Suu Kyi (pronounced Aun Sin Sue She) once military dictators leave power. The 1991 Nobel Peace Prize laureate largely has been kept under house arrest since the government cracked down in 1988 on pro-democracy movement.

To unify pro-democracy groups' power by working through the National Coalition Government of the Union of Burma, the exile government based in Washington, D.C.

To more actively support pro-democracy movements inside Burma, which the current rulers have renamed Myanmar.

To recognize the equality and right to self-determination of all Burmese ethnic groups. Members of the Mon, Karen, Shan and Chin ethnic groups exhibited unprecedented cooperation when planning the conference.

The resolutions how to replace the ruling military. Ethnically motivated. Generated the most emotional debate. All of the discussion took place in Burmese peppered with occasional English words or phrases. "U.S. онд "China lovely," for example—when no Burmese equivalent existed.

The room where the presentation took place, Neff Hall's auditorium, resembled an international hearing room. The red, gold and white flag of the Democratic Burmese Students Association and letters spelling out Kyi hung on the sides and front of the stage. Men in blue jeans, suits and ties or traditional skirtlike longis worn on the hands of the right and occasional, women in business or traditional attire—would come to the conference to support the conference. The conference closed with an appearance by area U.S. Rep. Mark Souder, who pledged to get resolutions "in the hands of the right people" in Washington.
have a growing number of Americans who are living in abject poverty, barely keeping their heads above water.

Mr. Speaker, there has always been a wealthy elite in this country, that is not new, and there has always been a gap between the rich and the rest, and the disparities in wealth in income that currently exist in this country have not been seen since the 1920s.

In other words, instead of becoming a more egalitarian country, with a stronger middle-class, we are becoming in a Nation which the rich have more wealth and power, the middle-class is shrinking, and poverty is growing.

Mr. Speaker, today the wealthiest 1 percent own more wealth than the bottom 95 percent. One percent own more wealth than the bottom 95 percent. The CEOs of large corporations today earn more than 500 times what their employees are making. While workers are being squeezed, being forced to pay more for health insurance, while their pensions are being cut back, the CEOs of large corporations make out like bandits.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation's 13,000 wealthiest families, which constitute one percent of one percent of the population, receive almost as much income as the bottom 20 million families in the United States. One-hundredth of one percent, more income than the bottom 20 million families. That, to my mind, is not what America is supposed to be.

New data from the Congressional Budget Office shows that the gap between the rich and the poor in terms of income more than doubled from 1979 to 2000. In other words, we are moving in exactly the wrong direction. The gap is such that the wealthiest 1 percent had more money to spend after taxes than the bottom 40 percent. The richest 2.8 million Americans had $950 billion after taxes, or 15.5 percent of the economy's pie, while the poorest 110 million had less, 14.4 percent of all after-tax income. Once again, that is not what America is supposed to be. While the rich get richer and receive huge tax breaks from the White House, the middle-class is struggling desperately, in my State of Vermont and all over this country.

It is increasingly common to see people work at not one job, but two jobs, and occasionally three jobs. When I was growing up, the expectation for the middle-class was that one worker in a family could work 40 hours a week and earn enough income to pay the bills. Well, in the State of Vermont, and all over this country, it is becoming increasingly uncommon when that happens. Much more often than not, wives are forced to work alongside husbands in order to bring in the necessary income, and kids, in many instances, do not get the care that they need.

Unemployment in our country is now at a 10-year high. We are over 6 percent, and there are now over 9 million people who are unemployed. But in truth the real number is higher than that, because there are a lot of people who are working part-time because they cannot find full-time jobs, and there are a lot of people who are not part of the statistics because they have given up and are not actively seeking employment.

Mr. Speaker, manufacting in this country is currently in a state of collapse. Let us be honest about it. In the last 3 years, we have lost 2.7 million manufacturing jobs, which comprise 16 percent of the total. That is right. You heard that right. In the last 3 years, we have lost 16 percent of our manufacturing jobs. At 14.7 million, we are at the lowest number of factory jobs since 1953.

In my own State of Vermont, my small State of Vermont, we have lost some 8,700 manufacturing jobs between January 2001 and August 2003, and the pity of that is that in Vermont, manufacturing jobs pay workers middle-class wages. In Vermont, on average, a worker working in manufacturing makes over $42,000 a year. That is a decent wage. We are losing those jobs, and the new jobs that we are creating are paying only a fraction of what manufacturing jobs are paying, and almost always provide much, much poorer benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in 2002 the United States had a $435 billion trade deficit, a $435 billion trade deficit. This year, the trade deficit with China alone, one country, China, is expected to be $220 billion, and that number is projected to increase in future years. It has gone up and up and up. The National Association of Manufacturers estimates that if present trends continue, our trade deficit with China will grow to $300 billion in 5 years.

But our disastrous trade policy is not only costing us millions of decent paying jobs; it is squeezing wages. It is squeezing wages. Because many employers are saying if you do not take the cuts in health care, if you do not take the cuts in wages, we are going to move to China, we are going to move to Mexico.

One of the areas where people are being most severely hurt is among young workers without a college education. For entry-level workers, without a college level education, the real wages that they have received, that they are now receiving, have dropped by over 20 percent in the last 25 years. And the answer and the reason for that is quite obvious. 25 years ago, 30 years ago if somebody did not go to college, as most people did not, what they would be able to do is go out and get a job in manufacturing. And millions and millions of workers did that. And with those wages and those benefits, they were able to lead a middle-class existence and raise their kids with a decent standard of living. But the reality now is that the new jobs that are being created, the jobs at McDonald's and the jobs in Wal-Mart are not paying people a living wage.

What is happening to our economy today is best illustrated by the fact that some 20 years ago our largest employer was General Motors. And workers in General Motors were earning $42,000 a year. We have still not seen jobs that pay that kind of wage today, a living wage. Today, Mr. Speaker, our largest private employer is Wal-Mart. And that is what has happened to the American economy. We have gone from a General Motors economy where workers earned decent wages and decent benefits to a Wal-Mart economy where people earn low wages and poor benefits. Today Wal-Mart employees earn $8.23 per hour or $13,661 annually. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a wage in income which is below the poverty level.

And that is what the transformation of the American economy is about, an
economy where workers used to work, produced real products, made middle-class wages, had good benefits, to a Wal-Mart economy where our largest employer now pays workers poverty wages, minimal benefits, huge turnover.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, in hindsight it did not take a genius to predict that unfettered free trade with China would be a disaster, which is why I and many other Members in the House have opposed it from the beginning. With calculated, hardworking Chinese workers available at 40 or 50 cents an hour, and with corporations having the capability of bringing their Chinese-made products back into this country tariff-free, why would American multinational corporations not shut down their plants in this country and move to China? It did not take a genius, frankly, to think that that would happen.

Should anyone be surprised that Motorola eliminated 42,900 American jobs in 2001 and invested $3.4 billion in China or that IBM has signed deals to train 100,000 software specialists in China over 3 years? Who is shocked that General Electric has thrown tens of thousands of American workers out on the streets while investing $1.5 billion in China? Honeywell is a sophisticated corporation. Should anybody be really surprised that they have built 13 medium-priced furniture from China into Vermont, as they import more me-
dium-priced furniture from China over 3 years? Who is shocked that they have built 13 million in China. Honeywell is a sophisticated corporation. Should anybody be really surprised that they have built 13 factories in China or that Ethan Allen furniture jobs at the mills and 17 U.S. manufacturing plants, including some in my State of Vermont, as they import more me-
dium-priced furniture from China into the United States? Nobody should be surprised that anybody is surprised at these developments.

China, for American multinational corporations, is a great place to do business, if by “doing business” we mean making products for export to the United States that companies previously made here. Not only are wages extremely low in China, but if workers attempt to stand up for their rights in China and form unions, those workers go to jail. Now, what a great place to do business when where the workers try to organize, they go to jail. What more could a company ask for?

In China today environmental regulations are almost nonexistent. And while China becomes one of the most polluted countries on Earth, companies that pollute, they do not pay a cent to “waste money on environmental safeguards.” In our country we said many years ago to companies you just cannot willy-nilly throw your garbage into our lakes and into our streams. You cannot pollute the air any way you want. You have got to have some environmental safeguards. Those safeguards are expensive. But in China, no problem, you can do whatever you want. Great place to do business.

Mr. Speaker, during the years advocates of unfettered free trade have tried to gloss over the bad news about the decline in factory employment by promising that a new economy was in
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the making. A new economy was in the making, one in which Americans would be working at good wages in the high-tech field. We have all heard it. Hey, you do not have to worry about them factory jobs anymore. We are the winners. We all will have new clean, high-tech computer jobs. All of our young people will go out there, make $50,000, $60,000, $70,000 a year. That is the future for the United States. That is what they told us. Unfortunately, estimates for unfettered free trade are wrong again. We now know that blue collar manufac-
turing jobs are not the only casualty of unfettered free trade. Estimates are that somewhere between the blue collar jobs have been lost in this coun-
try in the last 2 years, and that many of them have ended up in India. If any of the listeners sometimes want to argue with the phone company that your phone bill was wrong, you got on the phone and you are calling up and arguing, well you may end up going not to Chicago or New York or Los Ange-
les, you may be talking to somebody in India. And that is happening more and more.

According to Forest Research, a major consultant on this issue, they say, and I quote, “Over the next 15 years 3.3 million U.S. service industry jobs and $36 billion in wages will move offshore. The information technology industry will lead the initial overseas exodus.” That is from Forest Research. According to Booz Allen Hamilton, companies can lower their costs by as much as 80 to 90 percent by shifting tasks such as computer programming, ac-
counting, and procurement to China.

Among many other companies mov-
ing high-tech jobs abroad is Microsoft, which is spending $750 million over the next 3 years on research and develop-
ment and outsourcing in China. Just the other day, just last week, Intel Corporation Chairman Andy Grove warned that the U.S. could lose the bulk of its information jobs to overseas competitors in the next decade, largely to India and China.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, not only has unfettered free trade cost us our textile industry, cost us our shoe indus-
try, our steel industry, our tool and die industry, our electronic industry, much of our furniture industry, as well as many, many other industries, it is now going to cost us, unless we change it, millions of high-tech jobs as well.

Now, what a great place it is to be doing business. The United States needs to have a strong and positive relationship with China. I am not anti-Chinese. I am an inter-
nationalist. China is the largest coun-
try on Earth, and this country must have a positive relationship with China; and there are a number of ways that we can do that. But doing that, having a positive relationship with China, does not mean allowing China to steal American jobs.

We want our exports to be products manufactured by American workers, not the jobs that American workers have. If we continue to force American workers to, quote unquote, compete against desperate people from China and other developing countries, both in manufacturing and technology, the United States will be the loser.

By definition a sensible and fair trade agreement works well for both parties, not just for one. Trade is a good thing. Trade is a good thing when both countries benefit. Why are the New York Yankees do not engage in free trade by exchanging their top ball player for a third string minor leaguer.

The United States is the most lucra-
tive market in the world. We need to leverage the value of that market to achieve trade agreements that result in fairness for the American worker. And we can do that. Trade is a good thing. But our current trade policies are not working for American workers.

When we talk to trade agreements with China, Mr. Speaker, we should also under-
derstand that today 60 percent, 60 per-
cent of Dell Computer parts are made in China. Boeing recently said that it expected to purchase $1 billion worth of aviation parts annually in China by 2009 and $1.3 billion by 2010, up from $500 million this year.

North Carolina’s Pillowcase Corpora-
tion filed for bankruptcy on July 20,
2003, laying off 6,450 of its 7,650 workers. The company plans to sell its textile-pro-
ducing machinery to several nations, including China. Over the past year, Intel has added 1,000 software engineers in China and India. And on and on it goes. The bottom line is that American workers cannot and must not be forced to compete against workers in China who are paid extremely low wages.

Two-thirds of China’s 1.3 billion citi-
zens live on less than a dollar a day. The average factory wage in China is 40 cents an hour. Half of fac-
tory workers are paid. The average an-
ual salary for an information tech-
ology programmer in the U.S. is $75,000; in China it is $8,952.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons and more, I have introduced H.R. 3228, which would repeal permanent normal trade relations with China. My legisla-
tion, once again, would repeal perma-
nent normal trade relations with China. It will acknowledge that our current trade policies with that coun-
try are a failure, and we have got to begin negotiating trade policies not only with China but with other coun-
tries that work well for the American worker and the American middle class.

I am happy to say that in just over 3 weeks, this tripartisan legislation has garnered 52 cosponsors, including 14 Republicans. So we are moving forward in that area, Mr. Speaker, in a tripartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the decline of the middle class, we are talking about high unemployment; we are talking about the conversion of the United States from a manufacturing
We are also talking about the fact that in the United States, workers today are now working the longest hours of the workers in any major country on earth. There should be little wonder why the average American family is so stressed out. And one of the reasons that they are so stressed out is that people are working incredibly long hours in order to make enough money to pay the bills. Today, the average American employee works by far the longest hours of any worker in the industrialized world, and the situation is getting worse.

According to statistics from the International Labor Organization, the average American last year worked 1,978 hours, up from 1,942 hours in 1990. That is an increase of almost one week of work. Since 1990, the average American is now working an additional week a year. We are now, as Americans, putting more hours into our work than at any time since the 1920s. I just think about that. Huge increases in productivity and an explosion of technology, logically, would lead one to believe that people would be working fewer hours for higher wages, but the converse is true. People are working longer hours for lower wages.

Americans are now putting in more hours at our work than at any time since the 1920s. 65 years after the formal establishment of the 40-hour workweek under the Fair Labor Standards Act, almost 40 percent of Americans now work more than 50 hours a week; and we should do a lot of thinking about that. An explosion of productivity and technology, people working longer and longer hours; and in almost every instance in the middle class, two bread winners are needed to pay the bills. Workers in the private sector have declined since 1973. The rich get richer. The middle class shrinks and poverty increases.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked a moment about what is going on with the middle class. I have talked a little bit about the conversion from a manufacturing society, a General Motors society, to a service industry economy, a Wal-Mart economy but let us look for a moment at the people who are not even in the middle class; who have not made it into the middle class. People who are at the lower end of the socioeconomic ladder in our country, the 34.8 million people in America who live in poverty. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, while the rich get richer, 13.3 million more Americans became poor and entered poverty, the group of poor people in America.

In the midst of those people, Mr. Speaker, we have got to ask about the 11 million Americans who are trying to survive on the pathetic minimum wage of $5.15 an hour which exists here, and I think it is morally repugnant that this Congress voted to provide huge tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, but somehow the President of the United States and the Republican leadership, not for one moment have thought about raising the minimum wage, which today is at a pathetic $5.15 cents an hour.

How do people earning those wages survive? And I will tell you how some of them do it. After working 40 hours a week, they live in their automobiles because they cannot afford housing units in order to survive. They just cannot afford the housing because their wages cannot pay the rent. And what, Mr. Speaker, about the 43.6 million Americans who lack any health insurance? That is 15.2 percent of our population. What about the 3.5 million people who will experience homelessness in this year, 1.3 million of them children? What about our elderly citizens who cannot afford the outrageously high cost of prescription drugs? And the many of them who cut their pills in half, in order to fill the prescriptions that their doctors write for them? What about those people? What about the veterans who have put their lives on the line defending this country and then try to get into a VA hospital and find out that they are on a waiting list?

Mr. Speaker, one of the clear crises facing people by the American middle class is the crisis in health care and the cost of prescription drugs. In the last several years, we have seen huge increases in health insurance and with the increase of unemployment, we have seen more and more working people lose their health insurance. In terms of losing health insurance, people then open to bankruptcy, because if they end up with an accident or a serious illness, they go to the hospital, but they are unable to pay those bills. And the highest amount of people who are bankrupt are the people who cannot pay the health expenses that have been generated as a result of an accident or illness.

Mr. Speaker, our health care system today is in a state of collapse. More and more people are uninsured and more and more people are underinsured. That is, people have higher and higher copayments, higher and higher deductibles, higher and higher premiums. To my mind, the only solution, the only serious solution to our health care crisis is for this country to do what other major industrialized nation on earth has done and that is to move toward a national health care system which guarantees health care to every man, woman and child.

A hundred years ago, the United States of America said that every young person, regardless of income, could get a quality public education. Well, the rest of the world has said that every person in this country, regardless of income, is entitled to health care. But we lag behind what countries throughout Europe, Scandinavia and Canada are doing. To my mind, health care is a right, not a privilege. It is wrong that more and more Americans delay and hesitate going to the doctors because they do not have health insurance or because they cannot pay the deductible or the copayment.

When people in America get sick, they have a right to go to the doctor, to go to the hospital and get the health care that they need. The irony with regard to our collapsing health care system is that it is an extremely costly and wasteful system. The fact of the matter is that we spend more than twice as much per capita on health care as any other nation, and yet we end up with 43 million people with no insurance and many more who are underinsured. For the sake of our children, for the sake of our parents, for the sake of the middle class of this country, we have got to adopt a national health care system which finally says with no ifs, and, or buts about it, that every American will receive the care that they need, as a right of citizenship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, given the very, very serious problems facing the American people and especially our middle class, it is appropriate to ask what President Bush and his administration have done to begin addressing some of these problems. What are their priorities? What are they doing to reach out to the middle class and say that they face problems, we are going to help the middle class; we are going to lower poverty; we are going to improve health care? What are they doing in that direction?

Well, let me tell you a little bit about what they have done. They have given hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks to the very richest people in our country while cutting back on the basic needs of working families. Now, at a time when the middle class is shrinking, when poverty is increasing, when the number of people without health insurance is going up, when unemployment is far too high, who are the people that the Bush administration are reaching out to? Well, needless to say, it is their campaign contributors and the very wealthiest people in this country who have received hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks.

Through legislative and administration efforts, the Bush administration is working to weaken workers to form unions and to protect their jobs and incomes. When a worker is a member of a union, by and large that worker will earn 30 percent more than a worker doing a similar job who is nonunion. That is why many workers want to join unions expand that is getting harder and harder for workers to do that because the law very clearly sides with the employer and the large corporation and not with the workers.

The Bush administration if they can beat it, is now attacking overtime for American workers and trying to undo laws that have been on the books for decades which say that if you
worked over 40 hours a week, you will get time and a half. And I am proud that a number of Republicans join many of us on this floor of the House to say that when the middle class is shrinking, when real wages are declining, and when working people are living on the overtime pay that workers need.

Now, when we talk about the achievements of the Bush administration, and we understand that our deficit is now at an all-time high, that our national debt is going higher, that in the midst of all of this, our conservative friends year after year told us how terrible deficits were and what kind of terrible obligations we were leaving to our kids and our grandchildren, well, these are the folks that are driving up the deficit, and they are driving up the national debt. Now, why are they doing that? Why are conservatives doing that?

Well, I think there are two reasons. Number one, obviously, the tax breaks for the rich are not hard to understand. Here in Washington, D.C., there are fund-raising dinners in which individuals have contributed $25,000 a plate. Large corporations and their executives make huge contributions and that is payback time. Nothing new. The rich make contributions. They get paid back in tax breaks. They get paid back in corporate welfare. They get paid back with their trade policy which makes it easier for them to throw American workers out on the street and move out to China. That we can understand. That is obscene, but easily understood.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to you that there is another even more cynical reason for driving up this deficit and driving up the national debt. And I believe that that reason is that as the debt and the deficit become higher and higher, this President, or any other President, may be forced to encourage the American people and more and more Americans to worry about what we see, hear, and read; and one of the manifestations of that decision, if it is allowed to stand, is there will be cities in America where one company will own the largest television station, will own the largest radio station, will own many of the radio stations, and will own the local cable TV system.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what America is supposed to be, and I am happy to take my colleagues, the American people, with all of this country, in a grassroots fashion, millions of Americans have written and communicated to the FCC, some of them conservatives, the National Rifle Association, some right-wing organizations, some left-wing organizations, some in the middle, different points of view philosophically on almost every issue, but they have come together to say that in America we need to have a diverse ownership of media and different points of view to be heard.

The Senate, listening to the demands of the American people, had the courage in a bipartisan way, Senator BYRON DORGAN, Senator TRET LOTT helping to lead the effort, had the courage to pass a resolution of disapproval with regard to what the FCC did. In other words, they said we want to junk it. That bill is now here in the House of Representatives; and working with some of my colleagues in a bipartisan way, we have now gathered 190 signatures on a letter to the Speaker of the House, because the bill is now on the Speaker's desk, and we have written the Speaker, the American people have the debate and a vote about whether or not we want more media consolidation. I sincerely hope that the Speaker will allow that debate because if that debate takes place, I believe that the American people will win.

Mr. Speaker, on another area that is of enormous importance to the American people and more and more Americans, the Bush administration is moving in precisely the wrong direction in terms of media consolidation. In my view, one of the crises that we face in our country today is fewer and fewer large media conglomerates own and control what we see, what we hear, and what we read. I know the average person says, well, man, I have got 100 channels on my cable. Check out who owns those 100 channels. Check out who owns NBC, Fox, and CBS, which is Viacom. They own ABC, which is Disney; they own Fox, Television, which is Rupert Murdoch, an extreme right-wing billionaire.

What we are seeing in terms of media is fewer and fewer large corporations controlling the flow of information in America. Clear Channel Radio now owns 1,200 radio stations all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, what our freedom is about is debating different points of view. No one has all the right answers, but we cannot flourish as a democracy unless we hear different points of view; and the Bush administration is working hand-in-glove with the pharmaceutical industry, the most powerful lobby here on Capitol Hill. While Americans pay by far the highest prices in the world for their prescription drugs, the pharmaceutical industry year after year is the most profitable industry in this country.

In order to maintain their status as the most profitable industry, they have hired over 600, 600 paid lobbyists right here in Washington. We are going to descend on the Congress, on the House and the Senate, to make sure that we do not pass any legislation which will lower the cost of prescription drugs. Nonetheless, despite all of the hundreds of millions of dollars they have spent on all of their lobbying efforts, all of their campaign contributions, I am happy to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that 6 weeks ago, longer than that, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, had the courage to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and pass legislation that would allow our pharmacists, prescription drug distributors, and individuals to buy FDA-approved medicine in 26 countries including Canada; and if we can get that bill here, the Senate, we will be able to lower prescription drug costs in this country by between 30 to 50 percent. Unfortunately, on this issue, we are fighting not only the pharmaceutical industry but the Bush administration and the Bush campaign, which has received substantial support from the drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, on another area that is of enormous importance to the American people and more and more Americans, the Bush administration is moving in precisely the wrong direction in terms of media consolidation. In my view, one of the crises that we face in our country today is fewer and fewer large media conglomerates own and control what we see, what we hear, and what we read. I know the average person says, well, man, I have got 100 channels on my cable. Check out who owns those 100 channels. Check out who owns NBC, Fox, and CBS, which is Viacom. They own ABC, which is Disney; they own Fox, Television, which is Rupert Murdoch, an extreme right-wing billionaire.

What we are seeing in terms of media is fewer and fewer large corporations controlling the flow of information in America. Clear Channel Radio now owns 1,200 radio stations all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, what our freedom is about is debating different points of view. No one has all the right answers, but we cannot flourish as a democracy unless we hear different points of view; and the Bush administration is working hand-in-glove with the pharmaceutical industry, the most powerful lobby here on Capitol Hill. While Americans pay by far the highest prices in the world for their prescription drugs, the pharmaceutical industry year after year is the most profitable industry in this country.

In order to maintain their status as the most profitable industry, they have hired over 600, 600 paid lobbyists right here in Washington. We are going to descend on the Congress, on the House and the Senate, to make sure that we do not pass any legislation which will lower the cost of prescription drugs. Nonetheless, despite all of the hundreds of millions of dollars they have spent on all of their lobbying efforts, all of their campaign contributions, I am happy to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that 6 weeks ago, longer than that, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, had the courage to stand up to the pharmaceutical industry and pass legislation that would allow our pharmacists, prescription drug distributors, and individuals to buy FDA-approved medicine in 26 countries including Canada; and if we can get that bill here, the Senate, we will be able to lower prescription drug costs in this country by between 30 to 50 percent. Unfortunately, on this issue, we are fighting not only the pharmaceutical industry but the Bush administration and the Bush campaign, which has received substantial support from the drug companies.

Mr. Speaker, on another area that is of enormous importance to the American people and more and more Americans, the Bush administration is moving in precisely the wrong direction in terms of media consolidation. In my view, one of the crises that we face in our country today is fewer and fewer large media conglomerates own and control what we see, what we hear, and what we read. I know the average person says, well, man, I have got 100 channels on my cable. Check out who owns those 100 channels. Check out who owns NBC, Fox, and CBS, which is Viacom. They own ABC, which is Disney; they own Fox, Television, which is Rupert Murdoch, an extreme right-wing billionaire.
Mr. Speaker, when we talk about America, we often pride ourselves upon being a free country, a free country; and it is easier to stand in front of the American flag and give great speeches about freedom than it is to really fight for freedom. One of the most important elements of freedom is to understand, among other things, that not everything, not nothing that somebody says or does is something that we agree with, but what freedom is about is tolerating and respecting other points of view, of understanding that people have the right to read whatever they want to read, have the right to an attorney when they need an attorney.

I was one of the relatively few people in the House who voted 6 weeks after the horror of 911 against the USA PATRIOT Act, and I voted against the USA PATRIOT Act not because I am not concerned about terrorism. I happen to believe that terrorism is a very serious issue and the United States Government must do everything that it can to protect the American people and fight terrorism, but I voted against the USA PATRIOT Act because I believe we can fight terrorism without undermining basic constitutional rights, which is what the USA PATRIOT Act is doing.

Again, on this issue, we have seen some very interesting nonideological coming-together. We have seen some really very conservative people who are honest conservatives who say because they do not believe in Big Government they do not want the United States Government monitoring the reading habits of the American people in their libraries or their bookstores. Unfortunately, again, on this issue, the Bush administration and Attorney General John Ashcroft are on the wrong side. They are, in many respects, working to undermine the basic constitutional rights that are given, that have made this country great.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by stating that it is high time that the Congress of the United States begin to focus on the needs of the middle class, the vast majority of our people, the middle class of which is shrinking, the middle class in which the average person is working longer hours and for lower wages. America will grow when the middle class grows; and to do that, we need some fundamental changes in our policies.

We need a national health care system which guarantees health care to all Americans. We need to raise the minimum wage to a living wage. We need to fundamentally change our trade policies so that we do not continue to see the collapse of manufacturing. We need to make sure that every American, regardless of income, has a right to go to college. We need to rescind the tax breaks that have been given to the wealthiest people, the largest corporations and create a tax structure which works for the middle class and not just for the wealthy and the powerful.

There is a lot of work that must be done, and I look forward to participating in that effort.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight to set the record straight because last night the Food and Drug Administration Commissioner, Mr. Mark B. McClellan, made some statements in a speech before the National Press Club that I think need to be corrected.

One of the big problems that we face as a Nation is that pharmaceutical products and the cost of them is totally out of line with the rest of the world. For instance, and I have used this example on this floor of the House, a woman who has breast cancer, a doctor will tell her the drug of choice is Tamoxifen, and Tamoxifen in Canada costs about one-sixth or one-seventh of what it does here in the United States. There is a safety issue about the re-importation of these pharmaceutical products. I asked him if he could find one example, not one, but 40 percent of our orange juice comes from around the world, and that is not checked, maybe 1 percent of it is, and raspberries are imported from Guatemala. We had 1,024 people either get sick or die from those that we know of, and yet we do not mention those, and yet they talk about the safety of pharmaceutical products when we have not had one case of people being harmed from the re-importation of pharmaceutical products from Canada.

Yet, last night, Mr. McClellan said in his speech, “But at the same time, these Members,” talking about Members of Congress, “at the same time, the Members of Congress are clear-ly out of touch with the realities of keeping our drug supply safe, and the clear and present dangers to America’s drug supply that their bills would create.”

He is talking about a bill that we passed overwhelmingly here in the House when they, the Members of Congress, the Members of Congress, the Members of Congress, the Members of Congress sent pharmaceuticals to the United States citizens to buy pharmaceuticals at lower cost from other parts of the world because they are costing so much here in the United States.

Now, the Food and Drug Administration in my opinion, is marching in lockstep with the pharmaceutical industry, which is making huge profits here, while in other parts of the world they are making very small profits. The big profits and the big costs are to the American consumer, while the rest of the world does not bear those expenses. I just think that is dead wrong.

The safety issue is a bogus issue. And there is another example that I would like to cite that shows that it is not a safety issue. The FDA has approved 949 different sites where they produce FDA approved drugs in the world. That is 949, and in places like Haiti and India and China and elsewhere. There are 949 sites, they are in those sites, they send them out in large containers. Now, if there is a safety issue, it would be at those sites, because they are sending these drugs out in large containers where there could be tamper, but when they are sent in in very small amounts from Canada or Germany to United States citizens, they are usually in containers that are tamper proof, or could be made tamper proof so that the people would have absolutely no safety issue to be concerned about.

So I am very disappointed that the Food and Drug Administration continues to say to the American people and is trying to show that it is tough and others that they should not buy their pharmaceuticals from Canada or Germany or elsewhere, because the safety issue simply has not manifested itself. As a result, many Americans, many Americans are buying prescription drugs, are going to the pharmacist and saying, How much is it? And the pharmacist says, Well, it costs this much; and they say, Well, maybe I will come back tomorrow, or they buy half a prescription and split the pills, while at the same time they get drugs to Canada and buy the same prescription product at one-sixth or one-seventh what it costs here in the United States.
The Food and Drug Administration ought to be doing everything they can to make sure Americans get the best product, the best prescription drug at the best price in the world marketplace. World class drugs at world class prices. They should not be trying to say there is a safety issue when none exists.

THE CASE FOR LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KLINE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to come before the House tonight in a continuous series that this Member of Congress had the privilege of beginning scarcely a month ago, but a series of speeches that I hope will periodically and intermittently be a part of the fabric of my congressional career for howsoever long the Lord permits me to serve here.

I simply call it, Mr. Speaker, the case for life, and it is my ambition from time to time to come onto this blue and gold carpet of this Capitol and speak to my colleagues, and anyone else who may be listening, on the moral and intellectual and historical arguments for the sanctity of human life; and to perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in some small way enliven the moral sensibility of a Nation and be a part of an ongoing debate in America on this topic.

Mr. Speaker, this is a debate that continues at this very hour in the other body of this Congress. At this very moment, I am pleased to say, as a pro-life Member of Congress, that the United States Senate is at this very moment passing a conference report on the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. That legislation, as of today, will have three times passed the Congress since 1995 and will be delivered for the first time to the willing desk of President George W. Bush, where, unlike the veto stamp of President Clinton that met the ban of partial-birth abortion not once but twice, President George W. Bush, upon returning from his tour of the Asia-Pacific Rim, will no doubt, in an emotional ceremony, put his pen to this legislation and end a practice that has no place in civilized society.

So it is especially poignant for me, just a few steps down the hallway from that Chamber, to rise tonight and continue my discussion of the case for life. And particularly tonight, Mr. Speaker, I feel prompted to speak about abortion and Alney en livened. You see, it has always been my belief, since first having my conscience enlivened on this issue, that there is not one victim of abortion, but there are two. There is undoubtedly the nascent human life that is ended only to be born in darkness, but there is the other life that that act pays a price that psychologists are talking about today, but many Americans simply choose to ignore.

There are also other voices that I want to reflect on tonight as well, chiefly from our own history. As we think about the great American women who led this Nation in increasing measures towards equal status for women in voting rights and in property and in education, in career, in marriage, in childbirth and in social rights, we should consider—and think about—the wisdom and understanding that Susan B. Anthony, Emma Goldman, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton come to mind.

I just came from a stroll in the rotunda, Mr. Speaker, where I grabbed a piece of paper and scribbled the names of a few of those heroic women that actually appear on a statute at the very center of our Capitol. In the rotunda, there is a statute that bears the likeness of the three great heroes of the suffrage movement. Two of them I would like to speak about tonight as we talk about great American women and abortion, but then also talking about what women of America today face in the struggle over the sanctity of human life.

One of the faces on that statute is Susan B. Anthony, a name that is almost like mom and apple pie for most Americans. Susan B. Anthony was born February 15, 1820 in Adams, Massachusetts. She was born and brought up in a Quaker family that had long activist traditions. Early in life, she developed a deep sense, historians tell us, of justice and what could only be described as moral zeal.

After teaching for 15 years, Susan B. Anthony became active in the temperance movement. Because she was a woman, she was not allowed to speak at rallies, and this experience, as well as her acquaintance with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, led her to help form what became the Women’s Movement in 1852. Soon afterwards, she would dedicate her entire life to winning women not only the right to vote, Mr. Speaker, but Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton were about winning women a seat at the civic table; the opportunity not to be viewed, as women were in some aspects of common law, as the property of their husbands, but rather to be seen as coequal heirs of everything that freedom offers.

Ignoring opposition and abuse, Susan B. Anthony traveled, lectured, and canvassed across the Nation for the vote. She also campaigned for the abolition of slavery, women’s rights to their own property and earnings, and even women’s labor organizations. In 1900, she achieved a major victory in convincing the University of Rochester to admit women for the first time in their storied history.

Susan B. Anthony, who had never married, and was remembered as an aggressive and compassionate person with a keen mind and the ability to inspire, she remained active in the movement that she began until her death in March of 1906.

And Susan B. Anthony was pro-life. Let me read, if I may, from her publication, “The Revolution,” on this topic, published July 8, 1859. Susan B. Anthony wrote: “No matter what the motive, love or ease or a desire to save from suffering the unborn innocent, the woman is awfully guilty who commits the deed.” Referring to abortion. Susan B. Anthony, in speaking on to abortion, will burden her conscience in life; it will burden her soul in death. But, oh,” she wrote, “oh thrice guilty is he who drove her to the desperation which impelled her to the crime.”

So wrote Susan B. Anthony, words that we will reflect on before I take my seat tonight. Brokenhearted words of the suffering of the unborn innocent and also of the suffering of the American woman who would burden her conscience, who would burden her soul in death, but of the guilt of the man who drove her to the desperation which impelled her to perform the abortion.

Susan B. Anthony, memorialized in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, a woman whose name is synonymous with the voting rights and the equal status that women of 21st century America enjoy, was pro-life and understood the moral consequences of the act on an American woman and the deplorable position of a man that would force the outcome.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton also appears on the monument in the rotunda. And she, like Susan B. Anthony, her friend and colleague and collaborer for women’s issues in America, was pro-life. Elizabeth Cady, the daughter of Daniel Cady, a lawyer and a politician, was born in Johnstown, New York, November 12, 1815. She studied law under her father, who became a New York Supreme Court judge, and during that period of time she became a very strong advocate for women’s rights.

In 1840, Elizabeth married the lawyer, Henry B. Stanton. The couple became active in the American antislavery movement, and later that year Stanton and Lucretia Mott traveled to London as delegates to the World Anti-Slavery Convention. Both women, history records, were furious like the British women at the convention, were refused the permission to speak at the meeting to denounce slavery.

Stanton later recalled, “we resolved to hold a convention as soon as we returned home and form a society to advocate the rights of women.” And so she did. But it was not until 1848 that Stanton and Lucretia Mott organized the Women’s Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, Stanton’s resolution, that it was that day that the women of this country to secure to themselves the sacred right to the elective franchise,” was passed, and this became the focus of the group’s campaign for years to come.

In 1866, Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucy Stone established the American Equal Rights Association. The following year, the association became active in Kansas where Negro suffrage and women’s suffrage were to be decided in a popular
vote, although both ideas were sadly rejected at the polls. Stanton was a historian, a scholar, and one of the founders of the American Woman Suffrage Association formed in the 1880s and from which the suffragette movement emerged. It ultimately resulted in the passage and adoption of the 19th amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America.

This great American woman, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, is by all definitions a heroine of women. Like Susan B. Anthony, her friend, who also appears on that extraordinary monument in the Rotunda, Elizabeth Cady Stanton was pro-life, and unapologetically so. Think about these two women who appear on a miniature version of Mount Rushmore right here in the Capitol. We have three women who essentially represent a life-size smaller version of Mount Rushmore for women's issues in America; and they were women committed to equal rights, to the right and they were women committed to the right to life.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton classified abortion as a form of infanticide. She wrote in a letter to Julia Ward Howe, which is recorded in Howe's diary at Harvard Library on January 16, 1873. Elizabeth Cady Stanton wrote, "When we consider that women are treated as property, it is degrading to women that we should treat our children as property to be disposed of as we see fit."

Elizabeth Cady Stanton in essence saw a connection, Mr. Speaker, between that vile reality that was part of American life that the woman herself was property and the belief that an unborn child within the woman was property as well. She saw them as equal evils, related together; and so they are. On 12 March, 1868, Elizabeth Cady Stanton wrote, "There must be a remedy even for such a crying evil as this, referred to as property. It cannot be found, at least where it begins, if not in the complete enfranchisement and elevation of women."

Elizabeth Cady Stanton looked at abortion that was a reality in America in 1868 and said the antidote to end this evil is to raise women up. She saw abortion as a natural consequence of the subordination of women in our society. It is an astounding historical fact and a dark irony, Mr. Speaker, when we see the extraordinary sacrifices and advancements of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the great American women that won women their equal status in our society, that that same momentum that was used in 1973 to justify the practice of abortion, which those same heroic American women loathed to the depths of their being.

Think about those words, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, one of the three heroes of the movement in America that is memorialized in this Capitol building in stone. In the Rotunda where only Presidents, Alexander Hamilton, and the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., are memorialized, there are also these three women. Elizabeth Cady Stanton saw a relationship between reducing women to property and reducing the unborn children growing within them to property.

Let me say words again. She said, "There must be a remedy for even such a crying evil as this, but where shall it be found, at least where it begins, if not in the complete enfranchisement and elevation of women."

A powerful thought that the suffragette movement would look to future generations and say that the abortions that were taking place in the middle 19th century would some day go away, we would no longer treat unborn children as property if we could achieve the day when women were not viewed as property.

Alice Paul is credited as one of the leading figures responsible for the passage of the 19th amendment, which is the women's suffrage amendment. She was a leader in the fight to vote. In the Constitution of the United States of America, Alice Paul was raised as a Quaker, attended Swarthmore College and worked at the New York College Settlement while attending the New York School of Social Work. She left for England in 1906 to work in a settlement house movement there for 3 years. She was Chair of a major committee of the National American Woman Suffrage Association within a year, in her mid-twenties.

In England she had taken part in the women's suffragette movement, even participating in hunger strikes to make her point. She brought back this word, some would say, of militancy, I would say more generously of urgency, to the women's movement in America. It was that urgency that characterized the life of Alice Paul.

Her emphasis on a Federal constitutional amendment for suffrage was at the forefront in America and some within the women's movement; and after the 1920 victory for the Federal amendment, Alice Paul became involved in the struggle to pass an Equal Rights Amendment, which actually passed this Congress in the year 1970, was sent to the States, and it failed. Paul died in 1977 in New Jersey with the heated battle of the Equal Rights Amendment having brought her international acclaim.

Like Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton before her, Alice Paul was pro-life. Alice Paul said famously, and remember now, this is Alice Paul, born January 1885, died 1977, essentially the author of the Equal Rights Amendment, which actually passed this Congress in the year 1970, was sent to the States, and it failed. Paul died in 1977 in New Jersey with the heated battle of the Equal Rights Amendment having brought her international acclaim.

Let me say again, hoping that some other that abortion would be safe, legal and available, women would be able to make decisions about the right to have an abortion.

Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women, said Alice Paul, author of the Equal Rights Amendment, and I agree. It is an exploitation of women for physical and emotional reasons. Let me speak to those tonight as I conclude this portion of the case for life, abortion, and American women.

There are many who believe that abortion is safe in America. But truthfully, despite the use of local anesthesia, a full 97 percent of women that have abortions report experiencing pain during the procedure, which more than a third describe as intense, according to medical reports, or very severe. Compared to other pains, researchers have rated the pain from abortion as more painful than a bone fracture, about the same as a cancer pain, although not as painful as amputation, according to medical experts.

There are some, including former President Bush, who used to repeat the mantra that it was his goal that abortion would be safe, legal, and rare; but abortion is not safe for women, Mr. Speaker. Complications
are common. According to medical experts, bleeding, hemorrhaging, laceration of the cervix, menstrual disturbance, inflammation of reproductive organs, bowel and bladder perforation, and serious infection are commonplace in the aftermath of the most routine abortions in America. Even more harmful than the short-term pain, which women describe as severe, are the potential long-term physical complications that we never talk about in America.

And when I say "we," I mean those who support the right to an abortion and those of us in the pro-life movement. I will never forget President Clinton’s Surgeon General saying, so thoughtfully, that one particular denomination of Christianity needed to get over their love affair with the fetus." So said Surgeon General Jocelyn Elders. Despite the horrific aspects of her comment, the truth is that even we, in the pro-life movement, have not thought enough about the other victim of abortion as well, for there are, as I said at the opening of this speech, two victims. Two victims grieve the loss of unborn life, but we need to speak more boldly about the impact on American women, physical and emotional, that abortion extracts.

Among those long-term physical complications, I speak, for example, overzealous curettage, a medical procedure, can damage the lining of the uterus and lead to permanent infertility. Overall, women who have abortions face an increased risk of tubal pregnancy and more than double the risk of future sterility. Perhaps the most important are that all the risks of these sorts of complications, along with the risk of future miscarriage, increases with each subsequent abortion. I am not sure that it is any more comfortable to make their way into clinics know that, that with each abortion they risk infertility, sterility or when the time comes that they decide to say yes to life, that they may be greeted with the heartbeat of miscarriage in increasing measure. More controversially, according to the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, there is strong evidence that abortion increases the risk of breast cancer. A study by the Institute of more than 1,800 women in 1994, which in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, found that overall women having abortions increased their risk of getting breast cancer before the age of 45 by 50 percent. For women under 18 with no previous pregnancies, having an abortion after the eighth week increased the risk of breast cancer, according to this medical study, by 800 percent. Women with a family history of breast cancer fared even worse. All 12 women participating in this study who had a family history of breast cancer themselves contracted breast cancer before the age of 45. I say this as someone who has consistently supported research with the National Institutes of Health to confront breast cancer. I have had dear friends beset by this scourge and disease and I do not mean to speak in any way insensitively about it or in any way to associate the pain of one woman with the pain of the other, but rather simply to cite the research, that we can hear the truth echoing perhaps from this place tonight that according to the medical community and the Journal of the National Cancer Institute, the risk of breast cancer is rising to epidemic levels in America. Clinical research provides a growing body of scientific evidence that having an abortion can cause psychosomatic symptoms to some women. Psychologist Wanda Franz, Ph.D., in the March 1989 congressional hearings on the impact of abortion said, quote, women who report negative aftereffects from abortion know exactly what their problem is. They report horrible nightmares of children calling to them. When they are reminded of the abortion, Franz testified the women reexperience it with terrible psychological pain. They feel worthless and victimized because they failed at the most natural of human activities, the role of being a mother.

I think in my own heart of conversations with women of my generation who have become active in the pro-life movement but who have found in their faith the grace and the healing to move beyond that choice. And I think of a woman who said in my presence once, some 20 years after having an abortion, I did not dare tell anyone what I did not want to think how old that child would be. They do not tell you that in the lobby at the abortion clinic, Mr. Speaker, but they should. The exploding incidence of postabortion syndrome has even caused breast cancer with abortion, among those young women who are faced with an unwanted pregnancy and are faced with a choice between bringing that unborn baby to term or ending its life in the womb. I always look around the room knowing just statistically speaking that there may be one or two women here who are faced with an unwanted pregnancy and are faced with a choice between bringing that unborn baby to term or ending its life in the womb. I always look at those young women and I say, I want to make you a promise that that other side can never make. I say, if you are faced with an unwanted pregnancy and you make the decision, however difficult, with your family’s assistance or a crisis pregnancy center near you, to keep that baby and to term and end that you turn that baby over to another family for adoption, versus if you choose to end that life in the womb, if you choose life, I will promise you from

Now that clinicians have established that there is an identifiable pattern to PAS, postabortion syndrome, they face a new challenge. What is still unknown is how widespread psychological problems are among women who have had abortions. The LA Times did a survey in 1989 and found that 56 percent of women who had abortions felt guilty about it. And 26 percent, quote, mostly regretted the abortion, in a poll done by the LA Times. Clinicians’ current goal is to conduct extensive national research studies to obtain data on the size and scope of postabortion syndrome.

When one thinks, Mr. Speaker, of 1.5 million women undergoing abortions every year since 1973, it is almost overwhelming to think of the heartache that must grip the quiet moments of millions of women in our land. And because I am not standing in my home church, Mr. Speaker, I will not tonight explain to them how the soul is ran over under it, that there is grace and there is forgiveness and there is healing, and in a church near to them they can find it. It will always be my prayer as the Case for Life series goes forward in this series as what is the woman who has experienced this under the sound of my voice never in any way feel judged by this sinner, but that they would know that there is healing and there is grace in a God of mercy, and that they would know that we urgently need them to take a stand and to tell the truth to the next generation of women about the cost of an abortion, not just the ending of an innocent human life and every potential that it would ever have but, Mr. Speaker, about the breaking of a heart.

Oftentimes, as I stand before groups of young women in the prime of their life, I am asked about my position on abortion. My pro-life views are fairly widely known in Indiana. I always make the point to offer young women in the room a promise, and it is a good place for me to close this installment of the Case for Life tonight as I think about Alice Paul and Susan B. Anthony who believed that abortion was the ultimate exploitation, of women. I will look at these young women, oftentimes in a high school classroom, sometimes in a small church group, and I will look around the room knowing just statistically speaking that there may be one or two women here who are faced with an unwanted pregnancy and are faced with a choice between bringing that unborn baby to term or ending its life in the womb. I always look at those young women and I say, I want to make you a promise that that other side can never make. I say, if you are faced with an unwanted pregnancy and you make the decision, however difficult, with your family’s assistance or a crisis pregnancy center near you, to keep that baby and to term and end that you turn that baby over to another family for adoption, versus if you choose to end that life in the womb, if you choose life, I will promise you from
the moment they hand you that wiggling little baby in the operating room, whether you raise it or you give it up, there will never be a day in your life but that you know that you did the right thing. And the other side cannot make that promise.

And if the statistics that we heard tonight, the physical cost and the emotional cost of abortion, are not jarring, perhaps that challenge would be, Mr. Speaker. My prayer is that as we think about the great women of American history and the great women of the suffrage movement who won women the right to vote, that wrested equal status for women in our society, people like Susan B. Anthony and Alice Paul and others, when I think about the ten- der and wonderful women of my family and of America, I have hope for the cause of life, because I cannot help but believe that women who could take American society from a medievalist view of women as property and have the resolve to win the right to vote and to win equal standing in the public square because of their courage and their conscience, that those same American women and their daughters and their granddaughters will not someday lead us back to the truth that life is sacred, to the truth that echoes through history in those ancient words, “See, I set before you today life and death, blessings and destruction. Now choose life, so that you and your children may live.”

It is my belief that it will be when that day comes, that abortion comes to an end in America, it will be the women of America who lead us home, just as it was the women of America who led us to a more just society and to an equal station in our culture for women.

With that, I would conclude my part of this Case for Life series, Mr. Speaker, and yield for whatever approach he would choose to make to this issue to a member of this Congress for over 20 years, his vibrancy and wonderfulness of America who led us to a more just society and to an equal station in our culture for women.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Pence) and I and a few others, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Frank), and we cosponsored a forum on women who had had abortions. As a matter of fact, it was called Women Desire Better, and we were able to hear from four very brave women, including Jennifer O’Neil and Melba Moore and others, who told their stories of having had abortions and the horrific consequences that followed them to their bodies, to their psychological health as a direct result of that abortion.

And the abortion lobby would like to have us believe that this is something that is bestowed on us. And it is anything but. It is an ugly, very destructive act that is committed upon our unborn child, and women are the co-victims of every abortion. We know that the baby is either chemically poisoned, or he or she is dismembered as a result of the abortion; but we also know that the woman carries with her a terrible price that goes on year in and year out, and regrettably the abortion lobby enables that and somehow suggests that she ought to be happy with that decision.

And what we are trying to say is that there is reconciliation. The Women Desire Better campaign is trying to reach out to those women who are suffering in carrying the burden of that abortion and to say that there is hope, there is reconciliation, and truth is life after an abortion; but they need to come to terms with it. And I would encourage all those women who are perhaps listening to be in contact with the Women Desire Better organization or to talk to someone who has had direct experience, have experienced an abortion themselves and can bring, like I said, some reconciliation to them because, again, there needs to be that, I think, individually and collectively in America if we are to go forward.

Let me also point out, as my good friend and colleague I am sure pointed out today, is truly a historic day having seen the Senate pass by a very wide margin a ban on the gruesome act known as partial-birth abortion.

And what we are trying to say is that there is reconciliation. The Women Desire Better campaign is trying to reach out to those women who are suffering in carrying the burden of that abortion and to say that there is hope, there is reconciliation, and truth is life after an abortion; but they need to come to terms with it. And I would encourage all those women who are perhaps listening to be in contact with the Women Desire Better organization or to talk to someone who has had direct experience, have experienced an abortion themselves and can bring, like I said, some reconciliation to them because, again, there needs to be that, I think, individually and collectively in America if we are to go forward.

Partial-birth abortion, I would respectfully submit, is but the tip of an ugly and unseen iceberg. I just below the surface, the surface appeal of this horrible and cruel to contemplate, let alone face. Yet we persist in our allusions and denial as a country ever enabled by clever marketing, bias news reporting, and the cheap sophistry of choice. Let us be clear, and I do not think we can say this often enough, an abortion is child abuse and it exploits women. Women deserve better than having their babies stabbed or cut or decapitated or poisoned. Women deserve nonviolent, life-affirming positive alternatives to abortion.

Thirty years after Roe vs. Wade and Doe vs. Bolton, the companion decision, the national debate on partial-birth abortion has finally pierced the multiple layers of euphemisms and collective denial to reveal child battering in the extreme. The cover-up is over, and the dirty secret concerning abortion methods is finally getting the scrutiny it so richly deserves under consumer protection statutes. I would say to my colleagues that there is nothing compassionate, there is absolutely nothing benign about stabbing babies in the head with scissors so that their brains can be sucked out. That is child abuse. And yet over on the Senate side today and previously here in the House, we had Members for whom I have an enormous amount of respect defending the indefensible. We reach out to them and say, look at what you are saying. If they did this, if they were a young mother and they had a little baby girl, a young child who took her doll and took a pair of scissors and stuck those scissors into the back of the head of that baby, they would get convicted. They would say no, my daughter should not be playing that kind of activity. And yet there are Members of this Chamber who embrace, enable, facilitate, and defend that indefensible act on a tiny life, a baby girl or baby boy.

As the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Pence) knows and as my colleagues know, the loss of human life to abortion in this country has been staggering. 44.4 million babies have been killed by abortion since Roe v. Wade. And, yes, there were tens of thousands killed even prior to it in those States where abortion had been legalized like New York, like Hawaii, like Oregon, but 44.4 million kids. That is one out of every three of this generation missing.

Let me just conclude. On the WorldNetDaily site, there was an article on October 17, and I will just read part of it: “Attendees of a national conference for abortion providers watched and listened with rapt attention as the inventor of the partial-birth abortion procedure narrated a video of the grizzly procedure, and then they were asked to come up with a name for the body that was snuffed out, today is truly a historic day having seen the Senate pass by a very wide margin a ban on the gruesome act known as partial-birth abortion.”
procedure," the article goes on to say, “after the late-term fully developed unborn child’s life has been violently and painfully terminated, the audience breaks into applause.”

That is sick, I say to my colleagues. These are the ones that our friends on the other side of this issue will defend passionately. They broke into applause as that baby met his death. That is what partial-birth abortion is all about. It is evil. It is evil.

We are all about life, life affirmation. Thank God we have a President who respects the dignity and the value of each and every life and will sign this legislation into law, unlike his predecessor, Bill Clinton, who on two occasions vetoed this legislation.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), my friend, for having these times on the floor so that we can begin the process of educating America. Much work needs to be done. People who watch C-SPAN, know this: we care about life, the unborn, the newly born, all of those who are weak and disenfranchised.

Many of us are the leaders on human rights, religious freedom, Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and a whole host of other important legislation designed to protect the innocent from the strong, the weak, and the vulnerable from those who would do them harm. That is what it is all about. Government is for the weakest and the most at risk. The unborn in our society are the weakest and the most at risk.

Again I thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), and I yield back to my good friend and colleague.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his passion, for his generous remarks, and for his dogged determination in this issue.

We come to the close of this case for life much as we began, and it is always remarkable how sometimes God bookends things in ways that we could never have planned. Because we heard the gentleman from New Jersey begin his remarks by simply using a phrase I heard him use many times on floor, but I know he did not hear me use tonight. He said, “Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women,” which was precisely the words of Alice Paul, who in her 20s was a driving force behind winning women the right to vote in America; and when you talk about how sometimes God bookends things in ways that we could never have planned. Because we heard the gentleman from New Jersey begin his remarks by simply using a phrase I heard him use many times on floor, but I know he did not hear me use tonight.

He said, “Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women,” which was precisely the words of Alice Paul, who in her 20s was a driving force behind winning women the right to vote in America, the Equal Rights Amendment. She said, “Abortion is the ultimate exploitation of women.”

And I close with the words of Susan B. Anthony, who now every time I walk through the Rotunda and I look at those heroes of the suffrage movement carved in stone, I will think of it, if the Speaker will forgive me, as much a me–

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has been fighting battles for almost 25 years. He has brought passion and intelligence and commitment to an issue in trying to educate people around the country and around the world about the value of human life and this, unfortunately, very slippery slope which we have proceeded down in the years since Roe v. Wade and even since before that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT), a moral leader in the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, let me say it is a great day in the House, it is a great day in the United States Senate and it is a great day in the United States of America. I say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), as we have said and talked about on many occasions, a lot of times we hear the courts speak on different issues. Well, today we have had an opportunity to hear the people speak, that this is an issue that we should get our hands on.

I believe we will be judged by how we treat those who are the most vulnerable in society. For that reason, it is especially exciting to be here on the
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. BROWN of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACOBS-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, October 28.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, October 28.
Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, October 28.
Mr. FEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today and October 28 and 29.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 1900. An act to award gold medal to Jackie Robinson (posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and to express the sense of the Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reports that on October 20, 2003, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3220. To amend title 44, United States Code, to transfer to the Public Printer the authority over the individuals responsible for preparing indexes of the Congressional Record, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, October 24, 2003, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the third quarter of 2003, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SLOVENIA, AND FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 5 AND SEPT. 10, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1 currency</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J. Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Livingood</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ellison</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Morrison</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charlie Johnson</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td>750.16</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J. Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Livingood</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ellison</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Morrison</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charlie Johnson</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,560</td>
<td>248.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J. Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Livingood</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ellison</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Morrison</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Charlie Johnson</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>794.00</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee total

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent, if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

3 Military air transportation.

4 Euro dollar.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. MARGARET PETERLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 13 AND AUG. 23, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Peterlin</td>
<td>8/13</td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>$520.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$520.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>$615.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$615.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/21</td>
<td>8/22</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>$193.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$193.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,619.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,619.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DAVID TEbbe, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 27 AND SEPT. 2, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Tebbe</td>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>$868.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>Netherland</td>
<td>$6,718.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,718.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$868.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$868.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AFRICA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 3, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sheila Jackson-Lee</td>
<td>8/23</td>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>$588.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$588.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/28</td>
<td>8/29</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>$504.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>8/27</td>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>$161.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$161.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,253.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,253.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY MEETING IN THE NETHERLANDS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 4 AND JULY 10, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Christopher Smith</td>
<td>7/4</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,489.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,489.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Stecy N. Hoyer</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alene J. Hastings</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Robert B. Aderholdl</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Joseph R. Pitts</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Diane E. Watson</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ronald J. Neuhans</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Chasewick R. Gore</td>
<td>7/6</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$4,731.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,731.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Donald Kursch</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$868.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$868.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Marie Hauerspin</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial airfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,827.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,827.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David Killon</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$3,489.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,489.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Janice Heng</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$235.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$235.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Patrick Price</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial airfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,792.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,792.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Elizabeth Singleton</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Fred Tanner</td>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,317.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bill van Horne</td>
<td>7/5</td>
<td>7/7</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,355.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,750.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
3 If military air transportation

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ISRAEL, IRAQ, JORDAN, AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 26 AND AUG. 4, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tom DeLay</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,488.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,488.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRAQ, JORDAN, AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 26 AND AUG. 4, 2003—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ander Crenshaw</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Shogren</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Loffredo</td>
<td>7/27</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,448.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tom T. Delay</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$476.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ander Crenshaw</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$476.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Shogren</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$476.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Loffredo</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>$476.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$476.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tom T. Delay</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$892.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ander Crenshaw</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$892.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Shogren</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$892.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Loffredo</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>8/4</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>$892.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$892.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Momson</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>$248.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$248.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$750.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>$730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Livingood</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$750.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$750.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>$54,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>$54,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Momson</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>$54,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>$730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>$730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,956.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, SLOVENIA, AND FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 5 AND SEPT. 10, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J. Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>695.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Livingood</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>695.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/5</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>695.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>695.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. J. Dennis Hastert</td>
<td>9/7</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Eisold</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Momson</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Walker</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Van Der Meid</td>
<td>9/8</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>730.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,846.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.
4 Euro dollar.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member or employee</th>
<th>Arrival</th>
<th>Departure</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Per diem 1</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Other purposes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Dreier</td>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,486.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,486.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley W. Smith</td>
<td>6/27</td>
<td>7/2</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2,486.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,486.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Dreier</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>541.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradley W. Smith</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>541.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Lawrence</td>
<td>7/26</td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>541.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/28</td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/29</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>412.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>412.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>8/2</td>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>506.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,956.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
2 If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
3 Military air transportation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows: 4812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for FY 2004 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior to reimburse emergency expenses to suppress forest fires in FY 2003; (H. Doc. No. 108-108—137); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4813. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106-246, section 3004 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4814. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Indian Incentive Program [DFARS Case 2002-D033] received October 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4815. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Approval of Services Contracts and Task Orders [DFARS Case 2002-D034] received October 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4816. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report required pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 12302(d), relating to those units of the Ready Reserve of the Armed Forces that remained on active duty under the provisions of section 12302 as of july 1, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4817. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department’s report on the amount of purchases from foreign entities in Fiscal Year 2002, pursuant to Public Law 107-117, section 803(b); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4818. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Charles H. Coolidge, J.r., United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4819. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency Administrator of National Banks, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Electronic Filing and Disclosure of Beneficial Ownership Reports [Docket No. 03-23] (RIN: 1557-AC75) received October 1, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

4820. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification that it is estimated that the limitation on the Government National Mortgage Association’s (“Ginnie Mae’s”) authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1712 nt; to the Committee on Financial Services.

4821. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, International Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Rulemaking to Amend Parts 1, 2, 21, and 23 of the Commission’s Rules to Reallocate the 27.5-29.5 GHz Frequency Band, to Reallocate the 29.5-30.0 GHz Frequency Band, to Establish Rules and Policies for Local Multicast Distribution Services and for Fixed Satellite Services [CC Docket No. 92-297] received October 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


4823. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau/TAPD, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Telecommunications Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities; Recommended TRS Cost Recovery Guidelines; Request by Hamilton Telephone Company for Clarification and Temporary Waivers [CC Docket No. 96-67] received October 16, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.
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under Federal law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), 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. BALLENTINE (for himself, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. BALLenger, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. WILK, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. HENEGAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. HAYES):

H.R. 3364. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 Main Street in Tarboro, North Carolina, as the ‘‘George Henry White Post Office Building’’; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BOYD:

H.R. 3354. A bill to include in St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge, Florida, the land and facilities comprising St. Marks light-house; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. WAXMAN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. Brown of Ohio, Mr. G. MILLER of California, Ms. SCHATZ, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPUR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MURkowski, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. Berman, Mr. WEEXLER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALARD, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KLECKA, Mr. BACA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3355. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish minimum requirements for nurse staffing in nursing facilities receiving payments under the Medicare or Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of Texas, Mr. AIN, Mr. DEMING of Colorado, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. THORNBERGER, Mr. GUTENKLEIN, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MYRICK, Mr. BEAUPRE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTs, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CULBerson, Mr. Sessions, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. FASSEL):

H.R. 3356. A bill to require a balanced Federal budget by fiscal year 2009 and for each year thereafter, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse, to establish biennial budgets, to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to impose spending safeguards on the growth of entitlements and discretionary spending, and to enforce those requirements through a budget process involving the President and Congress and sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself, Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 3359. A bill to increase awareness of and research on autoimmune diseases, such as lupus, multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, and fibromyalgia for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. MILLINDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ABROMINIE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. EMANUEL, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 3360. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the automatic acquisition of citizenship by certain Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HART, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. SANCHEZ):

H.R. 3361. A bill to provide for the protection of unaccompanied alien children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY:

H.R. 3362. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group life insurance coverage for pregnancy-related conditions, screening for breast, prostate, and colorectal cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. NORTON):

H.R. 3357. A bill to amend the Soldiers’ and Sailors’ Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide protections to members of the Armed Forces who terminate consumer contracts and real estate residential purchase contracts entered into before permanent change of station or deployment orders or motor vehicle licenses entered into before military service; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. HENSARLING (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DEMINGS of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. THORNBERGER, Mr. GUTENKLEIN, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MYRICK, Mr. BEAUPRE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. PITTs, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CULBerson, Mr. Sessions, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. FASSEL):

H.R. 3363. A bill to authorize appropriate action if the negotiations with the People’s Republic of China regarding China’s under-valued currency and related trade practices are not successful; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RENZI (for himself, Mr. DELOYE, and Mr. JONES of Mississippi):

H.R. 3365. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the death gratuity payable with respect to members of the Armed Forces and to exclude such gratuity from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and any other Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Georgia (for himself and Ms. MAJETTE):

H.R. 3366. A bill to designate the building located at 493 Auburn Avenue, N.E., in Atlanta, Georgia, as the ‘‘J.0hn Lewis Civil Rights Institute’’; to the Committee on Overseas Security Assistance and Policies.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3367. A bill to provide for additional requirements for the National Intelligence Director and the Director of the Office of the Department of Homeland Security relating to geospatial information; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SHUSTER:

H.R. 3368. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot grant program to train displaced workers in high technology fields; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. KELLER, and Mrs. MUSGRAVE):

H.R. 3370. A bill to provide immunity for nonprofit athletic organizations in lawsuits arising from claims of ordinary negligence relating to the passage or adoption of rules for athletic competitions and practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. SCOTT):

H.R. 3371. A bill to establish a permanent grant program to improve public safety communications and the interoperability of emergency communications equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LAMSPSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLINDER-MCDONALD, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. FROST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WU, Ms. CORINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3372. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a pilot grant program to improve public safety communications and the interoperability of emergency communications equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 3392. A bill to designate the facility of the Agriculture Research Service of the Department of Agriculture located at State Highway 26 West in Poplarville, Mississippi, as the ‘‘Dr. Thomas A. Coble Agricultural Laboratory’’; to the Committee on Agriculture.
By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H. Res. 74. A joint resolution recognizing the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture on the occasion of its 50th anniversary for the important service it provides to the Nation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BELL, Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. King of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. T. MEDARD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. McCARTHY of New York, Mrs. T. LEVIN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. VAN HOLEN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. BOYD, Mr. RANDEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. COTTS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHAM, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 366. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the members of AMVETS for their service to the Nation and supporting the goal of AMVETS National Charter Day; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Ms. DELAUR, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. Kind, and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the improvement of combined sewer overflow control programs; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself and Mr. AHERDOL) :

H. Con. Res. 310. Concurrent resolution requiring the posting of the Ten Commandments in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. DELAFEE, Mr. SHADEEG, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. CAMP):

H. Res. 408. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of The Conservative Mind, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CANTOR, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 409. A resolution repudiating the recent anti-Semitic sentiments expressed by Dr. Mahathir, the outgoing prime minister of Malaysia, which makes peace in the Middle East and around the world more elusive; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GEORGE of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MATT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MUMMINGS, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KAPTUR, Mr. FARR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CORRY of Indiana, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. CLBYRN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DOGGET, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BELL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. RUSH):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that prior to the conclusion of the first session of the One Hundred Eighth Congress the House should pass legislation that would create an independent commission or select House committee to investigate United States intelligence relating to Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS of California:

H. Res. 411. A resolution expressing the sense of the House that John Wooden should be honored for his contributions to sports and education; to the Committee on Education and Workforce.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. MICA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H. Res. 412. A resolution honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 30th anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

206. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 130 memorializing the United States Congress to maintain the current imminent danger pay and family separation allowances for members of the military in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

207. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 134 memorializing the United States Congress to address the issue of traffic stoppages at railroad crossings; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 31: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
H.R. 129: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 2956: Mr. THURMOND.
H.R. 2768: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 1914: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3103: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2332: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2494: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
H.R. 2495: Mr. KLECKZA.
H.R. 3164: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 2253: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2719: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 3272: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2727: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2746: Mr. COLLINS.
H.R. 2768: Mr. LEWIS.
H.R. 2832: Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 2496: Mr. BACH.
H.R. 1935: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1782: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1936: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1937: Mr. WALTER.
H.R. 2906: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1430: Mr. MEEK.
H.R. 1783: Mr. FURTH.
H.R. 1784: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1906: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1785: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 3139: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1907: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1908: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1909: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1910: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1911: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1912: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1913: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1914: Mr. MILLER.
H.R. 1915: Mr. MILLER.
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. 2821: Mrs. McCarthy of New York.